



Proceedings
of the
House of Assembly

During the Fifth Session
of the
Thirtieth General Assembly
of Newfoundland

1955

Proceedings of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland

Session 1955

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 1955

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

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor read the Speech from the Throne.

MR. SPEAKER AND GENTLEMEN
OF THE HONOURABLE HOUSE OF
ASSEMBLY:

The year 1955 is the one hundredth anniversary of the inauguration of Responsible Government in Newfoundland. Representative Government was established in 1832, but once the principal of popular representation had been accepted it was inevitable that full responsibility would eventually be exercised by the elected legislature. My Ministers will describe their plans for the official observance of the Centenary of Responsible Government in Newfoundland, and you will be asked to grant the necessary funds for the purpose.

Just as 1955 is a notable year in the constitutional history of Newfoundland, so it is also in the constitution of the British Island-colony of Jamaica which celebrates this year its three hundredth anniversary of British colonial status. The people of Jamaica are now well advanced along the road to full responsibility in the administration of their public affairs, and are taking an active part in the great cause of British federation in the Caribbean. Newfoundland and the British Colonies of the Caribbean have traded continuously with each other for a longer period than have any other parts of the Western Hemisphere. Newfoundland and the British West Indies were the birth-places of the British colonial empire and they

have much of their history in common. It is our wish that the friendliest feelings and relations will continue to flourish between the British Islands of this Hemisphere.

When the Terms of Union of Newfoundland and Canada were being drafted in Ottawa it was felt by the representatives of Newfoundland and by those of Canada, that it was extremely difficult, if not impossible, to foresee the effect of Confederation upon the finances of the new proposed Province of Newfoundland. Recognizing this difficulty, the representatives of both countries wrote, and the Parliament of the United Kingdom and the Parliament of Canada confirmed, a Term which was designated to deal adequately with this situation. This is Term Number 29. Under it Canada is to appoint a Royal Commission to review the financial implications of Confederation for Newfoundland, and to report the form and scale of the financial assistance that Newfoundland will need to maintain her public services. As this Royal Commission is to be appointed within eight years of the date of Union, my Ministers thought it wise to prepare for the task of presenting Newfoundland's case for additional financial assistance from the Government of Canada. A Royal Commission of Newfoundlanders has been at work for many months past and thanks to their patriotic and valuable services my Government will be equipped to put Newfoundland's case forward with efficiency and vigor. When Newfoundland entered the Canadian Confederation our public services were being maintained at a level which fell, in most cases, considerably below that of the nearby Maritime Provinces

of Canada. Since that date my Government have striven to raise the level of our public services, and it is common knowledge that they have met with a considerable degree of success in this direction. However the level of our public services is still, for the greater part, well below that of the neighbouring Provinces, and it is the policy of my Minister to concentrate their efforts on reducing the gap as rapidly as may be feasible within the limits of sound financial practice. These efforts will be continued to the time of the appointment of the Royal Commission on Review of the Terms. The extent to which that can be done after the Royal Commission has submitted its report will depend largely, of course, upon the form and scale of the additional financial assistance that may come from the Government of Canada.

My Government continue to pursue their policy of extending and strengthening local self-government. Five new Municipalities have been incorporated since we last met, bringing up to 53 the number of Town Councils, Rural District Councils and Community Councils now in operation in the Province. Newfoundland's second city has been created by democratic decision on the part of the people of Humbermouth, Corner Brook East, Corner Brook, Corner Brook West and Curling. A Bill will be laid before you to give effect to the wishes of the people of these areas. That this new City will prosper and expand is I feel sure the wish of every Newfoundlander.

The shortage of suitable housing for our people continues to harass many families, and you will be asked to provide funds for the construction of many new dwellings in the coming season.

It has long been the belief of my Ministers that the Tourist trade should be developed in this Province and that active steps should be taken to bring this about. A Tourist Development Loan Board has been appointed and you will be informed of loans made or facilitated by the Board for the building of cabins and other establishments designed to cater especially to the requirements of tourists.

Announcement has already been made of the intention to have Signal Hill constituted a National Historic Site, and of the plan to create the Sir Richard Squires Memorial Park in the area of Big Falls on the Upper Humber River. My Ministers have approached with great caution the proposal to facilitate the creation of a National Park in the area between the head of Glode Sound and Glovertown. Their caution has not been prompted by the least disinclination to see such a Park established, but rather by the fact that once the land for a National Park is transferred to the Government of Canada the minerals under the soil, and the timber and water-powers on the soil, of that land are withdrawn from commercial or industrial use. My Ministers are not convinced that they should ask you to authorize the tying up of important natural resources even for so valuable a consideration as a National Park. The matter will continue to receive careful attention by the Government of Newfoundland in close consultation with the Government of Canada.

My Government are co-operating actively with certain municipal authorities, and with the Government of Canada, for the purpose of establishing some badly-needed air-strips throughout the Province. These would serve the interests of tourists

as well as our own people and should prove to be of much value in the strengthening of our Newfoundland economy.

The building of the Newfoundland section of the Trans-Canada Highroad is progressing as rapidly as circumstances will permit and considerable work will be done during the coming season. It is vitally necessary to Newfoundland's expanding economy that the road across the Island be built as quickly as the financial and other resources of my Government will permit. However my Ministers feel that, important as the Trans-Canada road is, they should push vigorously forward with their programme of repairing, renewing and rebuilding old roads, and building new roads, to serve the hundreds of thousands of our people who live around our coastline. It would be the height of irony if a modern railway spanned the Island from east to west and the majority of the population had no access to that road and if many communities were unprovided with road communications between themselves. It should be remembered that in preparing for a greatly expanded tourist trade in Newfoundland we are at the same time endeavouring to make Newfoundland more attractive for our own people.

MR. SPEAKER AND GENTLEMEN
OF THE HONOURABLE HOUSE OF
ASSEMBLY:

The remarkable prosperity of recent years continues to bless our Province and people. So far from showing signs of slowing down this prosperity gives every evidence of still more growth and virility in the year upon which we have entered. My Ministers are fully convinced that this prosperity must be fostered in the main by private enterprise which it is their policy

to encourage and they are willing and anxious to be of whatever legitimate assistance may be possible for the attainment of this objective.

The work of the recently appointed Fisheries Development Authority is now beginning to take definite shape and direction. With the close collaboration of the Government of Canada the Authority will this year launch the actual development projects which were laid before you last year. My Ministers are hopeful that private enterprise will take careful note of these projects and will be quick to emulate them if they prove to be technologically and economically sound. My Ministers were gratified last year when the practical implementation of the Federal jurisdiction in the field of foreign markets was, so far as our Newfoundland salt codfish is concerned, transferred to the eminent Minister of Trade and Commerce. My Ministers feel, however, that Newfoundland business interests, our fish merchants and fish exporters, are by no means relieved of their responsibility for making actual sales of fish in our old and historic markets. It is they, and not the Minister of Trade and Commerce of Canada, who are expected to do the actual marketing, whether that is done through NAFEL or any other medium. My Government do not and will not abrogate their own responsibility in this matter. Economic and financial ruin would ensue if our production of salted codfish could not be sold at a profit in the markets outside Canada. Newfoundland is now the last remaining part of the Western Hemisphere where any considerable quantity of dry codfish is still being produced and so many of our people still find the catching and salting of codfish to be their only means of subsistence that

it would be catastrophic if loss of profitable markets deprived our fishermen of an outlet for their fish.

My Ministers have never ceased to believe that the greatest opportunities for building permanent prosperity in Newfoundland lie in the discovery and development of its natural resources. Their firm belief in the possibilities of development of some forms of agriculture led them to procure the creation of a Royal Commission on Agriculture of which Dean A. W. Shaw, C.M.G., B.S.A., was Chairman. That Commission has completed two years of careful, painstaking work, and their report will be laid before you in due course. My Ministers have had the advantage of seeing some parts of the report, for these were submitted by the Royal Commission in cases where it was felt that action thereon might be taken early in the present year. Arising out of their study of these advance sections of the report a policy has been adopted actively to encourage the establishment of mink-raising ranches in Newfoundland and you will be asked to provide funds to implement this policy by making commercial loans, at an economic rate of interest, available to individual ranchers and groups of ranchers, as well as the provision of the services of a veterinarian experienced in mink, and other public services for the encouragement of this industry. You will also be asked to provide funds to enable my Government to launch a number of other programmes recommended by the Royal Commission.

In the field of mining, Bell Island, Buchans and St. Lawrence, our three principal centres, continue to produce and prosper while in Labrador great and historical developments have taken place. The Iron Ore Company of Canada, which only last year mined

and shipped its first output of iron ore, expects to ship some seven million tons in the present year. Meanwhile near the south-western corner of that part of Labrador granted to Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation, the Canadian Javelin Company have discovered and drilled a great new deposit of a wash-grade iron ore amounting to at least many hundreds of millions of tons. It will be the wish of everybody in Newfoundland that this new find will quickly be brought into active development. The Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation, that great grouping of famous British, Canadian and other industrial and financial concerns, continues its intensive programme of exploration in both Newfoundland and Labrador. My Ministers are happy to welcome Mr. M. J. Boylen to Newfoundland, and all Newfoundlanders will be pleased to know that this famous Canadian mining man has become interested in the mineral possibilities of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER AND GENTLEMEN OF THE HONOURABLE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

It is now just over a year since my Government appointed the Royal Commission on Forestry, under the chairmanship of Major General Howard Kennedy, C.B.E., M.C. B.Sc., M.F.L.C. This Commission has travelled thousands of miles throughout the Province interviewed many people, and examined many of our stands of timber. My Ministers were most anxious to know whether there was enough timber growing in Newfoundland to continue to supply the existing paper mills at their present and also at a substantially expanded rate of consumption, and at the same time support an entirely new pulp and paper mill that might be established

somewhere on the eastern section of the Island. A third pulp and paper mill has long been a Newfoundland ambition and my Government, after a careful study of the Royal Commission's Report, are completely convinced that a third such mill is not only possible but imperatively needed in the implementation of a sound forest policy. This is feasible even without making any use whatever of the vast timber stands of Labrador for the greater part of the next half century. My Government has formulated a firm policy of producing the establishment of a third pulp and paper mill in Newfoundland, and are taking all the steps necessary to bring the mill into existence at the earliest possible moment. From now on a great part of my Government's energies will be devoted to this end.

In leaving you to your deliberations I trust that Divine Providence may guide your counsels in the promotion of the best interests of Newfoundland.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor then left the Assembly Chamber.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair:

Hon. J. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, at this juncture I would move the first reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act":

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

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to remind the House that since we last met the death of a former and very notable member of the House has taken place. I refer, of course, to the death of Mr. K. M. Brown, O.B.E. Mr. Brown was, I think, one of the giants of this House in the second

part of the first half of this century. He was a giant not only in physical stature—in that regard I suppose he was the tallest and the stoutest man that ever occupied a seat although I remember that Mr. W. J. Woodford too was an enormous man in physical structure—but Mr. Brown was a man who was big of heart and big of mind as well. His name was a household word all along the northeast coast of this island and indeed in many other parts of the island as well. "Ken" Brown, or "Kenzie" Brown as he was known affectionately by so many thousands of our fishermen on the northeast coast travelled on most parts of the coast and was known by sight to tens of thousands of our people. He was born at Kings Cove on 3 August 1887, which made him just about 68 years of age. He was the son of James and Caroline Brown, and he was the great-grandson of William Brown who was elected in Bonavista Bay to be a member of this House in the first House we ever had under Representative Government in 1832. With his son, who is at this present moment representing the southern half of his native Bonavista Bay it makes three members of this family to occupy an elected seat in this Chamber.

Mr. K. M. Brown was educated at Kings Cove and later completed his studies at Vancouver Naval Academy in British Columbia. He spent several years sailing out of Vancouver as a mate and as a pilot and ultimately as master of several steamships. He returned to Newfoundland in 1920 and settled in Grand Falls where immediately he became a very prominent public figure. It was in Grand Falls that I personally first met him, in about the year 1924. In 1923 he entered politics under the leadership of the Right Honourable Sir Richard Squires,

when he was elected to represent the District of Twillingate, with the largest single majority polled by any candidate in that particular general election. He was re-elected for the same district again in 1924 and again in 1928 and still again in 1932.

Mr. Brown, at the time of his death, was senior director of the Fishermen's Union Trading Company of Port Union. He was elected in 1936 to be the President of the Fishermen's Protective Union, a position which he held for the next twelve years until his resignation. In 1946 he was elected by acclamation by the District of Bonavista South to represent it in the National Convention. From the moment he entered he was a towering figure respected by every member and feared by some. It was while he was delivering a very stringent speech, not more than a foot from where I sit at this moment, that he was stricken with this terrible hemorrhage which removed him from all physical activity until the day of his death. In 1947 he was made an officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire. After his stroke, in this very Chamber, he retired and lived in retirement until the day of his death.

Ken Brown was a man you could not ignore, you might disagree with him—I had my moments of disagreement with him and he with me—But he always commanded respect. He also always commanded love and great affection. He was a big-hearted man, a manly man. He was a real man. He was a hard hitter. He was a great politician. The thing I liked about him was that although he prospered, he had the brains and the ability to make him prosper, he never forgot the ranks from which he came, and he never ceased to be a genuine friend

of the toiling masses of our country and then of our Province.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition the following motion: That this House desires to record the expression of its deep regret at the death, since the last session of this Legislature, of Mr. K. M. Brown, O.B.E., former member of the House of Assembly.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in rising to perform this sad duty I want, on behalf of the Opposition to join, with the Honourable the Premier, in the feelings and sentiments which he has so ably expressed towards one Newfoundlander whose sudden illness and subsequent death, I believe, must have made more effect possibly upon the future of this country than the demise of any other person that I know of. It is with a deep feeling of personal regard for Ken Brown that I feel that I am privileged to second this motion of the Honourable the Premier's. I was present in the House on the occasion that Ken Brown was stricken. I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that had it been the will of the Almighty to spare that able and straightforward character Ken Brown would have left a deep imprint upon the history of this island and Province in which it is our privilege to live. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I second the motion so ably put by the Honourable the Premier. I am quite sure every member of this House will join in forwarding this note of condolence to the relatives of our former comrade, Ken Brown.

On motion resolution adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: Copies of the Resolution will be sent to the next of kin.

MR. SPEAKER: At 3:00 of the clock this afternoon His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor opened the 5th Session of the 30th General Assembly at which time His Honour delivered the Speech from the Throne, of which, for the purpose of accuracy I have acquired a copy which I shall now read to the House.

Speech from the Throne read by Clerk:

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to move that a committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne which was delivered by his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor so graciously in opening this session of this Honourable House.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion, this Speech from the Throne today is one of the most important speeches from the Throne ever delivered in the past one hundred years. The only other speech which I would consider would take any precedence over this Speech today is the speech which was delivered to the first Legislature of Responsible Government in Newfoundland in 1855. It is for that sole reason, that is that it was the first speech delivered to a Legislature under Responsible Government in 1855 that I give it precedence over this speech today. I shall, Mr. Speaker, have to make one comparison as I go along enlarging upon why I make that comparison between the two speeches, one delivered by the then Government of Newfoundland in 1855 and one delivered by the Lieutenant-Governor today. In this speech I think it would be very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to very briefly mention some points which were made in that speech of 1855 just to show the comparison with today and what has been done down

through the years. In the speech of the Newfoundland governor in 1855 he referred to the great responsibility of the Legislature and the Legislative Council to the public of Newfoundland. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, of course this was the first Legislature under Responsible Government. He referred to the great failure of the previous year in the seal fishery, the utter failure in that previous year. He referred to the great poverty in Newfoundland at that time. He referred to the absolute necessity for roads in Newfoundland— and this is important — not only through the settlements around the coast of Newfoundland of that day of 1855 but the utter necessity of roads even connecting each settlement. He referred to the great necessity of expanding the codfishery. He referred to a treaty which during the year previous, in 1854, had been made between the United States of America and the provinces, as they were called then, of Canada. And he asked the Legislature of that day of 1855 to use its best endeavours to confirm that treaty so as to bring Newfoundland within the treaty between the United States and Canada in order to expand Newfoundland's trade.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it will be seen from that very brief survey of that Speech from the Throne in 1855 that the problems of Newfoundland were the same problems as this Government has been having during the past six years. In this year of 1955 I am very glad to note from the Speech from the Throne that the Government has planned to lay before this House plans in connection with a proposed celebration or memorial of this one hundredth year of Responsible Government in Newfoundland. I think, Mr. Speaker, that any government of this year of 1955 would be very lax in its

duty towards the education of the people of Newfoundland if they did not ask this Legislature to vote moneys for properly bringing to the attention not only of the adults of this country, but in particular the school children of this country, what Responsible Government has meant and what progress has been made since 1855. I feel quite sure that when the Government brings its proposals before this Legislature we will have the full co-operation of the honourable members of the Opposition. In giving the Government that co-operation I feel quite satisfied also that they will have the co-operation of every member of the public of Newfoundland.

I am very glad also, Mr. Speaker, to note that His Honour in his Speech from the Throne referred to our neighbour, even though many miles away, our neighbour politically and historically, the great Island of Jamaica in the Caribbean, and I am quite sure that this House will wish that anything this Government could do, or any Government for that matter, to foster trade relations with the Island of Jamaica, and for that matter any other Island in the Caribbean area, will receive the support of the honourable members of the Opposition.

Sir, in the past century we in Newfoundland have gone from practically nothing but the salt codfishery to many diversified industries, and particularly amongst our present diversified industries I classify the fresh frozen fish industry. We have even passed from a colonial status to Representative Government, and then to Responsible Government then to everything but legally a Dominion Government, then reverted back to the lowly administration under the Department of Colonial Affairs and then suddenly to a position as a great Province of

the Dominion of Canada. That, being very brief, is our political history during the past one hundred years. Now, I said, Mr. Speaker, "Suddenly to a great Province of the Dominion of Canada." Although it was sudden in time it was not sudden in thought. Again I consider this should reflect upon the last one hundred years of our history. As I mentioned a moment ago, in 1855, the very, very first year of Responsible Government in Newfoundland, the governor, in his Speech from the Throne, asked the Legislature of that day to consider very conscientiously the joining in a treaty with the United States and the Provinces of Canada, which he said in his Speech, he considered was so wisely confirmed by the governments of the various Provinces of Canada. He saw the idea of getting in there into one uniform outfit. Now ten years later, 1865, I find that in the Speech from the Throne that the governor came out then and said that the propositions made at the Quebec Conference would be laid before the Legislature of this House, to ask this House to join in Confederation with the other Provinces of Canada. That was ninety years ago. Now as we all know, and I don't need to say anything on it, there were several other attempts made, so that although in 1948 we suddenly jumped into Confederation it was not a sudden thought. It was a thought developing over one hundred years, but it took one man, and we know who he was, to bring it into effect.

Now Mr. Speaker, I note also that in the Speech from the Throne His Honour referred to Clause 29 of the Terms of Union. Well, as we all know, sir, in 1949 when this country formally went into Confederation with Canada there was an agreement. We know one clause of that agreement has now

become known very familiarly as Term 29. Under that clause, as His Honour relates, the Government of Canada agreed within eight years of Union to set up a Royal Commission to consider what further financial assistance should be given to Newfoundland, because of the fact that it was very difficult for any human being at the time of Confederation to figure out just what the terms should be between the two governments with regard to finances. So it is related that the Newfoundland Government has already during the past two years had its own Royal Commission working on Newfoundland's problem, Newfoundland's reason for considering that she should be entitled to further financial assistance. I am quite sure, sir, that that Commission, as I believe I mentioned in this same speech last year, which is composed of some of the best people we have in Newfoundland for that particular purpose, when that Royal Commission has been appointed by the Canadian Government, will do well in relation to Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to our having progressed in Newfoundland in the past one hundred years from, as I said before, colonial status to a full partnership in the great Dominion of Canada, and having progressed from one industry, a codfishery, to a salt codfish industry, which was exploited by the West Coast English Merchants, to a fresh frozen codfishery which is now the greatest supplier to the great markets of the United States of America. In addition to that great progress, we had many many other industrial pursuits which we have in Newfoundland today. We have progressed socially to a very great extent, Mr. Speaker. That is well established in the Speech from the Throne today. Remember, Sir, His Honour referred

to municipalities throughout the Province established during the past years. He said that many such were established and that it is the hope of this Government that many more will be established. Now I say that is a great advance socially over the past one hundred years, and perhaps politically too, but I like to think of it socially. I noticed in the Speech from the Throne in 1865 that the governor of that day, in reading the speech related that there should be a greater degree of local control outside the central government. His proposal to the Legislature of that day was that the control should be exercised by the districts which had then been carved out in Newfoundland, and even that these districts should have taxation and carry a certain burden of their own affairs. Now we have not done it by districts. But we must remember that there has been a terrific development in Newfoundland, particularly during the past six years, in the establishment of townships and regional councils, and a great increase in the idea of people forming more local governments. Again this is not a new thought, but it is a great progress from the new thought, especially during the past six years. On this point, Mr. Speaker, His Honour referred to the great congregation of people in the western part of Newfoundland, the Humber River, and the towns of Corner Brook, Curling, Humbermouth, Corner Brook East and Corner Brook West and the fact that they had recently voted to join together as one great city. I am quite sure that all honourable members of this House, Mr. Speaker, will agree with me when I say that this House wishes that great city, whatever it may be called, the best of luck, and I am sure that we will be perfectly satisfied to give them every help

and guidance we can in the future years.

Mr. Speaker, His Honour said that his Ministers will in this session of the Legislature lay before the House measures to further extend the ever increasing policy of housing. That is what it has been since 1949, ever increasing, a year to year increase. I say, Mr. Speaker, again thinking of our one hundred years of progress, that the Housing which is being carried on in St. John's and Gander and Corner Brook and other places through the Province through Government assistance, not Government dole, it all has to be paid back, but by way of Government assistance whereby a man can acquire a home which he never could have had otherwise. The policy carried on in housing during the past six years is another shining example of the progress of the people of Newfoundland in this their centenary year.

Now, Sir, in addition to the developments which I have mentioned and many more too numerous to mention, may I for a moment be permitted to enumerate a few of the industrial developments undertaken by this Government during the past few years. And, Mr. Speaker, as noted in the Speech from the Throne, those industrial enterprises undertaken over the past few years will be vigorously pursued during this year. The first one mentioned, I believe, was the tourist industry; This Government has, Mr. Speaker, for the past two or three years made what I consider to be a vigorous and careful study of what, if any, dollars could be brought into this country through development of the tourist industry. On this point, Mr. Speaker, I believe that all members of this House will agree that Mr. Vardy, as

director, has done an exceedingly good job.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. MERCER: Now it took two or three years to find out just what we had to offer tourists if we could get them in here. At the same time we had to think about what we had here to induce tourists to come. It is no use just talking about going around our coastline seeing the rustic coast and a few rocks. You get that in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and any place you go. So we had to think of something else and ask ourselves what had we got. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the Government's attitude in deciding they should fully develop the tourist industry because we have at least three items of very important value, as far as tourists are concerned, which they have not in the same degree in the United States nor in the rest of Canada, that is an accessible as ours. We have our fairly easy access to caribou, our fairly easy accessibility to moose and our easy accessibility to salmon in our rivers. These three they have not got in the same way that we have here in any other Province of Canada nor in any state of the United States. Now there is a point there, Mr. Speaker, which I should like to bring to the attention of the House at this time, that is, in the Speech from the Throne it was stated that the Government considered it a matter for private enterprise, and it was to that end and purpose that the Government set forth the programme and advertised and said; if you can show us and prove to the Tourist Board that you have a place where tourists might be induced, and where tourists might enjoy themselves, and where it might be profitable for them to go, and if you can show us in addition that you have either cash or

kind such as land or equipment, fifty per cent of the cost to establish a proper service for a properly supervised tourist industry, then we will lend you the other fifty per cent and from you we will take back a first mortgage with interest, to be repaid over a period of years—private enterprise—But like the fishery development scheme, like the mining development, like practically every other thing that you may wish to go into there appears not to be in this country the capital for private enterprise to use in order to start an industry. So the Government says, well, we will help you to get started and you can pay us back.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to the point in the Speech from the Throne where the governor refers to that ever important, that one hundred year long matter, in fact that 456 years long important point and that particular debatable point of last year, the fishery. And I would like to make a particular point on just a few words made in the Speech from the Throne today which refers back to really a year ago, and which refers to the point I have been making all through my motion today—The Government in addition to progressing by putting out money is looking to private individuals, is looking to private enterprise, to help and encourage private enterprise to develop Newfoundland's natural resources. Last year, Mr. Speaker, when moving this motion I said the following: "I feel that the greater joy to emanate from the Speech from the Throne today is the fact that the speech has today served notice upon us and the country at large that the Government will this year and for years to come concentrate much of its time and money upon the fishing industry. That notice in effect states that the greatest single need in Newfoundland's economy

is a plan to help the fishermen to earn a better living. People generally will agree that it was a very wise decision to appoint a commission to investigate. It took two years and almost another year has elapsed since the report was received. During that time there has been top-level discussions between the Federal and Provincial Government re the report of that committee. During that period of investigation and discussion on the report, and Sir, again all will agree, nothing much could be done for the fishing industry—to do so would be working in the dark—During that period the Government concentrated upon what has become known now as the new industries. Now the Speech from the Throne intimates that the Government will concentrate this year on the fishing industry. I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, if the well known driving force of this Government is concentrated on the fishing industry like it has been in the past on other industries then with the co-operation of the fishermen and the trade there will be no doubt about its success—but we should and must get the co-operation of all people in all phases of the industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I notice that in speaking of the concentrated effort of the Government, again this year, in co-operation with the Government of Canada, the Speech from the Throne says "We sincerely hope that private enterprise will emulate our efforts in this respect."

Then, Mr. Speaker, we come to the subject of agriculture. The report on agriculture referred to in the speech is of great importance, according to the speech, to the economy of Newfoundland. It appears that a large number of recommendations have been made in that report, which will be tabled in this House in the near future. But

one special part of the report was referred to in the speech today, and that was that part of agriculture that has to do with mink raising. Now, sir, I think it is public knowledge again that during the past year the Government has encouraged and has succeeded in bringing into Newfoundland mink ranch owners from various parts particularly of Western Canada and I believe some from the United States and they have already established or are establishing themselves in Newfoundland, through, again, some help from the Government, to be repaid by first mortgage.

So that within this year 1955, one hundred years after our first Responsible Government, we have again introduced another new phase of industry into Newfoundland which was either never thought of or nothing had ever been done about it before.

In the mining field the Speech refers to the continued increase in mining development, to the two or three great present mining developments which we have in Newfoundland, Buchans, Bell Island and St. Lawrence, and also refers to what may be in the future.

Last year was started the greatest mining development not only in the history of this country but maybe the greatest in the history of the Western Hemisphere, namely, the Iron Ore Company of Canada and the Canadian Javelin Company. There is no doubt these two great companies, their output and their progress will contribute to Newfoundland progress and culture. These are matters which undoubtedly, as far as these two companies are concerned, will be for the future discussion in this House, and outside I have no doubt. Then there is the very, very active exploration work during

the past year of the British Newfoundland Corporation. That great corporation has gone to great expenditure during the past year to explore the possibilities in forestry, mining and electrical development both in Newfoundland and Labrador. There is one thing about it, Mr. Speaker, if we get no results from all the money that is being expended by these companies, this much; they were envisaged, they were induced, they were brought in here by this Government, and if they cannot do anything then nothing ever will be done here in that direction.

I was very glad to see also, sir, that the Government is pursuing its efforts in relation to establishing with the Canadian Government a national park. It seems from the Speech from the Throne the only thing holding it up is what land and under what conditions land should be transferred to the Government of Canada for national parks. There will be a national park in Newfoundland wherever it may be established, in Bonavista Bay or anywhere else, it will be of great advantage to the development of the tourist industry in this country. I understand also that it will be an advantage in other ways in that all moneys spent upon the parks that is, the beautification, arrangement and development of the park is being spent by the Canadian Government and so does not come from inside Newfoundland. Then in addition I believe whatever part of the Trans-Canada Highway passes through these parks is usually wholly and solely built by the Federal Government, so that it is very much to the advantage of this country to have a Canadian National Park.

I notice too in this year 1955, this centenary year of Responsible Government in Newfoundland, that the Gov-

ernment is planning in collaboration with the Federal Government of Canada to do some work with regard to certain air strips in this country. I presume, Mr. Speaker, they will be small air strips used by small aeroplanes but certainly they should be a great help and a great advantage to the people of Newfoundland for inter-communication between towns.

The Government too, according to the Speech from the Throne, is this year, as I am glad to see, continuing to spend considerable sums of money on the Trans-Canada Highway and also on roads linking up settlements with the Trans-Canada Highway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, finally I come to what I consider another very important and far-reaching development, as proposed in the Speech from the Throne, that is the proposal of a third pulp and paper mill in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I feel that if this Government, having set up a Forestry Commission, having obtained all experts on that commission, having given those experts freedom to have access to experts in various phases of the forestry industry, having taken more than a year by that commission to investigate and to visit many many places, as the Speech from the Throne, I think, says; "thousands" and interviewed hundreds of people interested in the forestry; the Government having considered their report then, I feel, Sir, it is now a matter of when, the Speech from the Throne says, that the Government feels that not only is it possible and feasible because of the amount of timber we have in this country, but that it is absolutely imperative that the Government should use its energies towards the establishment of a third pulp and paper mill. And if this Government uses its energies as it has used them in the past,

Mr. Speaker, then there is no doubt but that a third paper mill will be a fact.

Now, Sir, may I say this in closing; it is remarkable progress we have made during the past one hundred years, and it is still more remarkable that three of the greatest substantial and labour-giving industries in Newfoundland these too have been instituted under Liberal Administration (1) Grand Falls in the year 1905 under the Liberal Administration of Sir Robert Bond and the second one about twenty years later under the Liberal Administration of Sir Richard Squires, Corner Brook and the third one under the Liberal Administration of the Premier, Dr. J. R. Smallwood.

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

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I am very proud this afternoon to second the motion before the Chair, and, Sir, I am grateful to have the opportunity to make a few brief comments to certain phases of the message contained in that Speech from the Throne. Now, Sir, I am at a disadvantage. I have been preceded by a lawyer who has covered the speech pretty thoroughly. Looking over my notes as he went along I found I had to cut out an awful lot that I had to say.

The Speech from the Throne, Sir, as all previous speeches since 1949, is divided into two parts (1) an account of stewardship since we last met and (2) what we intend doing in the coming months or years. I feel, Sir, that

perhaps I should this afternoon go back over the past six years and give an account of our stewardship. In order to give justice to our accomplishments it would take me several hours or even days so that I find myself in the position where I have to congest an awful lot of work into an account in a few minutes to the House. I am sorry, Sir, if I have to repeat something which has been said here very often but I find it necessary to do this to make my point and go back over the history of Newfoundland.

This year, Sir, is the centenary of Responsible Government. I must still go back a bit further to our first government of Fishing Admirals. That was a form of government where the first fellow who sailed out from England to reach our shores took charge for the year. That was followed by a Representative Government again appointed by the Crown and then in 1855 the Island was given Responsible Government. I think, Sir, it was a remarkable age for this country when the people of themselves were responsible for their future. They had to elect their representatives. I am afraid Sir, down through the years, we who read the history and look back over it, sometimes were very critical of the government and perhaps we have not appreciated the factor of our independence when the people of the country were free to vote in these people in charge of our affairs. Unfortunately down through the ages they did not carry on as well as we would have liked them to have done. At the same time I think, Sir, we were probably one of the first countries who had Responsible Government and who had a say in our own affairs. I have just said, Sir, down through the years of Respon-

sible Government we did not make too much of a job of it, and we found ourselves in 1932 glad to go back to the Mother Country and the home government and have them take over. There were probably excuses for what led to that situation, Sir, as we see it today as the people were not so well-informed as we are. However, we came to that sad situation where we had to give up our independence and were ruled by the Crown. We went on for some years, Sir, and just at the last, in 1949, we came to the position where we had to decide on joining with Canada—The Campaign was well known to everybody—it was not so nice—an unhealthy campaign—However, to make a long story short we became a part of Canada, and the Liberal Government went to the country and were voted in with a big majority. I think, Sir, we were very lucky at that time that Canada should have been under a Liberal Government, a modern government, and if anybody in this world needed it we certainly did in Newfoundland. We had been very backward. North America had gone ahead and was going ahead, both Canada and the United States, and we were very far behind. As I said, we were very lucky that the Liberal Government should have been in power when we became a part of Canada.

Sir, when this Government took over I remember very well, we came in first in 1949, we were the victors who had won the election. There were a few on the opposite side of the House. On this side we had men from all ranks of life. We had lawyers, we had teachers, we had co-operative workers, fishermen and what-not, and we were faced with perhaps the greatest problem that ever could face a government. Here we were — we had

gotten into Confederation—we had become a part of Canada, with our standards of living far below the other provinces, far below the standards of North America, our country neglected down through the years, and we had to start over anew. However, Sir, I feel we were able to do the job, and like I said at the beginning, to give an account of our stewardship. I don't think we have anything to be ashamed of in what we have done in the past few years. If I were to compare, Sir, the Newfoundland of today, or my district of today, with what it was in 1949 it would take me several hours to do justice to it. But to be brief, Sir, yet to do some justice to the situation, I will take the departments formed by the Government when they first took office—We had quite a number—we were laughed at at times—but to go down through them—First of all we had the Department of Health and welfare as one department. This department was then divided into two departments; the Department of Public Welfare and the Department of Public Health.

Welfare—In this country we did not know much about it up until Confederation. Our old age pensions, as everybody knows, were very low and the other welfare benefits were unheard of. We did not know anything of people of 65 getting a pension; mothers' allowances or the childrens' bonus—we knew nothing of it when this Government was formed. The Honourable the Premier chose as his Minister of Public Welfare, Honourable Doctor Pottle. I don't think, Sir, if he were to search Canada from Vancouver to St. John's he could have gotten any better person than Doctor Pottle to take over Public Welfare.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not proper to mention an honourable member's name.

MR. CANNING: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker — The Honourable Minister of Welfare. He did a marvellous job, Sir, in that department, and I believe even the ranks of Tus-tany would cheer.

Then, Sir, I go on to the Department of Health. What was that situation in 1949? The shortage of hospital beds, the shortage of doctors, shortage of nurses, and hospital boats were practically unheard of. I think we had one. Our T.B. rate was high and on the whole we were in an awful situation. Today we have several hospital boats on our coast. We have built more hospitals and nursing stations than any other government ever in Newfoundland. But we have one difficulty there. We are prepared to send out doctors and nurses to our outports and unfortunately we cannot get them to go. In my district today, I believe, we are two or three nurses short, and it is not the government's fault. The Department of Health is prepared to pay them and send them out but they just won't go. We find our local nurses particularly refuse to go out in the outports. We do everything we can to remedy the situation but find ourselves at a dead end as we just cannot get them. I am just talking briefly, Sir, on these departments and what we have done. It would certainly take much longer to show their achievements and what they have done for our people. That also applies to the Department of Mines and Resources and the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives. Again, at the beginning we did not know what we had in this country and, of course, we had to get up investigations and

commissions etc. And this year we have set up a Commission on Forestry to investigate what we have in regard to forestry, and I am glad to note in the Speech from the Throne that there is a possibility of another pulp and paper mill.

We have also made investigations into minerals. We have also had a commission investigating the fishery. Perhaps the people are a little bit impatient at the progress being made. At the same time we must remember that we are very backward and that department has certainly had a difficult task ahead of them. It is a completely old-fashioned outfit in this world and we have to bring it up-to-date with modern plants and fishing boats.

But, Sir, behind all those efforts we have a leader in whom we trust very much. I feel it is my duty this afternoon to guarantee the support of my district for him. I assure him that the old people in my district appreciate his efforts since 1949. They were living on a pittance or just existing. Today they have forty dollars a month coming in. Widows in my district, I am sure, if I were to ask them what I should do this afternoon would ask me to extend their thanks that they are well looked after. The children again through the family allowance helping them through their schooling and giving them books, I am sure if I asked them this afternoon what I should say in this House of Assembly they would ask to extend to the Leader, the Premier, their thanks. And the people who in 1949 lived in huts and had no way of building a decent home, and for whom in the past few years we have built homes or repaired them, I am sure they would ask me to thank him that the leaks are not com-

ing down on them. And the fishermen if I were to ask them what I should say to the Premier this afternoon I am sure that they would say to me that they are grateful that the department is doing everything it can to modernize the fishery and they are very grateful that they are installing these fish plants etc. Above all they would ask me to say to him that they are very grateful that in case they should have a bad year and their returns from the fishery should not measure up to sufficiently enable them to get through the winter that he would probably look after them as he has looked after them a couple of years ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on for several hours in justice to what we have done in the past few years since Confederation in my district and in the country as a whole. We have come a long way. I often wonder if we would stop to think or realize what was happening in the past few years—to go down to the Department of Education or to the Department of Health as I have outlined what we have done, hospitals, ships and what-not and planes and X-rays and what-not. Then of course, Welfare, most of which I have already covered.

Natural Resources—When we took over we acutally did not know what we had. We knew that we had trees and land etc., but since we have taken over we have had Royal Commissions on these things to see where we stand, and the same thing applies to fisheries. We did not know in 1949 if we had codfish swimming in Placentia Bay during the winter, but before 1951 we knew that we had. Of course last but not least is the Department of Economic Development headed by an

able and energetic character, a man who knew Newfoundland and Newfoundland History and I may say who knew more of Newfoundland politics perhaps than any other living man to-day—I think he did. He was like most of us, not too old to realize how backward we were and he set out to prove something that any of us of the younger generation wanted to prove, that is, what we had. In other words we had gone down through the years boasting that Newfoundland had fishery resources, forestry resources, mineral resources, this thing and that thing and all through the years nobody had investigated, nobody had surveyed, and we did not know if we did have them or not. Now I came in here in 1949 and I hoped that we did have. Of course of all the things I wanted the Government to do was to go out and find out if we had those things. When the Department of Economic Development was formed that was just the job they did by air surveys and land surveys, hydro-electric and waterpower surveys. I think they practically covered all the surveys. I think they are to be completed this year with the recent one which my colleague mentioned, on forestry, and of course the fishery one. Anyway now we know what we have. And the leader of that department has been bold enough to go all out to see what we have and paid hundreds of thousands of dollars, and now he is still bold enough to go out and tap these resources. So that, Sir, we are looking forward to the future with optimism. We have done, I think, what the people of Newfoundland wanted us to do. We have gone out and made surveys and investigations of our minerals, our forest and our fisheries. We have found out what there is possibly there: Now we

are prepared to go ahead and make the best of our natural resources.

In conclusion, Sir, I want to say, I know my district fairly well. I have coveted it at least once or twice during the year. I guarantee the Premier that the people are behind him and they appreciate everything he has done. If we have had one or two people who have fallen by the wayside they do not blame the Honourable the Premier, Sir, and they don't blame this Government that some poor fellow succumbed to human frailty. I can assure him they allow for it, and they know there was amongst the first "twelve" a Judas, and so it will probably go on all down through the years.

In conclusion, Sir, in seconding this motion, I guarantee the Premier the support of my district and its best wishes for the future.

I thank you, sir!

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the motion so ably put by the mover and seconder I must not be unmindful of you, sir, who have guests here this afternoon. I will on that account make my remarks as brief as possible.

Certainly it is an honour to have the distinction to reply to the address on the Speech from the Throne, and I congratulate the two honourable members opposite. I would like, sir, also to congratulate the Government on the fact that so many of their number have again returned to Newfoundland from the sunny south. We only have to look across the House, Mr. Speaker, to see those who have been in the south and those who have not, as they are brown and sunburnt. Sometimes I wonder if they got their suntan to

hide the paleness which their past failures would ordinarily induce. I hope that is not the case. Anyway we are glad to see them back again. I never heard of such a wandering tribe. They are "liberal", sir, in every sense of the word. They take a holiday whenever they feel like it, and go off to various places I won't mention, but they come back again, thank goodness. They are nearly all over there, sir, and I want to congratulate the Government on having so many of them back. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the place of course and a lovely opportunity, too, but unfortunately not the time to slate the Government, consequently I have to renege on this splendid opportunity—This is not the time, as I said before—I must congratulate the mover of the motion, the honourable member for Port de Grave on the keenness of mind which he displayed when he compared the Speech from the Throne of 1955 with that of 1855, just one hundred years ago. I agree with him that these are probably two of the most notable in all our hundred years of Responsible Government—notable in that there is absolutely nothing whatsoever in them—nothing whatsoever. I must congratulate the honourable member for having the keenness of mind, I may say, to see and note the contents of both. Either could have been delivered at either time. The one we had this evening, sir, could have been delivered very well in 1855 and be just as applicable then as now. It speaks for instance of prosperity—What is it the speech said?

"The remarkable prosperity of recent years continues to bless our province and people. So far from showing signs of slowing down, this prosperity gives every evidence of still more growth."

Surely the honourable member who moved the motion is not forgetting the fact that today we have twenty-one thousand Newfoundlanders looking for work—Prosperity—Although in this country there are only about a hundred thousand people who look for work yet twenty-one thousand of these are today unemployed. I fail to see where there is any prosperity.

Fisheries: Much has been made of fisheries. We have ten or fifteen thousand fishermen—nobody seems to know how many—After five years the Government is not able, and I doubt that anybody is able to tell us how many fishermen we have. But I can tell you this much; We had 237 unmarketed quintals of codfish of last year's catch still in the country. I can tell you Brazil did not take a codtail and Norway has not and Portugal so far has not taken any but I am hoping the situation will be better there. Does anybody tell me that is evidence of prosperity? There is something wrong—something wrong with me or the person who tries to tell me that. Now I have seen nothing whatsoever in this speech, sir.—Oh yes! There was one thing. I looked around, sir, the right House or in the right when the speech was being first rendered to see was I dreaming, was I in country—Because almost from the start, the second paragraph says:

„Just as 1955 is a notable year in the constitutional history of Newfoundland, so it is also in the constitution of the British Island-colony of Jamaica which celebrates this year its three hundredth anniversary of British colonial status. The people of Jamaica are now well advanced along the road to full prosperity."

A whole half page in the second paragraph—As I said I was wondering

did the person who wrote that still think he was in Jamaica when he wrote it. I wonder. It looks to me like it was. In the Name of God, what have we got to do with Jamaica? Business people have to be jumping back and forth from Newfoundland to Jamaica all the time—Send a helicopter to Bonavista and a plane somewhere else to bring in three or four so-called fish merchants and put them on a plane with the Honourable the Premier and fly them off to Jamaica. I submit, sir, perhaps the Honourable the Premier wrote that when he was down in Jamaica and somehow or another got mixed up in his notes and it went in the speech—unfortunate, but these things will happen every once in a while.

No, sir, there is nothing whatsoever in this thing which I could develop. My honourable friend from Placentia West could go on for hours and hours with notes and everything else to explain it. There is absolutely nothing in it. I know that is something usually said about a Speech from the Throne, but this is the only case where I can see the definition applies.

It spoke of a paper mill—Well everybody can speak of a Seventh Heaven and talk of anything—We are talking of this third paper mill—Incidentally, sir, we have not the report of this Commission on Forestry. I think, therefore, I can say very little about it. Perhaps it will outline where and why, and we can go on to get it. But for two honourable gentlemen to get up and praise the Liberal Government for bringing the paper mill into this country—I wonder where are they or whither tending, how highsoaring in thought? Sir, imagine, the like was not even known in the best days of Rome and Greece.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): The Liberal Government brought in two before.

MR. HOLLETT: I did not hear that at all. I could give the honourable member an opportunity to repeat it. Oh yes! I heard that in reference to other industries.

MR. BALLAM: Where did they get them? In the case of Corner Brook and Grand Falls did the Government not guarantee loans?

MR. HOLLETT: Who paid the guarantees? Who paid the loans if they fell through? Who serviced them? Is it the Liberal Government or the people of Newfoundland? I say the people of Newfoundland brought in these industries. And if you in these times can be lucky enough to engineer a third paper mill then give the thanks and credit where it belongs to the people of this country.

MR. BALLAM: Brought in through Liberal Governments.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: If they want to argue may I start on the new industries?

MR. HIGGINS: No, not this evening.

MR. HOLLETT: But, I could have a lovely time this evening. I could take Superior Rubber Company and Koch Shoes—better get a pair soon—I could take all the other industries this Government, Sir, brought in. I hope the day will soon come when we on this side of the House will have the opportunity to congratulate them.

There were several things mentioned—Of course there was a park, Sir Richard Squires Park. I never heard of

that before. I have heard of a park but not of that. But I think it is a grand thing to call it after Sir Richard Squires because he was an honourable gentleman.

I would like to have the opportunity to go on, but, as I said before, I must not forget Your Honour is the host to us this evening.—So without further ado we on this side lend our support whole-heartedly to this motion to make a reply to the Speech from the Throne.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I should like first to offer a word of congratulations to the honourable gentlemen who moved and seconded this motion. For me it has always been a keen personal pleasure to hear speeches from either of these two honourable gentlemen. The first of them is a professional man, and with a very cool and incisive mind. He has on a number of occasions in this House addressed himself to some weighty matters, and he has always made a very notable contribution. But the honourable gentleman who seconded the motion is under the very great disadvantage of having just come in to the city from his own constituency. I once said a speech which he delivered here was one of the half dozen good speeches I have ever heard in my life, in a lifetime listening to speeches in this Chamber.

I am not able conscientiously to offer my honourable friend the same congratulations on the speech that he has just made. Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that in this one hundredth anniversary year of Responsible Government it would be a good parliamentary practice if the Leader of the Opposition got back to the ancient practice of making a speech on opening day, and not apologizing for doing so. From time immemorial, indeed

from the beginning of Responsible Government in Newfoundland the practice has been invariably, until the last three or four years, for the Leader of the Opposition to deliver a stinging and somewhat comprehensive speech running anywhere up to one-half or three-quarters of an hour, in which he attacked the Government's policy as outlined in the Speech from the Throne. But I regret that the House has been denied the pleasure and the value of that practice in these last few years.

I have no intention whatsoever of reviewing this Speech from the Throne in any detail but there are one or two things, I think, which deserve a little comment from me. In the first place I would like to say a word of very warm welcome to two gentlemen who are present as visitors in the Chamber this afternoon. One of them is a Royal Commissioner in connection with forestry, the other is a Royal Commissioner in connection with agriculture. Sir, Newfoundland has been extraordinarily lucky in terms of men, of the caliber of the men, she has been able to obtain as members of these two great Royal Commissions. I believe that 1955 will be notable for many things and high up amongst them will be the fact that we had the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and the report of the Royal Commission on Forestry. I believe that of all the Royal Commissions we have ever had in Newfoundland admittedly the one headed by the Right Honourable Lord Amnfree was the greatest and most far-reaching because it had simply stupendous results in changing the constitution of Newfoundland and therefore changing the economy of Newfoundland. But next only to that Royal Commission I believe, these two whose reports we

have had and will shortly have, who have worked for the last two years in one case and the last year in the case of the other, these two Royal Commissions are second only to the Amulree Royal Commission in their importance for Newfoundland. I venture to say that the adoption of these reports and the carrying out of their recommendation both as to agriculture and forestry will institute an economic revolution in Newfoundland, beginning in 1955. Experiments will be tried in Newfoundland this year in the field of agriculture that will, if successful, have very far-reaching effects upon our economy and therefore upon our history. Thanks to the superb work of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and the Royal Commission on Forestry, provided this Government continues to have its usual energy, the report of the Royal Commission on Forestry will give us the great third paper mill for which Newfoundlanders have yearned for many years. Sir, in 1905 the great paper mill was built at Grand Falls. It was not great then but it has become great since. It is a mill now producing in the neighbourhood of seven hundred and fifty tons a day, and that will shortly increase when they go into continuous production as they will do quite shortly. At the time it was built it was a mere couple of hundred thousand tons a year. I believe the mill at Corner Brook opened in 1929 was a mill having a capacity then of five hundred tons a day.

MR. BROWNE: It opened in 1925.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was begun in 1923 and opened the Fall of 1925 with a capacity then of something approaching five hundred tons of paper a day. That has since risen

until today the mill at Corner Brook is the greatest mill in this whole world, producing newsprint and pulp in the amount of twelve hundred tons a day. The building of these two mills altered the current of our Newfoundland history. The building of these two mills had the effect of almost physically picking Newfoundland up and altering its direction.

In Grand Falls you have today a magnificent town of six to seven thousand people, thoroughly modern and a beautiful town and a prosperous town with high-class people in it, all prosperous, all well-to-do, all well dressed, all well housed, all well educated—a fine town—a Newfoundland town that can take its place anywhere in the great Commonwealth of Nations, take it with pride. Then this town finds itself the centre of a system of towns almost as great, each of them, themselves; as the town of Windsor, the town of Bishops Falls, the town of Botwood, the town of Badger, the town of Millertown, the town of Millertown Junction, the town of Terra Nova—a whole system of towns based on one mill, based on one industry brought to Newfoundland by a Liberal Government under the leadership of the great Sir Robert Bond.

At Corner Brook you have today a new city with a population of twenty thousand souls, a city that could take its place beside the best they have anywhere across our Canadian Nation, a beautiful city, within a setting the like of which does not exist elsewhere on this Island of Newfoundland, a beautiful, magnificent city set amidst these great hills on that beautiful Bay of Islands. Corner Brook is the heart of that great industry and is also at the same time the centre of a whole

system of towns that have grown up and have been brought into existence by the mill, or where they have existed before they have been vastly improved and enlarged as a result of that mill. There is Hubbennouth, Curling, the whole countryside running from Corner Brook down to Mount Moriah, almost one continuous town, all prosperous, all well to do, all well dressed, all well fed, all well housed, all well educated, fine people, a credit to Newfoundland and a credit to Canada. Then you have a whole system of towns that have sprung up directly arising out of that great newsprint industry brought in by a Liberal Government under the great Sir Richard Squires. You have towns all over the West Coast of Newfoundland and even as far east as Indian Bay in Bonavista Bay in my own district of Bonavista North. That is what you get, when you get this third mill, which my honourable friend has been pleased to dismiss so airily here this afternoon. He had dismissed, Sir, very airily the very dream and aching hope of the Newfoundland people who have worked in Corner Brook and in Grand Falls and in the dozen other towns that have come into life as a result of these two great mills. These thousands of Newfoundlanders who have worked in these towns and earned good money, and these other thousands who know of the existence of these towns, who know what these great mills have done for Newfoundland, all over Newfoundland today every man, woman and child aches and yearns for that third great paper mill somewhere here on the eastern side of our island home to balance out our economy. The great newsprint industry of the west coast which has revolutionized Western Newfoundland and that other

island at Grand Falls which has revolutionized the centre leaves now only the great need, the deep gap in the eastern end of our island for a great paper mill that will spur up and stimulate development of new towns and new systems of towns here in Eastern Newfoundland.

We will have the mill—We will have the mill—We will build that mill. We will see that it is built. We will not build it as a government, but we will see that it is built. That mill is coming or my name is not "Small-wood." That mill is coming to Newfoundland—that mill is coming.

I would ask this House—I would ask Newfoundland to indulge in a mental exercise and that mental exercise is to try and imagine Newfoundland today in 1955 with no Grand Falls mill ever having been built and with no Corner Brook mill ever having been built. Down to the end of 1954 that is three months ago, the Grand Falls mill had distributed to our people, our Newfoundland people, in wages and salaries the sum of \$209,674,000 in wages and salaries. That same mill in that same period of time had made many purchases of products of Newfoundland made in Newfoundland, that is to say purchases made by them in Newfoundland amounted to \$80,180,000, and in that same period that great company paid out to the railway in freights for the haulage of their newsprint paper and the haulage of their pulp wood and other supplies the sum of \$12,600,000 in that whole period. Then in miscellaneous expenditures of one kind and another the total sum of \$26,000,000, to the end of December 1954, making a grand total of \$279,554,269, for the period from the commencement of the operation to the end of the last year.

When you turn to Corner Brook you find there is no great difference in the amount spent by them because, although they started so much later than Grand Falls, they were from the outset quite a large mill and developed rapidly into becoming the greatest mill in the whole world. So that since they began operations down to the end of 1954 the great Bowater mill in Corner Brook had paid out to Newfoundland in wages and salaries \$174,890,000. They spent in local purchases within Newfoundland \$31,171,000—Think of it: Newfoundland vegetables, Newfoundland potatoes, and turnips and cabbage, fish both salt and fresh, Newfoundland herring, Newfoundland hay, Newfoundland products of our factories, paint, cordage and other products of our Newfoundland factories. Then in railway freights, and these railway freights remember Mr. Speaker, benefitted some thousands of our Newfoundland people who make their living working for the railway these railway freights totalled to the end of December 1954 were \$10,854,000. Then in other expenses the company has distributed in Newfoundland amongst the people of Newfoundland \$16,970,000 making a total for Bowaters since 1923 or 1924 a total of \$232,822,000. Then if we add the two together and we get \$512,000,000, over half a billion dollars distributed in Newfoundland. Yet my honourable friend sees nothing in this empty speech from the Throne, sees nothing in it. It has this in common, he says, with the Speech from the Throne of 1855 that they were both empty, neither of them had anything—He dismissed a third paper mill.

MR. HOLLETT: What third?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no reference to it?

MR. HOLLETT: Put it there and then put it in the speech.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We will put it there. We will put it there.

Now my honourable friend of Jamaica! Like my honourable friend, I like to take a holiday each year. I assume he takes a holiday each year as I do too. For the last four years I have taken a holiday but for the four years before that I did not. In these past four years I have gone once a year to Jamaica. The first year I spent three days as the guest of Lord Beaverbrook at his home in Montego Bay. The second year I spent a week in Jamaica and the third year, that is last year, January of last year, I spent two weeks there and this year I spent two weeks or a bit more. I spent these two weeks out in the sun on the beaches, sun bathing, soaking in the sunshine and the vitamins so that I can come back spruce enough to start a third paper mill or three paper mills if there was a chance for them. And because for those past four years I have been visiting Jamaica once a year for my annual holiday, at my own expense, out of my salary, not paid by government expense—the Government pays my salary of course—and out of my salary I have paid my own expenses for my own holiday. I suppose there is nothing wrong with that?

MR. HOLLETT: Not a thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At least I hope there is not. Now I learned a lot in those four years. To begin with I visited not only Jamaica but I went as far south virtually as you can go and still be in the Caribbean—I went to the Dutch West Indies, and I visited one or two other parts of the Caribbean, enough to learn that the Caribbean is almost a continent, the distances within the Caribbean are quite astonishing. For example, from the southern tip of Florida, and Florida is supposed to be

a paradise down south where people go in the winter to get some sunshine, seven hundred miles south of that is Jamaica and a thousand miles south of that is Barbados and then seventeen hundred miles in a straight line and still in the Caribbean, or the other way a line from British Honduras and British Guiana another seventeen or eighteen hundred miles, and within these great distances are many British Islands, and bordering that great Caribbean Sea are many British Countries, and in addition to the other British Islands and British Countries there are other islands, Santo Domingo, Cuba and Puerto Rico and others. They are countries that are not British. But if you take them all, British and non-British in that great Caribbean you have a population of fifty million people. Fifty million who could consume the entire production of our Newfoundland salt codfish. They have the appetites, they have the desire for that fish—So that the great Caribbean could become, as I see it, properly developed, properly promoted, properly pushed, the greatest market for salt codfish from Newfoundland.

Now sir, another thing I learned was this: A new British Dominion is about to be born in the Caribbean, the Dominion of the British West Indies. In the House of Commons a few weeks ago, at Westminster, the Colonial Secretary of Britain said shortly a new British Dominion would be born in the Caribbean, the Dominion of British West Indies. In the month of January when I was in Jamaica the "Gleaner", which is the Kingston daily newspaper, announced from day to day statements made in every part of the British Caribbean, and every political leader without exception in the British Caribbean, has come out during January past in favour of a British Federation,

the Federation of the British West Indies.

Now, sir, here in Newfoundland—Newfoundland is an island, the first British Colony in the world, in history—Newfoundland—Britain's most ancient and loyal colony, the first of Britain overseas. Here beside us a couple or three thousand miles straight south are these British Islands of the Caribbean. As His Honour says in the Speech from the Throne—Newfoundland and these British Islands have been trading with each other longer than have any other parts of the Western Hemisphere, the oldest trade within the Western Hemisphere is the trade between Newfoundland and these West Indian Islands. Very well, if they are shortly to have a new British Dominion with its own tariffs, with its own trade policy, and if Newfoundland, now admittedly a Province of Canada—that is agreed—

MR. HOLLETT: Thank Joel

MR. SMALLWOOD: If Newfoundland, now a Province of Canada, has the ambition, if Newfoundland has the imagination to see a great opportunity then Newfoundland will see that opportunity, the opportunity to become the medium, the means, the channel through which Canada, all Canada, will trade with this British Caribbean, the channel through which all the Caribbean industries will trade with Canada—Must it be Nova Scotia? Must it be Quebec? Must it be Ontario? Might it not be Newfoundland enterprise? Might it not be the enterprise of Newfoundland merchants who have had the experience in trading with the countries of the world more than any of the merchants of the Mainland of Canada? Don't forget that on Water Street you have good merchants more versed in foreign trade than any of

the merchants of the Mainland of Canada. We have merchants in Newfoundland who have traded with Spain and Portugal and Italy and Greece and Malta and Brazil and all the Islands of the Caribbean. That is great experience in foreign trade, very great experience. Why, therefore, should not that great coming movement in trade in that great Caribbean where things are stirring, where development is taking place very rapidly—my friend, Littlemore, the head of the Industrial Development Corporation of Jamaica, a coloured man, a native of Jamaica, quite black, who went to England and became an industrialist and who made millions of dollars for himself and is now extremely wealthy—He went back to Jamaica at the invitation of his government to head up the Industrial Development Authority—As Mr. Littlemore told me, in the last three years he and his corporation of Crown companies acting for the Government of Jamaica have been able to bring over two hundred new industries and commercial enterprises into the Island of Jamaica. So in all these islands with trade development, these islands with a brilliant economic future, surely Newfoundland has enough daring and enough boldness and enough imagination to go after that great opportunity. I hope my honourable friend can see more than that I have a suntan. I hope that is not all he can see—A British Federation in the Caribbean—A suntan—A great new British Dominion being born and a great opportunity to develop trade between Newfoundland and the Caribbean—And all he sees in that is that Smallwood has a suntan.

MR. HOLLETT: Is it true?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, that is why my honourable friends are there

and that is why we are here. That is the reason—that is why my honourable friends will stay there and that is why we will stay here. The people of Newfoundland have taken their measure and have taken ours.

MR. HOLLETT: When will you get the suit?

MR. SMALLWOOD: As a result we will get the third paper mill.

MR. HOLLETT: Hear, hear, I hope you do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At least my honourable friend is not denouncing it.

MR. FOGWILL: Not yet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend denounced BRINCO. Last year they spent two hundred and fifty thousand dollars just making the beginning of a survey of the Grand Falls, Labrador, a project that will take five hundred million dollars to develop, to develop the hydro-electric power there, which BRINCO proposes to do, as much money as Grand Falls and Corner Brook have paid out in Newfoundland since 1905, that is what it will take to develop the power—"Bunko"—Some "Bunko". My honourable friend must admit it is pretty good—Some "Bunko".

Well, Mr. Speaker, when the debate properly begins we will bring out a great deal of information. I am quite sure my honourable friends opposite expect also to bring out a great deal of information. But the kind of information they have in mind and what we have in mind by bringing out information, I fear, are broadly different. However, we will look forward with interest and great eagerness to it. I have this to say before I close. The Prime Minister of Canada has invited

the Premiers of all the ten provinces to confer with him and the Government of Canada on the 26th of April on matters of the greatest concern to all Canada. I have accepted the Prime Minister's invitation to attend that conference. I propose to be accompanied at that conference by a number of my colleagues in the Cabinet. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it is our ambition as a Government to conclude the work of this Session of the House in time to enable us to prorogue the House. I am sure that my honourable friends listening will say, if I said dissolving, but I said prorogue the House about, say, the 24th of April, with our business done for this year so far as the Legislature is concerned so that the Ministers of the Crown may go to Ottawa with free minds to tackle the ponderous matters there. For that reason we will meet more frequently than has been customary. We will meet tomorrow and again on Friday. We do not, however, expect that my honourable friends opposite will be ready before Monday to proceed with the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The speech debate will go ahead as usual beginning Monday next, which will give my honourable friends, I believe, ample time in which to prepare. At least that has been the amount of time given in the past. On tomorrow and Friday we would hope to go straight ahead with the legislative business of the House. May I say that my honourable friends opposite will have all the time they want. All they have to do is ask for it and they will be given all the time they want on any matter of business coming before the House—all the time they want they may have. We will meet daily and at night time, some nights, and towards

the end of the session if there seems to be much business outstanding it might become necessary for the last two or three days to meet in the forenoon. All that has happened before. There is nothing new in that. But I don't want my honourable friends for one moment to get the idea we are going to try and rush them off their feet nor deny them all the time they want. But they are going to have to work as we do.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I resume my seat.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege, I take it—I would like to inquire if we can go on with legislation and other matters before we start the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have already done it.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

Motion: That a Committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne—
Carried—

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee will consist of the mover and seconder of the motion and the junior member for St. John's East.

Presenting Petitions

None.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Giving Notice of Motion

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Fisheries Assistance Fund", also

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Industrial Development Loan Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Development Loan Act".

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Fire Prevention Act", and

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Conditional Sale of Goods".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages.

A Bill "An Act Respecting Perpetuities and Accumulations to Certain Funds Established to Provide Pensions or other benefits".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Wills Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Bulk Sales".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Protection of Justices and Other Public Authorities".

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Disabled Persons Act, 1954".

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Education (Teacher's Pensions) Act" and

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act",

A Bill "An Act to Amend the School Attendance Act",

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I give notice

I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue and Audit Act", and

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Coming into Force of the Civil Service Commission Act, 1953".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949".

Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions for the Granting of Supply to Her Majesty.

MR. BALLAM: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Apprenticeship Act".

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Preservation of Historic Objects".

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act", also

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act".

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that it is my intention on Monday next to table the Report of the Royal Commission on Forestry.

MR. W. J. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege: We have

now heard notice of twenty-four Bills including Supply. And the Premier tells us we are going to take up all that for tomorrow, all these Bills, which will be introduced tomorrow and Friday, and go ahead. Is it conceivable, Mr. Speaker, that four members or five members in the Opposition can be in a position to deal with such a vast amount of legislation of such far-reaching importance on such short notice as this? Do we have a Speech from the Throne which we are not allowed to debate until this legislation has been taken up?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I point out, if the practice here is as it is in the British House of Commons and in the Canadian House of Commons, the Speech from the Throne must be disposed of before any other legislation is dealt with. Then it is not in order to deal with this legislation until the Speech from the Throne is disposed of.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wishes tomorrow to proceed with the Address in Reply, we are ready. It was just a courtesy to call it for Monday next rather than tomorrow. If he insists on tomorrow we are quite happy, indeed we would rather have it, but out of deference to the honourable gentlemen we decided to leave it until Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: The whole thing is out of order. We cannot refrain from doing that which we are not already doing—It is purely hypothetical—We are not already doing it. I cannot rule on a question not yet arising. What the Honourable the Premier may say has nothing whatsoever

to do with the procedure. Obviously the most that could be done to any of these Bills tomorrow is to give them first reading, which is a mere matter of form.

Giving Notice of Questions

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I had quite a lot of questions, but, as I said before, I don't think I should read them all now. I shall just read one.

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

- (a) Certified copies of Minutes of reports and recommendations of the Treasury Board in accordance with Section 37 (2) of the Revenue and Audit Act.
- (b) A copy of the Public Accounts.
- (c) An itemized account showing amounts paid on account of Travelling Expenses by Departments since April 1st, 1954. Also showing amounts charged to suspense Account as of 31/3/54.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask the Honourable the Attorney General to lay on the table of the House the Report of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, on their investigations into the alleged irregularities in the purchase of Conveyors for the Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to announce; Mr. Philip Forsey, member of the House representing the District of Burin, resigned in December and therefore the seat for Burin District is now vacant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the House as its rising do ar-

journal until tomorrow, Thursday, March 24, at 3:00 of the clock.

On motion the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 24, at 3:00 p.m.

THURSDAY, March 24, 1955

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

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker—I would like at this time to make a statement with respect to the rates now being charged by the United Towns Electric Company on the Avalon Peninsula.

On the 23rd day of March, 1953, the United Towns Electric Co. Ltd. made application to the Public Utilities Commission for certain increases in its rate structure.

The Public Utilities Commission advertised and held hearings with respect to this application, and before coming to any decision had the benefit of the services of an electrical engineer from Ontario and an independent firm of auditors.

Ultimately, having satisfied itself that an increase in rates was justified, an order was made on the 24th day of September, 1954, authorizing the Company to bring into force the increase requested.

I would remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that the Public Utilities Commission is an independent Commission set up by the Government but in no respect under its control. It is, of course, responsible to the Legislature.

The new rates authorized became effective on October 1st, 1954; and

some time later there was an outcry on the part of the public against the extent of the increases being charged. Reports reached the government and letters appeared in the papers indicating that rates had been increased anywhere from 50% to 40%.

At the request of the Premier I undertook to look into the increases granted, and the examinations I made disclosed the following facts:

1. No increases had been made in industrial rates.

2. A substantial increase had been made in domestic rates which could not, however, possibly amount to an increase of 100%.

3. Commercial rates had been increased by 200% and in some cases, by reason of the institution of a demand charge, much more.

This latter increase seemed so drastic that I at once suggested to the Chairman of the Commission that he should negotiate; and to the Managing Director of the Company, that he should agree to an immediate reduction of one cent per kilowatt hour and this was done.

In view of the fact that certain domestic customers had reported an increase exceeding 100%, an increase that could not be justified by the rates approved, I suggested to the Public Utilities Commission that it hold hearings in certain key towns on the Avalon Peninsula in order to see the bills in question and ascertain the facts. The commission will probably conclude this investigation on Monday next when it will doubtless report its findings to the Government.

Having now examined more carefully the new rate structure approved by the Commission and now being

applied by the Company, I am far from satisfied that increases to the extent approved can be justified, and I am consequently instructing the Commission that the whole question of rates now being charged by the Company should be re-examined, particularly in the light of its receipts since October 1st 1954; and that this re-examination should start immediately. I have no personal doubt but that this re-examination should result in a very substantial reduction in the rates presently being charged.

MR. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I may, could I ask the honourable Minister—does that apply, that re-examination apply to domestic rates?

MR. CURTIS: All rates.

MR. HOLLETT: I see—Because the Minister made some references to it not being a hundred per cent. I know of cases where it actually amounted to a hundred per cent increase, in my own district in St. John's West, and not a stone's throw from the Southside Road where householders are paying practically twice as much as they paid before. As a matter of fact a petition was brought to me in connection with that increase.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is debatable.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member asked a question.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I think I have the right to make a few remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: A ministerial statement is not debatable.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is certainly debating it.

MR. SPEAKER: At the moment it has reached the point of debate. It began by the asking of a question.

MR. HOLLETT: I may ask a question, Sir? And the answer is that an investigation will be made into the rates being charged at the present time. I believe that is correct. That being so, will this House be informed? Before the House closes?

MR. CURTIS: I hope so.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask two questions?

(1) Is the Minister going to give the Opposition copies of the statement just made?

MR. CURTIS: I am going to give it to the press.

MR. BROWNE: And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable the Attorney General would he table a copy of the order of the Public Utilities Commission in which the new rates were authorized? Will the honourable the Attorney General do that tomorrow?

MR. CURTIS: Yes.

Presenting Petitions:

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I agreed to present a petition from the residents of Butleville, Shearstown, etc. which reads as follows:

We, the undersigned citizens, request your help to get electricity, extended from Shearstown to the above mentioned places. We know that you are well acquainted with this area and will be only too glad to present our case to the proper authorities.

As you know electricity is no longer a luxury in these days, it is a vital necessity, especially where there is a

growing population such as ours. We are most anxious to have this extension which will be able to provide more adequate light and other facilities for homes, schools etc. Furthermore our shopkeepers are unable to have any refrigeration facilities and people have to go elsewhere for food, and it is impossible for telephone facilities, which needless to say is a very great drawback in cases of emergency. To give some idea of the population we have according to the voter's list 136 voters.

We trust you will give this request your particular attention.

Mr. Speaker, I visit this area quite often, and the electricity is cut off just as though it were cut with an axe from one side of the road to the other. On one side you can see the houses lit up with electricity and the next house for the sake of possibly twenty poles, is using the ordinary oil lamps. I am particularly interested, sir, in the shopkeepers who asked me to press their point in this petition in the matter of refrigeration, as they are losing a lot of money in their stores.

I ask that this petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department concerned.

On motion leave granted—Petition tabled.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition from the area concerned, i.e. Shearstown, and beyond it Butteryville, which is an area well known to me. I know it is a very thriving area with very industrious energetic people. It must be very maddening to be within a gunshot as some of them are and some of them several gunshots of electricity, indeed to be able to look out the valley and

see the lights which come in so far and then stop. I would agree entirely that the utility company should be asked to extend the lights in there.

The company, I understand, has recently changed hands, at least the ownership of the company has recently changed hands. My understanding is that a well-known investment house in Montreal who are either the owners of, or are closely associated with, the Power Corporation of Canada bought heavily into the company, and that the remainder of the title is vested in a number of prominent merchants along Water Street, and possibly some other shareholders as well. I understand also that it is the intention of that company, through its new owners, to do some extension of their facilities, and that they are prepared to put considerable sums of new capital into the company.

I strongly hope that they will extend their lines along the road. Only during the past summer I was stopped on the Hodgewater Line by a group of people one night as I went there, asking if I would endeavour to get the lights extended in their way. The lights now I believe are practically in to Mr. George Mackinson's Farm and possibly a wee bit further along the road, but beyond that point quite a number of other people live, and they too are anxious to have electric lights. I hope that this petition and the needs of the people referred to and the people in other parts will receive early consideration.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support that petition too. I am quite aware of the inferences — In Burin we can look across the harbour and see electric lights on one side, and on the other side on which I was living we had no lights. It

quite certainly can give one an inferiority complex—perhaps that is what I have been suffering from all my life and on that account—it certainly does give you one—I ask the government to make sure when they do get the lights there the people won't suddenly find the people on one side of the road have to pay \$1 for 10 kilowatts while the people on the other side have to pay \$2 for the same number of kilowatt hours—That is the situation we have just up here on the Southside Road.

HON. MR. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): I think it is \$2. for 20 kilowatt hours.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the difference anybody is going to burn twenty. I can bring you facts and figures, Mr. Speaker, to show that a good many people on the Blackhead Road are paying practically double what they paid before the rates were raised, and I am only extending the opinion that these people from whom the petition comes when they get the lights, the people on one side of the road won't be penalized in order that the others may have their lights. That is exactly what has happened here—We will come to that later in the Throne Speech.

On motion petition received for references to the department concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Before strangers were admitted I gave a message to the Legislative Assembly and I am empowered by the House to make that message public, as it is felt that it would be of general interest. It is this:

A few months ago I had the pleasure, with others, of visiting the Sultan of Zanzibar. He has been a

reigning monarch since 1910 and is now 75 years old. He was very interested in everybody he met, and asked me to convey to the Lieutenant-Governor and the Government and all the members of the Legislative Assembly of Newfoundland, as he said: "that other ancient Island, Newfoundland," his wishes.

Applause.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. C. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have the Public Accounts of the Province of Newfoundland for the year ending March 31st, 1954. I ask the leave of the House to lay it on the table of the House in order that they may be printed.

MR. I. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the committee selected by you, Sir, to draft an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne I now present that address to the House for its approval.

To His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Leonard Cecil Outerbridge, Knight Bachelor, C.B.E., D.S.O.

May it please your Honour.

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

Sgd, Isaac Mercer
Frank Fogwill
P. J. Canning

Assembly Room,
March 24th., 1955.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion is, report be received and adopted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to address myself to the motion but only for the purpose of saying that while we are prepared and perhaps the honourable gentlemen opposite are prepared to proceed with the debate, it was not our intention to proceed but rather to wait until Monday and begin the debate then and in the meantime to proceed with the business on the order paper and especially to go into Committee on Supply so that we might obtain interim supply or partial supply before the end of the financial year and pending the time when the full supply for the coming year will be brought down and requested in the House. I am aware of the fact that it is customary, it is regular parliamentary practice not to deal with supply, not to go into committee of the whole on supply until after the address in reply has been adopted by the House, that is to say, until after the debate on the address in reply and after that debate has concluded. But Your Honour will know far more about that than I do. If however the House, both sides, is agreeable to have us go into Committee of Supply for the purpose of getting interim supply, for Her Majesty for the coming year before that year arrives, then we will do so, and defer the debate on the address in reply. Therefore I rise for the purpose of moving that this debate do stand deferred, or that this motion for the adoption of the address in reply do stand deferred.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are perfectly agreeable to have it stand aside until Monday.

On motion debate on this motion deferred.

Giving Notice of Motion

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Education (Teacher Training) Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Interpretation Act".

Giving Notice of Question

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

(1) The total amount of Government moneys paid out on account of the construction and operation of the Birch Plant between December 1st, 1950 and the date of cancellation of the lease entered into between the Government and Chester Dawe.

(2) On what grounds was this 15 year lease cancelled?

(3) What was the total amount of depreciation allowed by the Taxation Division of the Dept. of National Revenue up to the time of the cancellation of the lease with Mr. Dawe? How much of this depreciation amount was paid over to the Government?

(4) Give total operating expenses during the tenure of the said lease.

(5) What amount of Fire Insurance was carried on said Plant, and how much has been paid out in fire insurance premiums during the operation of the said lease? With what company was the premises insured?

(6) What amount has been expended altogether on upkeep and maintenance of said Plant and equipment?

(7) Has Mr. Chester Dawe or any Joint Stock Company owned or controlled by him any interest, monetary or otherwise, in the present operation of said Birch Plant? If so, to what extent?

(8) Give a complete financial statement of the operations of the Birch Plant during the tenure of the above-named lease to include all moneys paid out by the Government on account of construction, purchase of machinery, operating expenses and purchase of stock up to cancellation of said lease.

(9) Give full information as to the terms of agreement or sale, as the case may be, with the present operators. To include amounts of any loans made to said operators.

(4) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House a complete report.

(1) Of the visit of said Minister and other honourable members to the various Capitals of European countries during the summer of 1954, stating (a) reasons for the extended visit, (b) the names of those who accompanied the Minister on these tours, (c) the total cost to the Province of said tours.

(2) A complete report of the recent trip of the Honourable Minister to Jamaica, stating also (a) the reasons for said trip, (b) the names of those persons who accompanied the Minister on these tours, (c) the total cost to the Province of said trip.

(3) An itemized account of all travelling expenses of the Hon. Minister since March 31st, 1954, listing the number of trips outside the Province, showing dates of departure, the num-

ber of days absent on each trip, the places visited, the purpose of said trip and the cost of each to the Province, as also the names of any other Government members or Cabinet Minister, or officials of the Government who accompanied the Minister.

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

(a) The names and addresses of all Mink farmers now registered in Newfoundland.

(b) The names of those Mink ranchers or farmers who have come into the Province since March 31st, 1954, and their place of abode before coming to Newfoundland. Where are their ranches located now and give names of Corporations where any are incorporated.

(c) Give the numbers of Mink presently held on each of the ranches now existing in Newfoundland.

(d) Have any loans or guarantees been made or given to any Mink owners presently operating in Newfoundland, if so to whom and for what amount in each case, and under what terms?

(e) Give the names of all members of the Mink Breeders Association, and who are the officers of said Association.

(f) What agreements, if any have been entered into between said Association and the Hon. Minister's Department or the Government.

(g) Under what terms and/or conditions did the Government take over the whaling boats formerly owned and operated by the Arctic Fisheries Ltd.

What is the total indebtedness of this company to the Government at the present time? Give date of the most recent loan and the amount of said loan.

(i) Is it the intention of the Government to operate the whaling boats and to supply whale meat to Mink ranchers, and if so at what rate per pound? Who will manage the Government's operations at the plant at Dildo. And what monetary arrangement has been made with him as to salary, etc?

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

(1) The total number of families receiving able-bodied assistance for each month since February 1st, 1954.

(2) A statement showing the number of able-bodied families receiving relief since February 1st, 1954 by Electoral Districts, and the cost of same by Districts.

(3) Give the rates per person or per family of able-bodied assistance.

(4) Give the list of those by Districts in receipt of sick relief in each month since February 1st, 1954.

(5) Table a statement of expenditures under the heading Northern Labrador Affairs, and also of receipts.

(7) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Premier to lay on the table of the House the following information:

(1) A full report of any conversations held with Premier Duplessis of Quebec relative to the Quebec-Newfoundland Boundary.

(2) Was Mr. J. Paul Beaulieu, Que-

bec's Minister of Trade and Commerce present at these conversations?

(3) What, if anything, has been done by the Government to determine the exact location of the Newfoundland Boundary as defined by the Privy Council decision of 1927?

(4) What was the nature of the "gentleman's agreement" between the Hon. the Premier and Premier Duplessis as reported in a recent statement by Mr. J. Paul Beaulieu to Mr. F. Burnham Gill and published in "The Daily News" of March 14th, 1955?

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

(a) A statement showing the number and titles of Documentary films made for the Government by the Atlantic Films and Electronics Ltd. since the first loan by the Government to the said Company.

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

(c) Is the Company under contract to make any further films for the Government, if so, state the amounts of money involved?

(d) What is the total indebtedness of this Company to the Government by way of loans at the present time?

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

(f) What number of people are being paid salaries by this Company and how many of these are Newfoundlanders?

(9) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic

Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

(1) The first Agreement made between the firm of Miag and the Government of Newfoundland relative to the building of the Cement Plant and signed for Miag by Kurt Steinbrueck.

(2) The Agreement signed by Herbert Marx on Sept. 6th, 1950 and the third agreement signed by one Ernest A. Junge.

(3) Table a copy of an agreement with Messrs. Hill, Vveeland and Lewin in New York relative to the sale of the Cement Mill, before the Mill had been erected. On what account did the Government have to pay the sum of \$50,000 to this firm, and to what account was this charge made? Was it charged to cost of building the Cement Plant?

(4) Table a copy of affidavit or certificate made by Dr. Valdmanis relative to the eighty thousand dollars taken to Germany by Mr. Grube of the Superior Rubber Company, and for which he was arrested there, in February 1954.

(5) Is it a fact that consequent upon this an inspection of the books of the Superior Rubber Company was ordered by the Premier? If so, is the Minister completely satisfied with the report received?

(6) Table copies of all correspondence with the German Rwald Zippman and any tentative agreement with him re an industry at Clarendville. What amount of money was deposited to his credit at Geneva? Table copy of correspondence with him relative to a shipping line.

(10) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance

or other appropriate Minister to lay on the table of the House the following information:

(1) A complete list of all loans made by the Government of Newfoundland since April 1st, 1949, together with amount and terms of said loans, and whether under headings of Fisheries Loans, Economic Development Loans, Industrial Development Loans, Fisheries Development Loans, Guaranteed Bank Loans, or Tourist Development Loans. State date of loan, interest rate, the name of the person or Corporation to whom the loan was made. Also the total amount of cash loans, and the total amount raised in the case of Government guaranteed loans. State the total amount of interest payments received by the Government on each loan and the total amount of said interest refunded back to the borrower in each case.

(2) In the case of Tourist Development Loans, table a copy of the Agreement, and state areas where development is to take place.

(3) Give a statement showing amount of money to the credit of the Government as of April 1st, 1954 and February 28th, 1955, at (a) The Bank of Montreal, (b) With Crown agents, (c) with the Government of Canada.

(4) Give total amount of Revenue and Expenditure in the same period.

(5) What amounts, if any, by way of temporary loans have been advanced to the credit of the Government by the Bank of Montreal since April 1st, 1954 and what amount, if any, is presently owing by the Government to the said Bank on account of temporary or other loans? Give dates.

(11) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the

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

(1) The total amount of money advanced or paid out to the under-mentioned Companies since the 28th of February, 1954 by the Government and in each case give the total Government moneys paid to each Company since its incorporation in Newfoundland, either by way of loans or advances. In case of Government guarantees to any of these Corporations give the total amount of money raised by each Company under said guarantees.

(2) State the number of employees working in each said plant, and the number of Newfoundlanders. (a) Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.; (b) Atlantic Hardboards Ltd.; (c) Atlantic Gypsum Ltd.; (d) North Star Cement Co. Ltd.; (e) Eckhardt Mills Ltd.; (f) Nfld. Tanneries (Wm Dorn) Ltd.; (g) Atlantic Gloves Ltd.; (h) Canadian Leather Goods Ltd.; (i) Koch Shoes Ltd.; (j) Superior Rubber Company Ltd.; (k) Hanning Electric Co. Ltd.; (l) Canadian Machinery and Industry Construction Ltd.; (m) United Cotton Mills Ltd.; (n) Atlantic Films and Electronics Ltd. (o) Terra Nova Textiles Ltd.

(3) In the case of each of the above-named companies state the amount of fire insurance carried. Who are the Underwriters and to whom are the policies made payable?

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

(1) Is it the intention of the Attorney General to proceed with the trial of Alfred A. Valdmanis on the charge of unlawfully by falsehood defrauding the firm of Miag of moneys

to the amount of \$270,000 between the first day of August 1950 and the 31st day of October 1951? If not, why not?

(2) Who were the representatives of the Government who held talks with Alfred Valdmanis at the Penitentiary just prior to the change of plea to that of "Guilty" in the charge of (2) unlawfully defrauding Benno Schilde of moneys to the amount of \$200,000?

(3) What civil actions, if any, have been instituted towards the recovery of moneys for the two firms supposedly defrauded? And is it not a fact that these amounts had already been paid to the firms in question by the Government under the heading of *ex gratia* awards?

(4) Table statements, if any were taken, of the following persons who received large sums of money from Dr. A. Valdmanis during his term as Director of Economic Development and as Chairman of NALCO.

Samuel Zwecker of 228-12 135th Ave., Long Island City, New York.

Elja Lurje of 255 West 76th Street, New York City. Ewald Zippman holder of a German passport No. 867, Valdis Matcus, one time associate with the St. Andrews Fisheries in New Brunswick.

If no statements were taken, why not?

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

(1) The name of the Italian firm presently interested in the establishment of a paper mill in this Province. What stage has been reached in an agreement with the Government by this firm, and what com-

mitments, if any, have been made by the Government or by the Minister on behalf of the Government?

(2) A copy of the report made to the Government by the International Basic Economy Corporation, commonly known as the IBEC Report.

(3) Is Mr. Gordon Pushie, the Director General of Economic Development, presently in the Province? If not, will the Minister inform the House of his whereabouts, and the purpose of his trip abroad? Will Mr. Pushie be visiting Germany in connection with the present investigations initiated at Harbour Grace recently?

(14) MR. W. J. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Premier to lay on the table of the House the following information:

What has been the cost of the Commission appointed to study the Newfoundland case. Give details of amounts extended in

(a) Salaries or other remuneration.

(b) Travelling expenses.

(c) Other expenses; with names of persons to whom salaries or other remuneration has been paid, with the amount or amounts in each case.

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

What is the present interest of the Government in the Birch Plant? What are the names of the present operators of the Birch Plant? Who are the present directors of the said plant? Has Chester Dawe any interest in the said plant? Has any loan been made to the present operators? If so, what was the amount, for what purpose was it given and what security has been

received therefor? If any agreement was made in writing concerning the change of management, table a copy of same.

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

(1) The total amount of money spent by the Government to date, on the Gypsum Plant? For what period was the plant shut down since July 1, 1954. What amount of manufactured wallboard or plaster board is on hand at this date?

(2) Give the names of the members of this House of Assembly who are directors of:

(a) Companies financially assisted by the Government.

(b) Companies owned by the Government.

(c) Companies whose bonds are guaranteed by the Government. State the name of the Company or companies of which such members are directors with the amount of salary payable to such member on account of his services.

Answers to Questions

Question No. 1

MR. POWER: The answer is being prepared.

Question No. 2

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, that is a question which asks me to table in the House the report which was made by the police who come under my department. I might say, Mr. Speaker, it is not the practice of the Attorney General to file in the House

nor even to give to the courts reports that he receives from the police.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—In the last session of this Legislature I made certain charges against Chester Dawe in relation to the purchase of conveyors for the Birch Plant, and I stated then this country received a loss of approximately one thousand dollars—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—Is the honourable gentleman allowed to make a speech and repeat a speech of the last session on a point of privilege?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this is not to make a speech but is on a point of privilege. I am raising a point of privilege and have to explain in order to know what it is. But I made the point last year. The Premier took me up and challenged me to give the information to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, which is what I did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what he refused from the beginning to the end to do and has not done it to this moment. He refused to give it to the RUMP and refused to give it to this House and to me.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I placed in the possession of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police all the information which I had except the name of the informer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All the gossip—I know where it came from.

MR. BROWNE: All I had I passed over to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Now here is my question—When the Royal Canadian Mounted Police made the report the Premier was privileged to see it and in the

newspapers or over the radio said the report exonerated Mr. Dawe, or words to that effect. Mr. Dawe was an honourable man, and now the honourable member for St. John's West should apologize.

I have not seen the report, Mr. Speaker. How do I know what is in the report. It is a confidential matter, apparently, between the Attorney General and the Premier, and I do not intend to apologize to anybody with regard to what I said. I think, Mr. Speaker, as the one who initiated the proceedings I should see the report that was given.

MR. SPEAKER: It is, of course, a point on which I am not able to rule.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I understand—Is it not in order for any Minister of the Crown, when asked for information he can refuse to answer a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, he can.

MR. HOLLETT: He can refuse on any grounds whatsoever?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Had anyone said, on any grounds whatsoever? Did Your Honour say? Did anyone else say that a Minister might refuse to answer a question on any grounds whatsoever? I only heard the Honourable Leader of the Opposition say that, and not anyone else, not on any grounds whatsoever.

MR. HOLLETT: I understand the Honourable Minister can refuse on any grounds whatsoever.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "On what grounds whatsoever." I have not heard His Honour say that.

MR. HOLLETT: I am asking the Honourable the Speaker now—Can a Minister of the Crown refuse to answer on any grounds whatsoever, giving any grounds as an excuse, is that proper procedure? I am asking a ruling on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The question does not arise. The fact is a Minister of the Crown may refuse to answer any question, and any report, that may be added there. The point is very well known in parliamentary procedure.

Orders of The Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister for Mines & Resources if it is his intention to table the report of the Royal Commission on Forestry. I understand that has been presented to the Government. I wonder if he would tell us whether we are going to receive that?

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines & Resources): Mr. Speaker, I regret the honourable member was out of the Chamber when I informed the House it was my intention to table the report in this House on Monday coming.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, during the Speech from the Throne, or in the Speech from the Throne, reference is made to extracts from a report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture. I believe the Honourable the Premier made reference to the same report, and I believe it is customary when extracts are given from a report that the extracts should be tabled or the reports that were quoted should be tabled so that the Opposition could have the benefit of putting their own interpretation on it. I would like to ask the Minister if we are going to

have the benefit of what has been reported to the Government by the Royal Commission on Agriculture.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on the point, the rule, if there has been such a rule in the first place, the extracts from which the quotations are made should be tabled, would that rule apply to a speech which His Honour would deliver to this House?

MR. BROWNE: I don't know whether that is a hypothetical question for Your Honour to answer—If I had the privilege to answer I would say that the Premier himself quoted these remarks yesterday.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the Premier did not quote these remarks yesterday.

MR. HOLLETT: On that point, Mr. Speaker, is it to be expected that we of the Opposition are to be expected to debate intelligently (we may use that word even on this side of the House) the Speech from the Throne if we have not in our hands at the time a copy of this report which has to be discussed. I really think the point is very well taken. We ought to have that before we go on to the Speech from the Throne.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I say it is our hope that a day be set aside in the House for a debate of that very report. It does not need debating in the Speech from the Throne, as a special occasion will be sought in the House to enable members to participate, if they wish. The House will not be deprived of an opportunity to debate the report of the Royal Commission on Forestry.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources might be in a

position to tell me when he expects this report on agriculture to be tabled.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture is not yet completed. We expect it will be submitted to the Government by the end of the month or within the next week or ten days.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I may say, if I am not out of order—When the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture is tabled in the House or at least after it has been tabled an opportunity will be sought by the Government to enable all Members of the House to have an opportunity to debate that report as well.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am quite convinced of the Honourable the Premier's good intentions on that. But I note he says that a day will be sought. Now we would like to have some guarantee that it will be so before we go on with the Speech from the Throne. The time limit for the life of this session has been announced. So we ought at least to be sure we have a day to devote to both the report on forestry and the report on agriculture. Could the Premier give us such a guarantee?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It ought to be sufficient and it would be, I believe, sufficient for most members of the House to have the Premier say, an opportunity will be sought in this session. That ought to be sufficient, and I will give no more binding guarantee than that.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, for one, I say that is not sufficient, and I accept the slur thrown across the House, and throw it back in his face.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: I have the right

to say that I am not taking any slurs from anybody from that side of the House in this session. It is only to be short and I think I will live twenty-four or twenty-five days longer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware I was casting any slurs. I thought it was a slur cast at me when the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said he wanted something better than merely the Premier's word. I was not aware I had cast any slurs.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has said that an opportunity will be sought to have a day set aside for this particular thing. Surely the Premier is able to set a date, he has that much authority and power, I hope. I am asking him to do that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To begin with, Mr. Speaker, I used the proper word, I did not say ; this will be given, I have no authority to say that. I have authority to say it will be sought. It is the House will determine the matter. I am only one member of the House, I am leader, but only one member. I will seek an opportunity for the debate. The House will decide whether that opportunity is to be given or not.

MR. SPEAKER: May I say, gentlemen, let us on both sides of the House make a determined effort to have this session one that we can be proud of, one that five years hence we can read our written words with some pride. I listened with many emotions to this interchange, and find it difficult to keep within parliamentary words to express my opinion on it—You see how a thing can degenerate. Hypothetical questions of things which don't exist on which I am asked to give a dissertation on parliamentary proced-

ure—Let me see what I have here—The Honourable member for St. John's West (it is so long ago and so much has been said I have almost forgotten what was asked) asked if a chance would be given for the Opposition to see the report of the Forestry Commission.

MR. BROWNE: No, I said; would we be shown the extracts from the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture from which the extracts are inserted in the Speech from the Throne, and open to debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The answer of the minister was that the report would be tabled on Monday.

MR. BROWNE: No, that was the report on forestry, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, on forestry—But the report on agriculture is not yet ready and is expected to be handed down within a week or ten days. Now there is a rule, of course, if any member, especially a minister, quotes from a paper or report he must lay it on the table. That, I believe I am not being presumptuous, is a common rule of law—Members are not to quote from evidence produced in court—So far I have no recollection of any speech being made, other than the Speech from the Throne, referring to agriculture or forestry, therefore, I don't think the point arises.

As to the other question asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition about the report of the Forestry Commission: I understand the Premier to say an opportunity will be sought to have a debate on that report. I read the word "sought" to mean it will be asked for, that the House will be asked to appoint a time to debate the report. Am I correct in that assumption?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Then I take it the House is satisfied an opportunity will be given to see the report and an opportunity, if the House so desires, to debate it.

Orders of The Day

Second reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, before moving the second reading of this Bill I would like to inform you, Sir, and the members of the House that this year we have numbered the Bills, I think the numbering will facilitate members in keeping the Bills in some proper order and so be in a position to find out the business before the House. At the same time we have ordered binders into which we hope members will be able to keep the Bills and so be able to have them all under one cover, a loose-leaf system. Unfortunately there were not enough in tow and we had to order them by telegraph. Just as soon as they come they will be circulated, and we will then be able to keep some order in this legislation which of recent years has become so voluminous.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill to which I move second reading is not a contentious Bill, and it was for that reason that it was moved for first reading yesterday. The practice, as you know Mr. Speaker, is that in both the Lords and in the Commons, the upper and lower houses, a Bill is introduced on the first day to assert the right of parliament to meet without a Speech from the Throne. Instead of introducing a dummy Bill I made a practice within recent years, as far as

I am concerned and with the Government's endorsement, to introduce a Bill which was a real Bill and yet as far as possible a non-contentious Bill.

Now the Bill before the House to which I now move second reading is a Bill which really should be passed and should receive the Royal assent before the end of the present month. As honorable members are aware, Mr. Speaker, the new criminal code adopted at the last session of the Federal Parliament will come into force and effect on the 1st day of April, and it is because of that that this Bill is necessary. The criminal code, Mr. Speaker, is divided into many parts but the part in which we are interested today is part No. 16 and part No. 16 has an interpretation clause, and it deals with the jurisdiction of magistrates, to hear certain indictable offenses, some of which a magistrate can hear with or without the consent of the accused and some of which he can hear only with the consent of the accused. But the section of the criminal code which I wish to quote and which applies to this case reads as follows—Section 4 (66) is an interpretation clause which governs Part 16—Magistrate means a person appointed under the law of the province, with whatever title he may be designated, who is especially authorized by the terms of his appointment to exercise the jurisdiction conferred upon a magistrate by this part. Now then, Sir, we could of course re-appoint magistrates, and in that re-appointment especially authorize and designate them by the terms of their appointment to do this work, but we have preferred to do it by way of an Act. We therefore have suggested, and I move in the House, that we adopt the Bill which provides that every magistrate shall be deemed to have been

especially authorized by the terms of his appointment to exercise jurisdiction conferred upon a magistrate by Part 16 of the Criminal Code, Chapter 51 of the Statutes of Canada 1953 and 1954. But this sub-section does not apply to any number of justices. The effect therefore, of this section, is, that when this Bill becomes law, any magistrate can exercise the powers of summary jurisdiction given by part 16 of the Criminal Code to magistrates.

I might say that various provinces have taken different attitudes with regard to this section. In Saskatchewan I think certain magistrates are designated as trial magistrates for this type of case, cases arising from Part 16. But when I was in Nova Scotia, in the Legislature there, they were putting through a Bill precisely the same as the one we have before us today, and they are doing what we are doing, i.e. giving a magistrate power to act in cases under Part 16.

There is a further amendment, which is a purely nominal one—Section 3 of the Bill, was just remembered. I do not think this will need any explanation. There is however, Sir, an amendment in Section 4 which is very important—Provincial offenses—offenses against laws made by us as a Province are triable, of course, in our courts. But the Evidence Act of Canada does not apply in such cases, and in such cases, as lawyers here will know, in such cases evidence is our own Provincial Evidence Act—We have a Provincial Evidence Act which is effective in provincial cases, just as there is a Canadian Evidence Act which takes effect in criminal cases. Our Evidence Act is effective not only in cases of provincial offenses but also in civil proceedings. Now under the Criminal Evidence Act, the Evidence Act of Canada, they have a clause which is

equivalent to this clause 4 set forth in this Bill: "A witness giving evidence in an inquiry held under Section 115 or Section 116 shall not be excused from answering any question upon the ground that the answer may tend to criminate him, or may tend to establish his liability to a civil proceeding at the instance of the Crown or any person or to a prosecution under any Act of the Legislature." We have, as you know, Sir, several inquiries that must take place in the course of the year. We have inquiries into every accidental death, we have inquiries into every fire and we have many other inquiries that magistrates are from time to time called upon to hold. We have been handicapped in the past by the fact that many witnesses refuse to answer any questions and there is nothing we can do to make them answer. Therefore we propose to add this Section to our Summary Jurisdiction Act. The effect of this Section will be that every witness must answer every question put to him. If he claims the right not to have to answer the question he still has to answer it, but the answer he gives cannot be used against him, cannot be used to incriminate him, and cannot be used to make him liable for criminal proceedings.

MR. J. HIGGINS: Any charge under the Code?

MR. CURTIS: This does not cover charges under the Code. But that is covered under the Canada Evidence Act where a person giving evidence is protected from proceedings under the Code whether or not the evidence he gave is given in a criminal proceeding or a provincial proceeding he is still protected. If my honourable friend would like to refer to the Evidence Act he would find that covered in Section 5 of the Canada Evidence Act

where it says; with respect to any questions a witness objects to answering on the grounds that his answer may tend to criminate him or may tend to establish his liability to civil proceedings at the instance of the Crown or of any person, and if but for this Act or the Act of any provincial Legislature the witness would therefore have been excused from answering such questions, then, although the witness is by reason of this Act or by reason of any such Provincial Act compelled to answer, the answers so given should not be used nor referred to in evidence against him.

I think, Sir, there can be no objection to this section the object of which is to bring our Provincial Evidence Act into line with the Canada Evidence Act and in fact with our own Public Inquiries Act which makes it necessary for any witness to answer any questions but protects him from having that evidence used against him.

I would move, Sir, that this Bill be now read a second time.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I am interested, not with respect to any section other than section 4. Whilst I appreciate the answer given me by the Honourable the Attorney General I am still not entirely satisfied as to the effect of this Act to protect a witness. By way of analogy I refer the Honourable the Attorney General to section 87 of our Highway Traffic Act, Revised Statutes of Newfoundland 1952, Chapter 94: Chapter 87 of that Act requires the driver of any vehicle involved in an accident resulting in injury or death or property damage to fifty dollars or more to report within 24 hours in person to a constable. Then it goes on under sub-section 5—It is a pity the Honourable Minister of Public Works has

gone out, as this, I think, is his own pigeon — It provides that all reports made subsequent to an accident shall be for the information only of the Minister and the department, and any such reports or any part thereof or any statement contained therein shall not be open to public inspection nor admissible in evidence in any trial, civil nor criminal, arising out of the accident report being made — except that sub-section 8 of the same Act makes it an offense to make a false report. It is also an offense not to make a report or not to answer questions.

Now I know, Mr. Speaker, of cases where a person is charged with a breach of 2854 of the Criminal Code, i.e. drunken driving, and admissions made by him to the police constable pursuant to this section of the Highway Traffic Act were used as evidence against him, to prove he had in fact been driving a vehicle on the night in question, when they had no other evidence. I checked the matter and the magistrate admitted that evidence on very very safe grounds, several decisions in the Supreme Court of Canada. What additional protection then does this give? If, for instance, John Jones is called as a witness in an inquiry into the death of Bill Smith. He says: "Yes, I am talking to Bill. I pushed him over the stairs". All right, he is protected, but under the Criminal Code he is indicted for manslaughter. Is he protected, or is this the position I raise as an analogy under the Highway Traffic Act. I would like the Attorney General to explain that. It may be that this objection is not valid, but I think it is, Sir.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, my learned friend here on my left has put his finger, I think, on a very im-

portant point in connection with this new amendment to the Summary Jurisdiction Act, but I am not sure the Attorney General brought out clearly that this amendment to which my learned friend has just referred applies to inquiries and not to trials. Section 115 and 116 of the Summary Jurisdiction Act deals with inquiries into fires and sudden deaths. The point is: If a witness is giving evidence he can be compelled to give evidence which may render him liable to prosecution.

"A witness giving evidence under an inquiry held under section 115 and 116 shall not be excused from answering any question upon the ground that the answer may tend to incriminate him, or may tend to establish his liability to a civil proceeding at the instance of the Crown or of any person or to a prosecution under any Act of the Legislature." Now this proceeding is an inquiry, a magisterial inquiry, and here in the magisterial inquiry, evidence will be produced which will lay the basis for prosecution, probably under the Criminal Code. Now under the Criminal Code this section will apply but does not apply under the Inquiries Act. Is it the effect now when inquiries have been held into a fire or a sudden death a person has to answer questions even though it renders him liable to prosecution? What the House has to consider is whether we should depart from a practice we have inherited from England and is practised still in England that a person is not compelled to answer a question which may incriminate him. It is also the practice in the great United States. What we are asked to do is to adopt a practice laid down in the Criminal Code and my opinion, from a close study of the Criminal Code, I think it is

barbaric. I think it is cruel and I think it is not a good precedent for us to follow. If we have a humane provision in our law which we have inherited from England and it is still being practised by the United States and by England I think we ought to stick to it and not depart from it and be so obliging as to follow the Canadian Criminal Code.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Attorney General what happens to a man who refuses to answer such a question, a question which tends to incriminate him? He cannot be prosecuted can he?

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any other member who wishes to speak?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, if anybody else wishes to speak I would say in reply to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition; if a man refuses to answer he goes to jail for contempt. He must answer if asked a question. He may not refuse to answer because the answer may tend to incriminate him but he is protected.

I may say the matter mentioned by my honourable friend the honourable and learned member for St. John's East is new to me. I have not been involved in that type of case recently. But I certainly will check up the position. Because there is this distinction between the two things—of course the report made after an accident is not a report made under oath. It is true it is punishable if it is not true but it is not a report under oath. It is only a report of an accident, and I understand from him in such a case the magistrate has accepted reports as evidence on only one point; he was driving the car. Now that of course is debatable. Whether that is something that is anything like what we are envisaging in this amendment—

MR. HIGGINS: If I may Mr. Speaker? The point is covered from here—I would be happy to wait upon the Attorney General and show him the exact point I had in mind.

MR. CURTIS: I would be glad too, Mr. Speaker, because I have great respect for my honourable friend's problems particularly insofar as effecting prosecutions in the courts. Whilst he has difficulties in court our difficulties are just the reverse of his. We want to be fair to him just as, I am sure, he wants to be fair to us. I would be glad if he were to discuss that matter with me. But I do think, Sir, the witness in this case is being protected. We had a case, I might say, fairly recently in the Mental Hospital inquiry where people came before the Commission and admitted they had stolen and we could not prosecute them because we had no other evidence. I must say in that respect we lived up to the wording of the Public Inquiries Act. As long as I am Attorney General nobody will be taken advantage of because of any statement he had to make in answer to a question. If a man says he is guilty of something of course it will start you looking for evidence, but his own evidence cannot be used against him. I would think that would be sufficient protection. Although I can quite see now that my honourable friend from St. John's West (the junior member) is defending criminals and he naturally sees things from his point of view whereas perhaps in five or ten years he will be over here.

MR. BROWNE: We do not defend criminals. We defend people charged with offenses who may be innocent.

MR. CURTIS: They may be criminals too. We think they are or we would not be prosecuting them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable member has already spoken.

On motion Bill read a second time. (Opposition members voted nay).

On motion Bill ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

First Readings

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Fisheries Loan Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Loan Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Fisheries Assistance Fund". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Industrial Development Loan Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Perpetuities and Accumulations to Certain Funds Established to Provide Pensions or Other Benefits". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Conditional Sale of Goods". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act Respecting Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Wills Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Bulk Sales". On motion read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Provide for Protection of Justices and Other Public Authorities". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Fire Prevention Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Disabled Persons Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Revenue and Audit Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the coming into force of the Civil Service Commission Act, 1953". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Apprenticeship Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Preservation of Historic Objects". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the School Attendance Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you I have a message from the Lieutenant-Governor.

Message read by Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable the Minister of Finance:

I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, recommend that, pending the tabling of the Estimates for the Financial Year 1955-56, a vote on account of Five Million Three Hundred and Ninety-Two Thousand Dollars calculated on the basis of roughly one-seventh of the total vote for the year 1954-55 to meet essential public services be provided by the Provincial Legislature.

(Sgd.) LEONARD OUTERBRIDGE,
Lieutenant-Governor.

March 23rd., 1955.

On motion resolutions referred to a Committee of Supply.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to air a grievance. The grievance I wish to air concerns the publication of Hansard—When Your Honour a few moments ago was referring to a matter you said; "In five years time we should look back with pride on the proceedings now taking place in the Legislature in this session"—Your Honour it is five years since the proceedings of 1950, which were published recently. If that is to be the standard of speed with which the Government produces Hansard it will certainly be five years hence before we have the Hansard on the proceedings now taking place.

Now I understand — I have been speaking to people who ought to know and they tell me there is no reason why several years' Hansards should not be published, 1951, 1952 and 1953—I don't see why they should not be published.

Mr. Speaker, in these historic documents, which I take it the Minister of Provincial Affairs will preserve, there are enshrined wonderful debates, and it would be very desirable that the public should have access to them. What is the use of having had these debates in this House if the public cannot get an opportunity of seeing them. I know personally I am very interested. I was not here when the House was in session during 1951-1952-1953 and did not have the opportunity of hearing the beautiful speeches rendered. But by what I can hear, what the Premier has told us, I believe the speeches which were made in this House, especially by members on the Government side of the House have been the best speeches ever delivered in the House of Assembly. Now,

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame these should not be published, and I trust an effort will be made to have them published as quickly as possible, certainly before the House prorogues or before the next general election, when I am sure all those concerned will be glad to have extracts published in the press on certain matters.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support these remarks made by my honourable friend relative to this grievance. We are, both the Government and this side of the House, handicapped by the fact we cannot refer to certain statements made in Hansard. I fully agree with the remarks of the Speaker—It would be nice to look back on some of them with pleasure. I am quite sure that at least one leader on this side of the House will feel a little qualm to have the public look at some of the statements he made. But these things will happen—I expect on the other side of the House there are statements—for instance I can point out one now that the Honourable the Premier made back in 1950 Hansard—Nothing drastic or anything of that nature—I haven't got it here.

There is another thing about that, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether Hansards are official—Are they the records as official statements of people in the House—If they are then I think they should be somewhat of a closer edit, they should be edited more carefully—I will have occasion later in the session to point out several errors made—In this instance the Premier was made to say that—something like this — “We have been privileged to hear from the Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives what we are not usually accustomed to hearing from him, an excellent speech.” I am quite sure the Premier never said

that, but that is what he was made to say in Hansard 1950. I think, therefore, all these things should be gone through very carefully. But I do agree with my honourable friend here on my right, we should have the Hansard now of 1951, 1952, 1953 and if not 1954. I believe in the House of Commons in Ottawa they get it every day. That is so, is it not? They get them next day. Here we are now four or five years without any statement of what may have been said four years ago. I think it is terrible. I could understand in the old days when there was not very much money and it might have been difficult to get the necessary staff to fill these things, but with the Government at the present time, and for the last five or six years having more money than they knew what to do with, still they have not sufficient staff to keep these records.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Honourable the Premier or some other Minister could tell us when we might expect these Hansards?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to say except two things — (1) The Hansard will be published and circulated in due course and (2) Newfoundland is the only Province in Canada that prints its Hansards.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on the point raised by the Honourable Minister who has just sat down, may I point out the Legislature of Nova Scotia published its Hansard almost daily and the Province of Ontario does the same, by mimeograph.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I repeat, we are the only Province in Canada that prints its Hansard. I am not talking of typewriting or

mimeographing — We are the only Province in Canada.

MR. BROWNE: We might just as well not have it if we have to wait five years.

On motion House resolved into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage Chairman of Committee:

Resolutions:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, is the Honourable Minister going to make any statement relative to these?

MR. POWER: Mr. Chairman, this Bill is merely to make funds available until the estimates are passed. The amounts specified are roughly one seventh of the possible vote for the year, and the amounts in the schedule are merely guess estimates by the Department. If there is any drop balance when the estimates are brought down then these will be swept up in the main vote.

MR. BROWNE: Well, if the House is going to be closed on the 23rd of April that is only 1/12th of the year's expenditure. The Premier told us yesterday he had to be in Ottawa for a conference on the 27th, and would therefore have to close the House by the 23rd. If that is so, and he said it in all seriousness yesterday.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I did not say the 23rd I said the 22nd. I did not say the 27th. I said the 26th. Otherwise the honourable gentleman is strictly correct.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I take it then it is official that the House will close on the 22nd. In

that case it is less than one month and we are asking for two months supply—Why not limit it to just one month?

MR. POWER: It is probably a generous request. It was difficult to make the exact amount. The money is merely swept up in the general vote.

MR. CURTIS: And of course, Mr. Chairman, there is always a chance of a slip-up. Although the Premier said we hope to close. I don't think anybody wants to tie anybody down to any particular schedule. I remember last year we were in the unfortunate position of not voting enough and we had to come back for a second interim vote. I think it is much better to cover it in one vote rather than come back for a second.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect, the money in any Department is not spent on a basis of a twelve month division. In some division heavy expenditures might have to be incurred from the beginning of the financial year. I think it would be most unwise if we are restricted to merely one month's expenditure.

Schedule:

Legislature: \$25,000.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister of Finance what that \$25,000 is intended for?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sessional pay—So that we may get our pay.

MR. BROWNE: Are there not 27 members now of the Legislature? Who is going to be cut out?

MR. CURTIS: This is for next year. This year has been voted.

MR. BROWNE: Which calendar year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: 1956, the one hundredth anniversary of Responsible Government and also of the mental hospital.

MR. BROWNE: And also of another institution as well.

Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, is that correct that there was a mental hospital here in 1856?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the year it was built.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I always have certain doubts in my mind when people begin to read up on the history of mental hospitals, and I am worried about these people.

Items II through VIII carried.

MR. HOLLETT: In Item IX, Public Works, \$1,000,000 is that approximately one quarter of the amount for the year. I wonder if the Honourable Minister would explain.

MR. POWER: I suppose Public Works must spend more money in certain months than in others. I imagine in the beginning of the year the expenditure would be heavy.

MR. HOLLETT: Public Works spends a lot of money this time in the year? I understand it does not spend much on roads at this time of the year.

MR. SPENCER: That would be a waste of time at this time of the year.

MR. HOLLETT: And a waste of money too. I am only asking if there is any particular reason.

MR. POWER: It does not mean every individual amount represents one seventh of the whole amount.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask the Minister a question? That represents one seventh of the total expenditure on current and capital account. You are including capital there too are you?

MR. POWER: Yes, both.

MR. HOLLETT: It may be that the Minister of Public Works or the Government might like to spend a million right off as bait right now for some reason of which they have not given us any indication.

MR. SMALLWOOD: An election?

MR. HOLLETT: Could be.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But the elections were held last fall on October 2. That is when the honourable gentleman announced it was to be held, on that date.

MR. HOLLETT: When I am finished speaking I will sit down and you may stand up—If the Government wants to become facetious, I can become facetious too. I am quite confident it is possible for the government to cook up some bonafide explanation for asking for a million dollars — One quarter of the annual amount for the Department of Public Works, and the idea behind the cooked up reason may be coming up or may not be—But they have some reason. And it is insinuated they want that million dollars because there is an election coming up, and they want to spend some money on it.

Items IX through XII carried.

MR. HIGGINS: That is not 1/7 of the Board of Liquor Control surely.

MR. POWER: That is to cover salaries.

Items XII and XIII carried.

MR. BROWNE: On Fisheries and Co-operatives \$250,000. I notice the expenditure voted for the current year \$711,000.

MR. HOLLETT: No, \$460,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On current account?

MR. BROWNE: Yes on current account, \$460,000 — Are you figuring some capital expenditure?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Quite likely.

MR. POWER: That is the amount the Department of Fisheries requested for interim supply, and there is nothing extraordinary about it.

Carried.

MR. BROWNE: On Economic Development. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister of Economic Development if he has any expenditure in mind during the coming month in connection with Economic Development. I thought we had gotten to the stage where there was to be more grants to these industries. The current vote is \$170,000, and there is a vote here for \$250,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That could be both current and capital. We may have even more. We may have to come in again before the estimates and ask for more. I frankly don't know.

Items XV and XVI carried.

On motion the committee arose and reported having passed certain resolutions.

Report received. On motion said resolutions read a first time, read a second time and concurred in.

On motion the Honourable Minister of Finance introduced a Bill based on said resolutions.

On motion Bill read a first time. A Bill, "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Services For The Year Ending the Thirty-first Day of March One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-six and For Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service".

On motion Bill read a second time.

On motion Bill read a third time—Ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: That is the end of the order paper.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 3:00 of the clock.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn I wonder if I may say a word complimenting the Honourable the Attorney General for having the Bills numbered, as I suggested last year.

I would like to make one other suggestion, i.e. that the Clerk be instructed to ask the printers to have the order paper printed the same size every day.

MR. POWER: Before we adjourn, Mr. Speaker, may I remind you of my request to have the Public Accounts printed, for the year ending 1954.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance asked leave to have the Public Accounts printed, and distributed and leave was granted.

On motion the House then adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 25, at 3:00 of the clock.

FRIDAY, March 25th, 1955.

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. DROVER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Pumbley Cove, Bear Cove Western Arm and Purbeck Cove in White Bay. These people are requesting that the proposed road from Baie Verte to the Trans-Canada Highway be constructed so as to take in their settlements. These are flourishing settlements. The people are loggers and fishermen and they are hard-working. Such a road would enable them to send their catches of fish to Corner Brook where ready markets are available. They are without the services of nurses, doctors or hospital and the road link would enable them to get hospitalization without undergoing hardship.

I have much pleasure in presenting this petition. I support it, and I ask leave to have it tabled in the House and passed to the Department of Public Works for consideration.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the Citizens Committee of Harbour Grace District. This petition, Sir, concerns the road in Spaniards Bay known locally as "Lassic Road." I believe it derived the name from the time that Newfoundland was in very destitute circumstances and the people who worked on that road received as pay molasses and Indian meal. This road, sir, is on the highroad and is

situated close to the high school, and it is on a curve. You will remember, sir, that in the newspapers a short while ago it was reported a car was driven off this road and fell in the sea alongside. It is very dangerous, sir, and with the increase in traffic becomes more so.

I lend my support to this petition, sir, because I have driven over that road many times, and know some serious accident will happen unless it is looked into.

MR. DROVER: I beg leave to lay this petition on the table of the House to be referred to the department concerned.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition signed by some four hundred and ten residents of Point Leamington and Leading Tickle praying that a road be constructed between these two settlements. Some four years ago the road was commenced there, and has reached the present stage of having the right-of-way cut and the main bridges put in. The present request of the petitioners is that the road be completed during the coming summer.

The road is a very important one connecting the fishing settlement of Leading Tickle to Point Leamington, and so to Botwood and Grand Falls and the Trans-Canada Highway. Leading Tickle is noted as a very prolific fishing ground and the lobster fishery and early salmon fishery is very important to these people. If they had that road connection they would find a ready market for these valuable products in the Grand Falls Area.

In case honourable members are interested; they have also very famous turting grounds down there. Perhaps

some of the Honourable Ministers would like to go down and at least visit them, if not to shoot.

I support this petition, Mr. Speaker, and ask that it be tabled in the House and referred to the department concerned.

On motion petition tabled for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Giving Notice of Motion

None.

Giving Notice of Questions

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

- (1) In connection with the operation of the Rail-Car Ferry Service between Clarenville and Gander, what, if any amounts were charged to the Government for said service by the Canadian National Railway?
- (2) Is it correct that the facilities of this service were denied the people of the Port Blanford and Alexander Bay? If so, state reasons for such denial.
- (3) Is it still the intention of the Government to continue work on a road from Port Blanford to Bunyan's Cove. If so when is work on said construction likely to commence?
- (4) Will any delay be caused to the construction of the Trans-Canada Highway between Alexander Bay

and Port Blanford by the Government's decision to delay the granting of title to the Federal Government of that section for a National Park?

MR. SPEAKER: Before entering on questions I want to say something about the asking and answering of questions, arising out of yesterday—I have spoken on this subject before—There seems to be some doubt and confusion—

First, let me say that there is no other House in the Commonwealth which allows so great latitude in the asking or answering of questions as does this one. For example: We can ask for forty-eight hours notice of a question but in order to save time, and speed the work, we attempt to do it on twenty-four hours notice. Notice of a question is given orally in this House thereby giving the member asking the question an opportunity at least to make the question heard once in the House. I have no intention, of course, of reverting to any other procedure on my own. That, of course, depends upon the decision of the House itself.

I would refer all honourable members to the authorities on parliamentary procedure, Sir Thomas Erskine May and in our own Hemisphere Dr. Arthur Beauchesne, page 119, para. 295, where Beauchesne gives more than two pages of inadmissible questions. For example—a Question may not contain references, may not contain imputations, may not be asked which might prejudice pending trial in court of law; may not seek for matters which are in their nature secret, such as decisions of proceedings of Cabinet, advice given to the Crown by law officers, and a final inadmissible question which seems to cover

everything — ((Questions may not relate to matter which passed outside the walls of the House and do not relate to any Bill nor motion before the House)—

On the answering of questions a point came up yesterday: I was asked; "On what grounds?" I had no reply for this reason: "A Minister may decline to answer a question without stating the reason for his refusal and insistence on an answer is out of order. No debate is allowed."

The authority for that is: "A refusal to answer cannot be raised as a question of privilege, nor is it correct to comment on such refusal." A member may put a question but has no right to insist upon an answer. "Answers to questions cannot be insisted upon if the answer be refused by the Minister on the grounds of public interest nor can the question be replaced on the notice paper. Refusal of a Minister to answer on this ground cannot be raised as a matter of privilege."

There is one other thing I might quote: "It is not imperative for the Minister of Justice nor the Solicitor General to reply to questions seeking information upon legal points, upon measures before parliament nor relating to matters of public interest. They are the legal advisers of the Government, and in that capacity are confidential officers. And nothing could be more inconvenient than that they should be liable to interrogation by members as to the advice they have given or may be called upon to give to any department of the Government," —So we might go on — I am referring now to Beauchesne!"

"An inadmissible question would be one which sought information about matters which are in their

nature secret, including amongst other things advice given to the Crown by officers of the law. It is improper, of course, to ask a Minister what advice he intends to give to the Crown, for the simple reason that by answering such a question he would be committing himself, and it does not follow that the Government or even the Crown would accept the advice given by the Minister. Opinions of law officers of the Crown, being confidential, are not laid before parliament nor cited in debate and their production has always been refused, but if a Minister deems it expedient such opinions should be made known for the information of the House he is entitled to cite them."

Every opportunity is given to supply information to the public. It is really not proper to ask a question the answer of which is readily available in reports made to the public. However, I would not rule such a question out of order because it might be of interest to the House as a whole or the member concerned to table the information then and there. I refer particularly to Question No. 6 of today—I don't know—I have a note here; "Can this be had under public reports?" Perhaps it can.

May I call the attention of honourable members to Question 7, para. 14: Reference is made to a statement in a newspaper. Now that assumes that a press statement is correct. There again that is purely a technicality. It is not proper to ask if a statement in a newspaper is correct. However, the enquiring member may ask the Government if that is an expression of Government policy. I personally think such a thing would be rather a splitting of hairs.

Now in Question No. 12 I find it

is a little bit more serious. The first part asks if it is the intention of the Government in the person of one of its Ministers to do a certain thing. That obviously is advice proposed to be given the Crown.

Sub-question 2 of the same question—who were the people who did such and such a thing—It presumes that certain people did do that, which is making a statement which, of course, the Chair has no way of knowing is a statement of fact or a mere allegation of fact.

As to the third part of the Question: "What civil actions, if any, have been instituted towards the recovery of moneys for the two firms supposedly defrauded?" That, as I read it, would be out of order.

Now I will call Question No. 3, which is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Economic Development:

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, do I understand you to call the question now for an answer?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before your Honour does that would you permit me to say a word on the subject of questions addressed by the Opposition to Ministers of the Crown

The practice in this House is quite different from that carried out in almost all other Houses within the British system, that is, the Parliament of Great Britain, the Parliament of Canada, the Parliament of South Africa, the Parliament of Australia, of New Zealand and the Provinces and States of these countries, where they have a federal system. Here in Newfoundland we have carried out a practice that is almost unique—Members of the House stand in their places

and ask and give notice orally of a question they intend to ask—"I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask the Honourable Minister of Finance thus and so"—and he names the question. Now, Mr. Speaker, that inevitably—I ought to say before going on; in nearly all other Parliaments and Legislatures in the British system questions are not given notice of orally, they are written and handed to the Clerk of the House who submits them in case of doubt, to Mr. Speaker, who rules out any that are in Mr. Speaker's opinion unlawful according to the Rules of the House, unlawful according to parliamentary procedure and precedent. Questions so ruled out do not appear in print on the Order Paper, and as they have not been asked orally and do not appear in print on the Order Paper they are never heard of by the general public. But in this House the practice is for the honourable member to rise in his place and orally to read aloud his question, which then appears in print on the Order Paper. Before the Order Paper is available to the members of this House, as for example today, it is published in the daily press, which of course makes it available at once to such members of the House as wish to use the opportunity to make propaganda—For example two questions on today's paper—Section (2) of Question 12—Now that question might have been framed in this way: "Did any representative of the Government hold talks—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—I understand that question was ruled out of order—Is it permissible to discuss it here now? If that is so I ask to be given the same opportunity on this side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not quite clear what the point of order is.

MR. HOLLETT: The point of order is, Mr. Speaker, in that you ruled that particular question out of order, is it permissible for any member of this House to discuss it here?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think, Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of Your Honour's own comments, as the question is in fact on today's order Paper, and as I am agreeing with Your Honour and dealing with the very point Your Honour has raised, I think I might be permitted to cite this as an example of a thing that is or ought to be out of order.

MR. HOLLETT: Legal propaganda!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I say, if the question were worded in this way—'Did any representative of the Government hold talks with Alfred Valdmanis in the Penitentiary just prior to his change of plea to that of guilty—it might have been a proper question. At least it would not have been obvious propaganda. But that is not the way it is worded. It is worded as an obvious piece of propaganda, very malicious, very evil.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think the honourable member is justified in saying that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I mean, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion that is a piece of obvious, malicious, propaganda.

MR. HOLLETT: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker—I want to make this statement, Sir—If it is permissible for the honourable member to discuss any one question and make, what he calls, "political propaganda" out of it, the same opportunity should be available to us, to talk about every ques-

tion here, whether the Government is in favour of them or not. I submit, Sir, you having ruled the questions out of order and that they should not have been presented and therefore must not be answered or need not be, I submit, in view of that opinion, nobody else has the right to discuss them at this period.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to say on that point of order—The House will agree that is rather a delicate situation. I must admit two facts (1) the question has not been called and (2) I did say that Sections (1) and (2) of Question 12 were out of order. On the other hand, the fact is that the question, for reasons which I have already pointed out, have been printed, have been asked, and the point has been made. I permitted the honourable member on my left to make some remarks thus far, but do not think that he would be justified in reading an interpretation nor meaning therein—I am afraid that I shall have to uphold the point of order or else allow the whole Section of the question to be debated by the whole House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I say, why not? Why should it not be debated? The fact that I am debating it does not stop the other party from debating it. I hold, Mr. Speaker, it is a very good subject to debate, and as part of that debate I made this point:

MR. HOLLETT: At this time?

MR. SMALLWOOD: At this time. Now I make this point: Because of the particular method we have in this House of asking questions, that of standing in ones place and asking them orally and having them appear the following day in print on the Order Paper; and the fact that ques-

tions, before they are answered and before Your Honour rules them out of order, may appear in print in the daily press and be read on the radio, because of that, Sir, I hold that members of the House, I don't say only the Opposition, but members of the House might well be tempted to use the whole technique of questions and answers as a means of cheap political propaganda. That is the point I am making, and I give as an example the one which Your Honour has ruled out of order, which does not mean it cannot be mentioned, cannot be cited. The fact that Your Honour has ruled it out of order is very good reason for citing it as an example. Now because Your Honour ruled the question unparliamentary it does not follow that it cannot therefore be mentioned. I hold it can be mentioned, and I mention it as an example. The point I am making is that honoured and honourable tradition of questions in a parliamentary assembly can be used for propaganda purposes because if Your Honour rules it out of order on the day it appears in print on the Order Paper the propaganda has already been made in the daily press and on the radio. That is my opinion—Now as to the first example: "Who were the representatives of the Government who held talks with Alfred Valdmanis at the Penitentiary just prior to his change of plea to that of guilty . . ." Who says there were any representatives? The question says it. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition says there were representatives of the Government—because he drafted his question to say there were representatives of the Government—He says so. I do not say so. The Attorney General does not say so. The only one who says so is the Leader of the Opposition, and he says it in

this question. He gives information in the question.

MR. HOLLETT: Oh do it

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the information given is that the representatives of the Government interviewed Alfred Valdmanis. He gave that information, he offered it voluntarily, and then asked the question—"Who were they? What were their names?" First he gives the information that representatives of the Government interviewed Valdmanis in gaol just before he changed his plea to guilty. Then he asks: "What were the names of these representatives?" Now that is propaganda, malicious, vile and evil.

Now I give another example:

MR. SPEAKER: Keep the questions on an impersonal level:

MR. SMALLWOOD: The same honourable—I did not say the honourable gentleman was malicious, vile or evil—I said his question is and the propaganda is.

Now the same honourable gentleman in Question No. 13 (3) asks:

"Is Mr. Gordon Pushie, the Director General of Economic Development, presently in the Province? If not, will the Minister inform the House of his whereabouts, and the purpose of his trip abroad. Will Mr. Pushie be visiting Germany in connection with the present investigations initiated at Harbour Grace recently?"

The first part of that question is a fine question with nothing wrong with it. It is quite honourable. And the next part of the question "Will Mr. Pushie be visiting Germany?" That is a perfectly fine and honourable question if it stopped there. But it

does not. ". . . in connection with the present investigations initiated at Harbour Grace recently?" That, Sir, is another piece of vile and foul propaganda, vile, evil and mischevious propaganda. That, Sir, leads us to ask the question whether we can continue the practice we have followed for a century in this House, of having notice of questions given orally, so that before Your Honour has an opportunity to rule a question out of order, it has been circulated, the propaganda effect has been shown, and the Government, although conceivably quite innocent of the matter started in these questions will be thrown on the defensive to deny what is a lie in the first place, because — as Mark Twain said: "A lie can get half way around the world while the truth is pulling on its boots to chase it." The question I ask is whether we will have to abandon that practice. But for one reason I would move today that the old practice be changed and that notice of questions be handed in in writing to Mr. Clerk who would be able to consult Mr. Speaker, who would pass on the question's legitimacy in a parliamentary sense, so that the only questions that would appear on the Order Paper would be proper parliamentary questions. I would move that but for one reason—Just as surely as I do so the Opposition would make out at once that we are afraid of questions. We are not; But a few more propaganda questions like that and I will move it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr Speaker, we have all heard the old dictum: "If you cannot answer the question properly then attack the man who asked it." That is the attitude being taken by the Government this evening on this particular question. I maintain, Mr. Speaker—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

Has this question been called? Has there been a refusal to answer it?

MR. SPEAKER: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman says we are refusing to answer. It has not even been called.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know of any that were called except No. 3. It is not the one on which I was attacked in the first instance, and the Honourable the Premier could take as long as he wished on it. I presume I can get in a sentence or two— In other words, I take it, the Government's attitude is this—If it is not convenient to answer a question properly directed at them, or improperly if it is improperly, then say "No" and be done with it. If it is out of order there is nobody in the House has any objection to the Honourable the Speaker ruling it out of order. And if the Honourable the Premier wants to put in a new system for questions after a hundred years let him do so. That is not the point. If it or anybody asks a question we ought to get an answer one way or the other, either "Yes" or "No" or whatever you like, but we should get an answer. If it is out of order then the Minister is under no obligation to answer. It was stated yesterday that no Minister is required to answer a question under certain conditions. We know these rules, we know these laws have been handed down for many, many years, but for some reason or other these questions must have slipped out to the press or radio—I don't know—and the Honourable the Premier thinks they should be out—I don't know exactly what he thinks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the honourable gentleman allow me—"For some reason they slipped out"—the honourable gentleman handed them down to the press while asking them, and we watched him—so they slipped out to the press by accident now—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I deny that statement completely. I deny that statement completely, and the man who says that, Sir, is not speaking the truth again. I had to say that, Sir, once. I say it again. I did not take them down to the press. I say the man who said that is not telling the truth in any shape or form. As a matter of fact when speaking about me or of me he never wants to tell the truth. Yes—If you can answer the question attack the fellow who asks it—that is good propaganda. That is telling the people all over the world, particularly in areas down in certain sections of this country, what a character that Leader of the Opposition is—he did not get away with it though, no. That is what he wants to get across, the Honourable the Premier. But, Sir, we are not falling for that sort of stuff—we respect your ruling, Mr. Speaker. If you rule any particular question out of order, whether out of order by evil intent of the Opposition or whether out of order by error or mistake, we respect the order of the Chair. If it is ruled out of order that settles it. We have no desire to get up and question your ruling in any way, shape or form.

Well, I take it as the Honourable the Premier referred to that question about Mr. Gordon Pushie I can also refer to it. "Will Mr. Pushie be visiting Germany in connection with the present investigations initiated at Harbour Grace recently?" Mr. Speaker, if that is not common knowledge all

around the world then my name is not what it is, Sir. It is common knowledge that Koch Shoes over there was raided by the RCMP and that certain documents were taken. It is perfectly true that the RCMP raided this respectable citizen of this world formerly employed by Koch Shoes—That is known all over the country, has been on the air and in the press and everything else and simply because I asked if Mr. Pushie had gone to Germany, where Koch comes from and where his father resides—I will go into that later—That is out of order and nobody is going to answer it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nobody said that—I will answer when and as it is called.

MR. HOLLETT: You are going to tell us why Mr. Pushie has gone over. Good. And don't think we don't know.

As to the other item, Sir, on Valdmánis, is a matter certainly that is important. I don't want the Honourable the Premier to think these questions are based on hot air or any kind of wind. When a question is asked from this side of the House it is based on something. And the question was asked, particularly the one that was ruled out of order, or one of the ones:

"Is it the intention of the Attorney General to proceed with the trial of Alfred A. Valdmánis on the charge of unlawfully by falsehood defrauding the firm of MIAG of moneys to the amount of \$270,000 between the first day of August 1950 and the 31st day of October 1951? If not, why not?"

I submit, Sir, although you have ruled these out of order, that is something which I should like to know. This man pleaded guilty to

a certain charge of defrauding Benno Schilde of certain moneys, and received a sentence of four years in the penitentiary. Simultaneously another charge was made that this man defrauded the firm of MIAG of \$250,000. He pleaded guilty to one charge and was sent to the penitentiary for four years. Thus far the people of this country don't know whose money—I believe he was involved in this thing. They don't know what is going to happen—Can a man get away with \$250,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is now debating the question, debating the sub-matter of the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman is off the subject. We are not debating Dr. Valdmans but merely the matter of asking and answering questions. I would like, if the honourable member would permit me—I had a reason for getting myself clear on this, and we can only get the opinion of both sides and would like the debate to cease with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I can give you a guarantee of that from this side of the House. But it is not nice to be told that the questions asked are malicious, vile and evil.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Propaganda.

MR. HOLLETT: I am the perpetrator. The doctor of propaganda in this country talking to me like that. All I can say, Sir, is that down through the ages this is the rule: If you don't like what the man is doing or saying attack him.

MR. SPEAKER: Without joining in the debate—I raised the matter be-

cause the question concerned me vitally. I do try to be fair to both sides of the House but the House will see that if a member on this side asks a question and I only see it after it has become public property and it becomes public property before it becomes the property of the House, then if I rule an inadmissible question out of order I thereby prevent the Government from saying a word about it. All I would ask is that we do have forty-eight hours between the time of asking the questions orally and printing in the Order Paper. I take no cognizance of what is said in the press or radio.

MR. BROWNE: You are not going to enforce that rule, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot enforce it unless the House gives me leave.

MR. BROWNE: I only want to say one thing.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): The Honourable Leader of the Opposition pledged that the debate would be closed.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker has made certain comments since that time. I just want to say this as a piece of information. If the Honourable the Attorney General does not want to hear it I think I will sit down. I think in view of what the Premier said about the practice in other Legislatures—In Ottawa I think I had a little experience and Mr. Speaker you might find this interesting. It is appreciated that where there are so many members over two hundred and sixty the question is written and given to the party whip to pass on and then given to the man in charge of questions who sees they are in the right form. Very often he comes back and says—"That ques-

tion of yours. I think you should change it and put it in another form. I will tell you why." or "That question has been asked before in this session." But I have never known, in four years, any question was commented upon by the Speaker, that is, that he took a question and ruled it out in private. He may do it when asked before the House but never in private.—They have the officials—

MR. SPEAKER: The House of Commons in Westminster says: "It is improper to give oral notice of questions."

MR. CURTIS: I may say there are frequent references in "May" to rulings given by Mr. Speaker in private, that questions are out of order—It is very frequently mentioned in "May" that Mr. Speaker privately rules that certain questions are out of order.

MR. BROWNE: They may have done it, but they did not do it during the four years I was there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Meaning to his knowledge they did not.

MR. BROWNE: You cannot say that he did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can, because I have seen them in the Canadian Hansard, more than one reference to that very fact.

MR. HOLLETT: Let us come back home, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It is all very simple—I do not want to cause any embarrassment to any member by ruling on questions publicly. I might add, too, that Question No. 4 is also addressed to the same Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

Answers to Questions

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is in course of preparation, Mr. Speaker. That is the answer for Question No. 3 and No. 4.

Question No. 5—In course of preparation.

Question No. 6—In course of preparation.

Question No. 7—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that this is a proper question, but notwithstanding that fact I propose to answer it.

(1) The conversation lasted about twenty-eight seconds. It was held in public. There were present at least half a dozen Newfoundlanders including some newspapermen from St. John's. The occasion—Seven Islands. The time—last summer. The immediate spot—that part of the railway where the two railcars loaded with iron ore from Labrador, one from Quebec, was stationed. I was there first looking at our Newfoundland car being photographed. Mr. Duplessis arrived a few minutes later with an entourage of friends, of ministers, I don't know who. He said:

"Well Joe, how are you?" (That was very natural)

"Well, Maurice, how are you?"

"What about this boundary?"

"Oh, we will have to get that fixed up."

That is the report—That is No. 1.

(2) I have not the foggiest idea.

(3) It is not in the public interest to say but certainly with the Government of Quebec nothing.

(4) That gentleman's agreement had no nature. It did not exist. It is non-existent. There ain't no such animal. There has not been any agreement, gentlemanly nor any other kind of agreement between Mr. Duplessis nor anyone else in the Quebec Government and me or anybody else in this Government.

Question No. 8—In course of preparation.

Question No. 9—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I presume these agreements are being copied. We will not table the originals, obviously.

Question No. 10—In course of preparation.

Question No. 11—In course of preparation.

Question No. 12—

MR. SPEAKER: Question No. 12 is addressed to the Honourable the Attorney General. I ruled that out of order, item (1) and (2), on the grounds that it asks what advice the Attorney General proposes to give, and in that it contains a statement or allegation of fact. The question might be re-worded.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware that you have ruled that I do not have to answer the second part of this question, but there is no reason why I should not answer it. The first part of the question I do not have to answer and do not intend to answer, but I do intend, Mr. Speaker, to answer the second part. I have to ask permission to answer the question because the nature of the question and the way in which it is worded make it necessary for me to answer it. I hope there will be no such other question asked.

There were no representatives of the Government, to my knowledge, who held any talks with Valdmanis prior to his change of plea, none.

If my honourable friend who asked this question says these questions are based on something (these were his exact words) "based on something other—"

MR. SMALLWOOD: Based on hot air or wind.

MR. CURTIS: I might say these questions cannot be based on anything. There is no foundation for it. My friend's colleague to his left knows there was no such interview—nobody went—I dislike very much having to become a phonograph, but a question like that irritates me, the very fact it should be here on the record. Nobody saw Valdmanis, nobody, with my knowledge, Nobody was sent by me, nobody representing me. I have never seen him myself and nobody representing anyone in the Government that I know of, and I am the one to whom the question is addressed.

12 (3) What civil actions, if any, have been instituted towards the recovery of moneys for the two firms supposedly defrauded?

How would I know that for the two firms. If my honourable friend wants that information let him go into the courts and look up what civil actions have been instituted for the two firms. There was civil actions taken by the Government but for them and not for the two firms.

MR. HOLLETT: Why, it was the firms that were defrauded?

MR. CURTIS: "And is it not a fact that these amounts had already been paid to the firms in question by the Government under the heading of ex gratia awards?"

No, it is not a fact, Mr. Speaker.

12 (4) I don't know who they were. I never heard of some of them, Mr. Speaker. If these statements were taken, and I believe they were, they were taken by the police in the course of their duty and will not be tabled in this House.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before we pass on to number 3, regarding the paragraph of Question No. 12, there is a statement I think I should make: As everyone knows as Solicitor General I was in charge of this particular case, and this particular part of the question, Mr. Speaker, contains the clear allegation that I, acting as Solicitor General, and law-officer of the Crown, did something for which I should be debarred if it were true.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there was no such insinuation in that question. "Who were the representatives" It asks the Honourable the Minister of Justice and does not ask the Solicitor General. I maintain the Honourable Minister has no right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He has every right.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, I submit I have every possible right in the world—In its present form it is an allegation and an accusation—If it had said "Did any representative" that might or might not have been a proper question—But to say who were the representatives—The clear imputation is that representatives went down to see Valdmanis and put the gun to his head to have him plead guilty or else. The question in its present form, Mr. Speaker, is capable of no other implication—I say, sir, if that were true I should be debarred as a law officer

of the Crown, if I were guilty of such conduct. It is a gross allegation against me as a layman, a lawyer and a law officer of the Crown, and I demand it be withdrawn.

MR. HOLLETT: Demand? That what be withdrawn?

MR. MURRAY: The statement "that representatives of the Government held talks with Valdmanis previous to his conviction. Who were the representatives?"

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid the honourable member cannot ask for a withdrawal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, it ought never to have been on the Order Paper.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted a word—in fairness to the honourable gentleman who just spoke, I had a somewhat nebulous connection with the late great man and I can—I think it is my duty to inform the House that the Honourable the Solicitor General conducted what part of the case that I know of, the latter stage including the time immediately prior to the Valdmanis change of plea, certainly according to the highest principles of the bar. I think it would be less than simple justice if I do not say so. I know nothing of any other aspect of the thing, but I can vouch for the Solicitor General acting in that capacity at that time certainly behaved himself as a lawyer should.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, on that point, it is the first time I had any awareness of the fact the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs was Solicitor General. I knew it but I completely forgot it, and completely forgot the Solicitor General was in

charge of the prosecutions against Valdmanis. I never thought of it, it never occurred to me. I repeat again this question was not based on wind nor on hot air.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—I ask that Your Honour order the honourable gentleman to withdraw that last remark. After the Attorney General of this Province, the chief law officer of the Crown and a Minister of the Crown, had said that there was not a syllable of truth in it, now the Leader of the Opposition in full hearing of that, says this question is not based on nothing, on wind. Now, sir, I ask that you order him to withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! — Order!

If honourable members would make just a slight attempt to maintain parliamentary procedure and show some deference to the Chair these embarrassing situations would not arise. I am afraid I must ask the honourable gentleman to withdraw that statement that the question is founded on some substantial thing.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I did not say any such thing. I said the question was not based on hot air.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not an implication.

MR. HOLLETT: Have I to disclose all my reasons for every question here? I have already said if there is any idea of imputing any dishonesty to any member of the Cabinet or the Government then, of course, I am sorry. I never meant any such thing. I cannot go into detail without telling things which are not to be told. And I maintain a person has not to get up here and give the reasons for questions

asked. I maintain, sir, in the first instance there should be none of this talk—The question was ruled out of order by Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—The honourable member has only himself to blame. The matter had been settled by both sides of the House. Just now it was said that obedience to the Rules of the Chair was shown—One of the chief rules in asking and answering questions is that there shall be no debate thereon. The debate has been entirely uncontrolled.

The honourable member has made a statement which is offensive to certain members of the House, and I am afraid I must uphold the point of order and ask that it be withdrawn—If honourable members would be guided, these embarrassing situations would not arise. I pointed out at the beginning that the question contained inferences and imputations and makes a statement which may or may not be true. I am not saying it follows the honourable member says such a thing by design, it might very well be by accident. Now the thing has been denied not only by the Attorney General but by the Solicitor General corroborated by the honourable member on my right; and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has said his question is grounded on fact.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I said it was not based on hot air. I said nothing about fact. But if you wish me to tell—if you wish me to say on what my question has been based I shall have to consider it—But, Sir, I abide by your ruling. I have always done that—but I do what I have to, withdraw.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I insist—The Honourable the At-

torney General says the question is based on hot air, and the Honourable the Solicitor General says the same thing. As far as the Solicitor General is concerned, he is supported by the honourable gentleman's colleague that this question is based on nothing but hot air. But that having been said, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition then repeats that it is not based on hot air nor on wind, the clear imputation being: "I do not believe the Attorney General and I do not believe the Solicitor General." That is really offensive and it is something which the honourable gentleman ought to withdraw.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I maintain there has been an awful lot read into the words I used.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member realizes I have given him at least four opportunities, when he is only permitted one, to reply to a point of order. It is a very simple thing. What do you expect me to do. To say the question "is not based on hot air" implies it must be founded on something substantial, something pertinent. The remark has been objected to as it was out of order and uncalled for. I have to sustain the point of order and ask the honourable gentleman to withdraw it.

MR. HOLLETT: I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker—but I would say the question was based on information.

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the honourable gentleman to withdraw that statement.

MR. HOLLETT: I withdraw it all, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman must do nothing unless standing in his place. The honour-

able gentleman will retract his statement.

MR. HOLLETT: Put me out, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say any more.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman will not bow to the order of the Chair, I seek Your Honour's advice as to what this House is to do to punish the honourable gentleman and enforce the authority of the Chair.

MR. HOLLETT: That is good policy. I know what the Honourable the Premier wants to do. I withdraw the statement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I withdraw my request to Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Question No. 13.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the first part of that question, which seeks the name of the Italian firm presently interested in the establishment of a paper mill in this Province; the name of a man, Alfeo Taglioli.

"What stage has been reached in an agreement with the Government by this firm, and what commitments, if any, have been made by the Government or by the Minister on behalf of the Government?"

The answer is, no stage, not even the beginning of a stage, not even the ghost of a stage. No commitments have been made by the Government. No commitments have been made by the Minister on behalf of the Government. Mr. Alfeo Taglioli visited Newfoundland on two occasions. He does not speak any English whatsoever, and he engaged the services of a married lady in this city, who speaks Italian fairly fluently, to be his interpreter. He called on me in her pres-

ence, and spoke of starting a paper mill if we would give him the necessary stands of pulp wood. We told him we had lots of wood and asked him, did he have lots of capital, men and know-how. He said he did. He then went back to Italy. I contacted the Canadian Ambassador in Italy. I contacted the Canadian Consul General in Rome. I contacted the representative of the Department of Trade and Commerce in Canada and in Rome, and I got financial reports on the gentleman in question. These were not very reassuring, and when Mr. Taglioli visited me again as he did a second time, I had some further discussions with him, and that was the end of it. I never had very much, if any, faith in the likelihood that gentleman would be the means of starting a paper mill in Newfoundland. Indeed it was of so little importance that I never even mentioned it in Cabinet. I never even took it that seriously.

MR. BROWNE: Getting experience.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have had experience of some gentlemen and it has not been so pleasant, present company, of course, excepted.

13 (2)—**Mr. Speaker,** I intend to table that. I thought I would have it here this afternoon, but I am informed by my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, that he has only the originals. I remember that two or three years ago we had many copies of it mimeographed or rather photostated in his Department, and I thought I had some copies of it. These are not available, apparently. As soon as I can get the two main books copied I will table them. I am able to table one here today, four copies of this one Section

of the report, dealing with fisheries. I think there are enough copies of it to circulate to the press. The other two I will table as soon as they can be copied photostatically or by some other means.

I may say that I am quite free in my own mind now that to table the IBEC Report cannot possibly be damaging to the public interest. I don't know how long it will take, but before the House prorogues I will table them, if they can be copied that quickly. The Survey Division of the Department of Mines and Resources states the copies that were made were given over to Mr. Pnshie or Mr. Short. Possibly they may be up in my office. Anyway I will have them tabled.

13 (3) He is not presently in the Province. He went, on Saturday, I think, to London. He is in London on business for the Government, for the Department of Economic Development, not even remotely connected with Koch Shoes, not even by the wildest possible stretch of the imagination connected with Koch Shoes nor anything else in Harbour Grace, but straight Economic Development. Mr. Pnshie will not be visiting Germany—In connection with the present investigation? No.

Question No. 14—Answer in course of preparation.

Question No. 15—Answer in course of preparation.

Question No. 16—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the first part of No. 16 is in course of preparation. The second part of No. 16 has the following answer:

The honourable member for Green Bay is a director of Newfoundland

Gold Sail Leather Goods Limited; Kosh Shoes Limited; Atlantic Hardboards Industries Limited. He receives no fee for being a director on these companies.

The Honourable the Attorney General is a director of Bowaters Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Mills Limited, for which he receives the normal and customary fee that is being paid to the Government directors and has been paid since 1924. The Attorney General is a director also on behalf of the Government of the St. Lawrence Corporation, Newfoundland Asbestos Limited, Newfoundland Hardboards Limited, Arctic Fisheries Limited. For being a director of these companies he receives no fee and never has.

The Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives is a director, representing the Government, on the board of Andrews Labrador Fisheries Limited; Fishery Products Limited; North Atlantic Trading Company Limited and Bonavista Fish Meal and Oils Limited, for which services he receives and has received no fees.

On the board of Atlantic Gypsum as directors are; the Attorney General, the Honourable Minister of Public Works, the Honourable Minister of Labour, the Honourable Minister of Economic Development. These directors have received and will receive no fees.

Finally, on the Board of NALCO as directors are, the Honourable the Attorney General, the Honourable Minister of Finance and the Premier. They have received and receive no fees.

I may say in connection with all these honourable gentlemen no fees whatsoever have been paid or are being paid or will be paid in any shape or form, good, bad or indifferent, di-

rect or indirect, except in the case of the Honourable the Attorney General as a director on the board of Bowaters.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, if I may—During the discussion on the highly irregular Question No. 12 the House will remember that I did volunteer some information which, so to speak, absolved the Solicitor General. (It has since occurred to me I possibly should have included the same reference to the Honourable the Attorney General. It might be misunderstood if I did not). I would, therefore, ask your indulgence, sir—The course of my remarks so far as they apply to the Attorney General's conduct of the Valdemus case, in the last stage, what I knew of them, was exactly the same as that of the Solicitor General. I think probably, sir, I should say that.

MR. CURTIS: Thank you!

MR. SPEAKER: I suggest the House take a short recess.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Orders of the Day

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, could we begin with item 3 and go right on as far as we can with second readings:

Second Readings:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Fisheries Loan Act".

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the second reading of this Bill, "An Act to Amend the Fisheries Loan Act". The amendment to Section (d) in the Bill is a minor one, and one to enable the Government to make a contract with the Chairman of the three loan boards;

the Fisheries Loan Board, the Co-operative Loan Board and the Industrial Development Loan Board.

The Fisheries Loan Act as it presently stands on the statute books provides that the Board shall consist of not less than five members; that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall appoint one member of the Board to be Chairman, and it provides also for the members of the Board. During the term of office of the first chairman that worked out quite satisfactorily, but when Mr. Baxter resigned the Government wished to secure the services of the present incumbent. It gives him an understanding to give him a contract for ten years. This amendment is to clear the way in order to allow the Government to make that contract.

That about covers it, Mr. Speaker, and I move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion is that Bill be read a second time.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question in connection with that. I think the amendment appears to be a good one. I would like to know if the Minister would say, when the time comes to say, who are the five members of the board, or if more, who are they—no less than five, I believe, have to be on the board.

Another question I think he could answer is the relationship between such a board and the Fisheries Development Authority.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the present chairman of the board was formerly a civil servant and had been working for some time in the civil service before being appointed to this position. The contract therefore, I take it, is for the purpose of giving him the benefit of

the years he has worked in the civil service. I am not sure what is the standing of this Fisheries Loan Board nor the standing of the officials. The previous one was the case of a man retired—he was a bank manager, Mr. Baxter, who had retired from the management of the Royal Bank and was kept on here at a salary of ten thousand dollars a year. His assistant, and I don't know if there were any other members of the loan board, was Mr. Callanan. I don't know whether he was a member. I believe he was the secretary to the three boards, and Mr. Baxter was Chairman of the three boards.

Now when the minister is speaking perhaps he might inform us what salaries are going to be paid and whether it is the intention to pay the present incumbent of the office the salary of ten thousand dollars a year, and what the matter of the contract is to be. I think we should have that information because this seems to be a new department. Obviously the appointment of Mr. Baxter was of a temporary nature, as he was an elderly man who only stayed for the purpose of setting up the thing and then left. Here's a man who is settled here and is obviously going to stay some time, and the Government expects to be making a ten year contract. Now I don't know whether it is necessary for the Minister to have a ten year contract. I have not had a chance to compare this amendment with the Bill up until just a moment ago, and I am not in a position to make a comparison with other boards. The only one I can think of is the Board of Public Utilities, where another gentleman retired from the Municipal Council has been kept on under contract. I don't think there is any necessity for a young man to be appointed to a

position of this kind to be given a contract such as envisaged in this Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman in question was before Confederation a civil servant in the service of the Government of Newfoundland. At Confederation he left Newfoundland's civil service and went into the service of the Government of Canada where he continued for a number of years in the Federal field, indeed until he resigned from the service to take his present position. That he did at our earnest request. We lost Mr. Baxter. His wife died here and he was left, as the honourable gentleman said, quite alone in Newfoundland. Whilst his wife lived he was quite happy to live in Newfoundland and had even bought a house for himself, after he became chairman of these boards. After his going it became important to get a good steady, dependable man who knew our fishermen and knew our people, who knew civil service routine and governmental procedures. A man quite frankly to whom we felt we could trust fairly substantial sums of money as the chief executive of these three loan boards. So we asked Mr. Drover to resign from the civil service of Canada in which he clearly had excellent prospects, because he was looked upon as one of their most valuable men in Newfoundland, and with very good reason because he was exactly that. So in order to attract him we offered him a pretty attractive proposition, to continue at the same salary that Mr Baxter had gotten, ten thousand dollars a year, which is about the same salary nowadays of some of our Deputy Ministers. That is the position.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, there is only one other thing I have to add to that: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition wishes to know who

are the present members of the board. They are: Mr. Drover, who is chairman, Senator Ray Patten, Mr. H. B. Clyde Lake, Mr. Molesan, Mr. Ross Young and for the Federal Government Mr. Louis Bradbury.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Development Loan Act":

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to put into effect an identical amendment and for exactly the same purpose. I don't think it requires any further explanation. I move second reading of the Bill.

Motion is that Bill be now read a second time.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, on that same point, I would like to have a similar answer—Who are the members of that board.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I suppose this is not the time in which we could say very much about the work of the board as far as loans to co-operative societies. But this is a very scant introduction to a Bill to appoint a chairman of a loan board to co-operative societies, which co-operatives once formed a large part, I should say, of the work of the department over which the Honourable Minister presides. Probably some other day we shall have an opportunity to discuss this. But I would like to say that the gentleman who has been appointed, has been appointed, I take it, rather on his experience in the fisheries than his experience with co-operatives. I hope that in the arrangements of the board more weight will be

given to experiences of the members in regard to the co-operative movement than has been the case in regard to the appointment of the chairman. Perhaps when the Minister replies he will let us know that.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, the present members of the board are Mr. Drover, Chairman, Mr. Dawe the acting Registrar of the Co-operative Society acting in place of Mr. Drover who has been ill for some time, Mr. Scott, who was previously Deputy Minister of co-operatives; Mr. James, Manager of the Newfoundland Co-operative Union and Mr. Peet who has had quite a long and distinguished career in labour circles in St. John's and also had a very close association with the Co-operative movement being previously president of the Co-operative Credit Society and for several years has been a member of the Credit Committee. I believe that covers the point raised by the honourable member for St. John's West. That is the personnel of the board. Care has been taken in appointing any personnel that they have had experience in the co-operative movement.

With regard to the loan activity of the board, the honourable member will have the pleasure of seeing that for himself in the report of the board which will be tabled. All I can say is that the opportunity is there for the co-operative societies to borrow from the board for the purposes set out in the Act. If they don't there is not very much we can do about it.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting the Fisheries Assistance Fund":

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, the

preamble to this Bill sets forth the position pretty clearly and the reason why it must be introduced.

The Commission of Government, by certain levies upon certain fishery products notably salt cod, amassed a certain sum of money, in the vicinity of half a million dollars, which in 1949 they established in a fisheries assistance fund for these purposes: The establishment and development of new markets for salt codfish and encouraging and assisting development of the fisheries generally.

When the old statutes were being repealed in order to clear the way for consolidation in 1951 the appendix listed a certain number of Acts to be repealed. This Fisheries Marketing Fund Act which sets up this fund was one of them. It was repealed without anybody taking too much notice of it, and we suddenly found one half million dollars that nobody had any authority to do anything about. The fund has remained unchanged throughout the years, accumulating interest, I believe, at one-half per cent down in the Savings Bank or wherever it is. The only charges that have been made against it have been those in line with decisions made by the Commission of Government to pay a bounty to anybody in the fishing industry who wishes to secure a pump for cleaning his fish, who is entitled to some assistance from the Government. Now the ratio is that we pay one-third of the cost of the pump up to fifty dollars. The charges against the fund then during the years, with the exception of 1949 when the change was made, was between fifteen hundred and two thousand dollars a year. There is presently in the fund in the vicinity of \$600,000. I am sorry I do not have the exact figures, but will be able to have it for Committee of the Whole

stage. This Act is to give authority to the Government, to the Minister of Finance, with the concurrence of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, to apply the fund to the encouragement and development of the fisheries.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this is a fund which the Government inherited, and which apparently must have been forgotten by everybody, having disposed of any other funds otherwise the Government must not have had the necessary authority to do it. Now it appears that about six hundred thousand dollars remains in that fund at the present moment, and the purpose of this Bill is to give the Government power to spend it. That is what it amounts to, to be spent, of course, in measures to encourage and develop the fisheries of Newfoundland. Now that is a very broad and general purpose, of which the Minister is now speaking, and it seems to me this is a matter which should be given further consideration other than just to leave it at that, to give the Minister full power to dispose of that money.

It is true that in an earlier session—it has to be invested—No it does not even have to be invested but it may be invested—then the Minister would have power to withdraw any deposits or vary any investment—and under the next section it may be applied for encouragement and development of the fisheries of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could leave this over. We have not had an opportunity of discussing this amongst ourselves.

MR. HIGGINS: While it is standing over perhaps I might direct a question to the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable

member for St. John's West, speaking in this debate, has asked for an adjournment of the debate, therefore he has the right to speak again when the item is called again. If the Honourable member for St. John's East should speak—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two about the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman wants the debate deferred. That is all right. We don't want to defer it at the moment. We will defer it and give the honourable member for St. John's East should to consider it, but can we not continue the debate?

MR. SPEAKER: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I do not agree to the deferment in that case. We will vote it down. We will give the honourable gentlemen all the time they like, but I want to now speak to the Bill. Why not? Is there any reason?

MR. SPEAKER: Order—The facts are simple, most elementary. The motion is before the House. The order has been moved by the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives. The floor was obtained by the honourable member for St. John's West. He is speaking. He has asked the mover if he may have the debate adjourned. As far as the Chair is concerned he still has the floor until his motion is lost, whereupon another member may speak, or if debate is adjourned then no other member may speak. Some confusion arose there—

MR. BROWNE: I understood the Minister in charge of the Bill agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: I had not had the opportunity to put the motion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I put it—The honourable gentleman who moved the motion is content that the honourable gentlemen opposite should have more time to consider the Bill before they participate in the debate. But in the meantime may not a speech or two be made, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Not without depriving the honourable gentleman who is speaking.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So that he may speak again—I thought the honourable gentleman had finished. If he wishes to speak again that is all right. I thought the position was that the honourable gentleman had finished and another honourable gentleman did not want to speak now.

MR. HIGGINS: I did, sir, but they would not let me.

MR. CURTIS: Is it in order, Mr. Speaker—My honourable friend, the junior member for St. John's West started to speak to the Bill and in the middle of his speech moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: No—Not moved the adjournment—

MR. CURTIS: Asked for time. Does not that necessarily mean that before asking for an adjournment of a debate he should make that request before speaking and not in the middle of his speech. In other words it ties up every one does it not.

MR. SPEAKER: I said it was extremely elementary—It seems that the extremely elementary has become profound. Let us go over the situation: The Government order was called by the Minister in whose name it stands. He has made his speech and resumed his seat. The floor is held by the honourable member for St. John's

West. He spoke for close on four minutes and then he addressed himself directly to the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives and asked; "May I have this debate adjourned?" The Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives said; "Yes". Since then at least four other members have been commenting. It is impossible to follow. The member for St. John's West has the floor. He asked the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives to allow an adjournment of the debate. If the Minister had said no, then the member for St. John's West must either continue his speech or sit down. That is all. If the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives and the House agree to adjourn the debate then we shall have the motion to adjourn and nobody else may speak.

Let us begin where we left off—Would the member for St. John's West care to repeat his question?

MR. BROWNE: Will I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I must protect the honourable member's interest. If he makes that motion and the motion is lost he is forfeiting his right to speak.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, what I did before was to wonder if we could have this matter deferred because we have not had an opportunity to discuss it amongst ourselves.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, as Leader of the House, may I suggest that the debate now be deferred so that the honourable member may continue his speech when the debate continues? Is that in order?

MR. SPEAKER: It is not out of order. I am trying to find out just what is going on. Do I understand

the honourable member for St. John's West to ask for a deferment? Does the Minister of Fisheries and Cooperatives agree?

MR. KEOUGH: Yes, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Now will the honourable member make the motion that the debate be adjourned?

Motion put by Mr. Browne:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, before you put that—Is that in order? Is not the honourable member then taking the prerogative of the Government? Is it not the Government's function to determine whether the debate shall be adjourned?

MR. SPEAKER: Exactly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Therefore I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as Leader of the House, with the consent of my colleagues, that the debate be deferred.

MR. SPEAKER: But the member for St. John's West asked permission which was granted by the Government. If the House votes against that motion I would rule it out of order because I will not have this member deprived of the right to speak. May I again repeat; will honourable members be guided by the Chair. The motion was obviously seconded by the Minister.

Motion carried—That the debate be deferred—

MR. SPEAKER: At the resumption of the debate the honourable member for St. John's West has the floor.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—What I gathered from your Honour's remarks it was the concurrence of the Honourable Minister, which means he spoke for the Government when he agreed.

Therefore it was the Government that postponed the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. Otherwise the members opposite might move a motion and probably the vote could be "No".

MR. SMALLWOOD: In other words it is the Government who sets the timetable for the Government's business.

MR. SPEAKER: Exactly—These are all Government orders, and debate can only be deferred with the Government's permission.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Industrial Development Loan Act":

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill. This is a third of a series of three Bills, one of which has been read a second time; the second of which has not been read a second time because the debate has been deferred, and this is the third Bill. This one also deals with the position of chairman of the three boards. I move this one because the Industrial Development Loan Act administration comes under me as Minister of Economic Development. I move the second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that this Bill be now read a second time:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I see nothing wrong with this amendment. I wonder if I might ask the Honourable the Premier if he could let us have the numbers and amounts of loans that have been granted under this Industrial Development Loan Act?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the Honourable the Premier is in a position to answer that question, but perhaps he is in

a position to tell us the names of the board members as well when he answers?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate I can say that within fifteen days of the opening of the House the report and the annual report of this board must be tabled. I assume that it will be ready and will be tabled. It will contain all that information, as to what loans were made and to whom and for what etc. That is true of the other loan boards as well.

Now as to the personnel, from memory, in addition to the Chairman, Mr. Drover, and the Secretary, Mr. Callanan, it consists of Mr. H. R. Luscombe Mr. N. Short, OBE, the Deputy Minister of Economic Development, and the fifth, it may be Mr. F. M. O'Leary. He was a member I know and may be still. Yet he may have resigned and some other member may be there. That is four, I will find out the fifth if the honourable gentlemen wants it. The fifth, I think, used to be Mr. F. M. O'Leary, but I don't remember if he is now or not.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting Perpetuities and Accumulating to Certain Funds Established to Provide Pensions or Other Benefits".

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill, which will interest more the legal members of the House than the lay members. The rule governing perpetuities is a rule of law which forbids any disposition of profits may be postponed beyond the life of any number of persons living at the time of the disposition and a further period

of 21 years after the death of survivors'. It is proposed that this rule should not be applied to trusts which are set up to provide pensions, retirement allowances, annuities or sickness, death or other benefits to employees or to their widows, dependents or other beneficiaries. I know of no case in Newfoundland which will be affected by this legislation. But we are now part of a great country, and it is quite likely organizations who have these benefit funds, may from time to time be here. I may say this Bill is recommended by the Conference on Uniformity of Legislation in Canada. We thought there would be no harm in having the law here in case any Mainland company settled here and should continue to set up a trust fund for the purpose of pensions. I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, there is only one case occurs to me. I believe at the present time in the Supreme Court there are certain funds which have not been claimed because there has been difficulty in ascertaining the persons to whom the funds should be paid. What I am thinking of at the present time amounts to about fifteen hundred dollars, which was established about fifty years ago and by the accumulation of interest has grown to that amount at the present time. The Registrar of the Supreme Court is the trustee of that fund, and I imagine that when it was created further back—The Attorney General referred at the termination of the fund and twenty-one years after—will that fund be taken away by the Government? What will happen in a case like that? Who will take possession of such a fund? It seems to me it is not completed under this provision—I will just try and make it clear:—In 1870, I believe it was, and in 1904 four hun-

dred dollars at the time was paid into the court. The Registrar of the Supreme Court was made Trustee. Since that, the account went on and one way and another the principal now reaches nearly fifteen hundred dollars. The Registrar is still trustee and is anxious to distribute it, but all the beneficiaries or persons who are entitled to it are not accessible, not easy of access. We do know some who are entitled to it but don't know all. Of course it may have to be that there will be applications to the Supreme Court as to what shall be done about it. But has the Government in mind taking over funds if there were more like that?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the object of this Bill is to affect items like that at all. It is purely to deal with trust funds which are established for the purpose of providing pensions, retirement allowances, annuities or sickness, death or other benefits to employees or to their widows, dependents or other beneficiaries. I don't think this Act will affect that at all. The effect of the Act is only such as would enable a company doing business here to set up a trust fund for its employees in order that the proceeds of that fund would be invested in one way or another, quite like the CNR. The CNR might possibly have some fund to come under that category. It is not a Bill changing the existing law except to enable this fund to continue beyond the life of people living or expected to live twenty-one years after.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting the Conditional Sale of Goods":

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, this Act respecting the conditional sale of goods is designed to protect creditors and purchasers, if you like. A conditional sale of goods is defined on page 4, a contract for the sale of goods under which possession is to be delivered to the buyer and property in the goods is to be vested in him at a subsequent time on payment of the whole or part of the price or on the performance of any other condition, or contract for the hiring of goods under which it is agreed that the hirer become or have the option of becoming the owner of the goods on compliance with the terms of the contract, that is, a purchase agreement a hire purchase agreement. There is no law underwriting such contract at the present time in Newfoundland. So we are proposing to bring in this Bill which is designed to protect the creditors and/or purchaser. A system of registration is set up under the Bill under Clause 4 which says that all such sales shall be produced in writing and filed within thirty days otherwise the sale will be void, unless the terms are complied with.

The only other item of interest in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is Clause 22 which provides that after the Act comes into effect all sales made prior to the coming into effect of the Act will be brought within the ambit of the Act, and ninety days notice is given in which all such contracts are to be filed.

As I have said, this Bill should be of considerable interest not only to lawyers but also to businessmen and commission agents generally throughout the country. As we all know such sales have grown enormously in Newfoundland during the past number of years.

As to the form of the Bill, sir, I might say it has been drafted by the Committee on Uniformity of Legislation for Canada and only recently has been committed to the mercantile section of the Canadian Bar Association. This is the form which we received. It is eventually to go back to the Committee on Uniformity of Legislation again, and will doubtlessly in its present form be enacted in all provinces of Canada.

I don't think there is anything at all contentious in the Bill as far as its present form. I move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to say on that except it is a new Bill, something which is newly applied to business, and I am just wondering if it would be wise if the Government did circulate the Bill amongst the legal representatives of the business section of the community of the province before we have been asked to vote on the Bill. I have only had an opportunity to glance briefly through it, and I must admit that I have so far seen nothing wrong with it. I am not very familiar with business techniques—I should not have made that admission of course as the Premier is listening to me and will throw it at me one of those days.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: I really think it would be wise if legislation of this kind were circulated to get the opinion of the trade and commerce. We are a new province of Canada. An Act like this may be all right in British Columbia or in Ontario but may not apply so easily here. I only throw out the suggestion. I have nothing against the Bill itself. We have not had much time to study it. I am

wondering if perhaps some of the legal members of our side of the House would like to speak on that.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, this is legislation that at first flush should make sense perhaps, but seven members of the House having looked at it, and I reduce that number to six—The Honourable Minister who introduced the Bill possible does know something about it. It is a matter of considerable importance to the trade. It is something which I feel deserves a little better than just a passing comment and a passing glance. I would venture to suggest to the Honourable Minister that perhaps he might agree to follow the same procedure as was followed by the Minister of Fisheries and Cooperatives and defer the debate on this until tomorrow or some other date. For instance in the House (or not in the House at the moment) are two of the great legal brains of the Government. The House is going to be deprived of the value of their opinion on it. I say quite frankly, and I speak for my colleague in St. John's West, we are certainly not in a position now to discuss the Bill intelligently. That situation may or may not improve over a passage of time.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, all I would point out is that at the moment we are not discussing the content of the Bill and the principle is simplicity itself, that is, that there should be some contract for conditional sale of goods and that the contract should be registered in order to protect the creditor and subsequent purchaser.

I have no objection to deferment, but I do not see why it should be.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—I wonder if the Min-

ister has given consideration to the question that this is a money Bill. It proposes to collect fees on the registration of these documents, which will be very considerable. On an agreement involving say ten thousand dollars it would be three dollars up to five dollars and twenty cents for every hundred dollars, which would be a tax which would be levied on every agreement. A tax would be collected. Is not that in the nature of a money Bill?

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order comes rather late, the motion has been made and discussion has been entered upon and the Minister concluded the debate. As I have not studied the Bill thoroughly I suggest that we be allowed to put the question that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole and the point might be decided there, and it might be treated as a money Bill if it turned out to be such.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting Bill of Sales and Chattel Mortgages:"

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this is a similar Bill with power to raise money by fees from persons concerned. I therefore ask if this is not a money Bill and if it should be introduced by way of resolutions—

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to speak to the Bill but to the point of order. I think that if it should be shown that there are sections in this Bill which provide for payment of fees I don't think that in itself would make it a money Bill. We can get over the difficulty in Committee by having these particular sections passed by way of resolutions. I think

that question came up last year— Obviously the object of this Bill is not to make money but rather it is to give a service to the people and charge a fee for the service.

MR. BROWNE: It will make a good bit of money.

MR. CURTIS: That may be but the object of the Bill is not to make money.

MR. HIGGINS: The money is to be merely incidental.

MR. CURTIS: There will be certain expenses in registering, and I don't think a fee or a payment of a fee makes it a money Bill—However, if my honourable friend insists on it, Mr. Speaker, and you would like to have the matter adjourned to give it consideration, I don't think there would be any objection from this side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not competent to rule on the point of order. I am totally unfamiliar with the subject matter of the Bill. Therefore, the matter will have to stand over until such time as I have studied it.

Second reading deferred.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Wills Act":

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the law governing wills is not always clear that is the law that applies when a testator is living in one jurisdiction and dies leaving property in another jurisdiction. This Bill provides (1) where a will deals with land the making of it is to be governed by the law of the place where it is situated, where the land is situated and (2) where a will deals with property other than land the making of it is to be governed by the law of the place where

the testator was domiciled when he died and (3) insofar as a will deals with property other than land it is valid and admissible to probate if it is made in accordance with the law in force when it was made in the place in which it was made, where the testator was domiciled and (4) that the change of domicile after a will is made does not invalidate it, that recourse may be made to the law of the place where the testator was domiciled when he made the will. Nothing in this part precludes resort to the law of the place where the testator was domiciled at the time of making a will in aid of its construction as regards either an interest in land or an interest in movables. When the value of a thing that is movable consists mainly or entirely in its use in connection with a particular parcel of land by the owner or occupier of the land, succession to an interest in the thing, under a will or on an intestacy, is governed by the law of the place where the land is situated.

This is another of those Bills, Mr. Speaker, designed to make the law of all the provinces uniform. I do not think it is contentious. But obviously if any of my learned friends or any member of the House would like to have an adjournment so as to consider it the Government will not object. Actually I think the Bill expresses the law as it is, but it is because the law is not clear that the Bill is brought in, so that it may be made clear.

I move second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the last remark which the Honourable the Attorney General made: "It is not any change in the law but it is not clear at the present time and this is to make it clearer." Well I defy the

Honourable the Attorney General to repeat what he read and make it intelligent. I don't think anybody listening to him although he read well, understood what he said. Last year I made a suggestion regarding Bills primarily of a legal nature. That suggestion was not accepted. I think Bills which refer primarily to legal matters should be referred to members of this House consisting of members of the legal profession.

MR. MURRAY: Then we will never get anywhere.

MR. BROWNE: I am surprised to hear a comment of that nature, an admission that lawyers would not agree. It is well known of course that lawyers must take opposite sides otherwise the cases would not be argued—Then the lawyers most eminent in their profession are appointed to the bench to decide—I feel quite sure, Mr. Speaker, if a Bill of this kind were referred to a Committee, a Bill which has to do with the amendment to existing law, small Bills which are brought in such as this, which are very difficult to take up in the House on second reading and also in Committee because the great majority of the members in the House, not being lawyers, have not the statutes available, are not familiar with the matter involved and take little interest in it.

Now this is a particularly difficult subject dealing with wills, dealing with the question of domicile of the testator. For instance, I noticed as the Attorney General was going through that one paragraph here in the Bill to which he referred, paragraph 23—I may say the purpose of the Bill is to add a new part to the Wills Act consisting of seven or eight sections but nevertheless something entirely new to this country. We never had any legislation of this kind here before.

"Nothing in this Part precludes resort to the law of the place where the testator was domiciled at the time of making a will in aid of its construction as regards either an interest in land or an interest in movables."

That is to say, if, for example the Premier or the Attorney General made his will while down in Jamaica the law of that country should be consulted in interpreting the will which the honourable gentleman made.

MR. CURTIS: I don't think so.

MR. BROWNE: And if in Germany or behind the Iron Curtain, God only knows what would happen—if there had been an accident to the Honourable the Premier when he was behind the Iron Curtain the law of Communism might have come into effect and all his property might have been confiscated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What property?

MR. BROWNE: All his assets.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What assets? Any assets to do with me are from here up. (Mr. Premier pointed to his head)

MR. BROWNE: It has been rumoured the honourable gentleman is the proprietor of a very expensive country estate to which he proceeds and travels in a very luxurious car sometimes accompanied by animals not entirely domesticated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman refers to my son-in-law's farm.

MR. BROWNE: I don't know if it is the son-in-law of the Premier who owns the farm to which I refer. It is certainly a beautiful estate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Has the honourable gentleman ever seen it? May I ask if he measured it?

MR. BROWNE: No, I estimated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He confines his measuring activities nearer the City.

MR. BROWNE: I do not know what the Honourable the Premier is referring to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe if I ask the honourable gentleman if he has bought any eggs lately and had them taken to the Federal inspector to have them examined.

MR. BROWNE: No—I don't know what the honourable gentleman is speaking of now.

"... and interest in land" includes a leasehold estate as well as a freehold estate in land and any other estate or interest in land whether the estate or the interest is real property or is personal property:

The various forms are all there. I don't want to go into them. But obviously that is very difficult to explain, and I feel sure that the Attorney General must agree with me that if the lawyers of this House were formed into a committee to sit down and study it they would be in a position to come back to the House and make recommendations to which I think the other members of the House would be satisfied to agree—and after all we don't have to all agree, but a majority of members on the Committee. Any odd number would be sufficient to enable this thing to be considered. I remember a case recently; there was a gentleman who belonged to this country who had gone to the United States and he was absent for twenty-five years, and died in the United States and left

some property in the United States. He also left some property to which he was entitled here in this country—property to which he was entitled by a will made nearly forty years before. This gentleman had gone away and left the property behind him. The executor was still alive, happily, and he had to go to see the Chief Justice regarding this, and this difficult point came up as to what law applied. He had personal property in the United States and Freehold property here, or an interest in it under a will. It was quite a complicated case.

MR. CURTIS: Would this legislation have been helpful to you?

MR. BROWN: I think we were helped by the law as it stands at the present time, by the law as it stands in England, which was followed. But I do not say it would not be a good thing to have, probably it is. I feel quite sure if it is being recommended by the Committee on Uniformity of Legislation that it probably is a good thing. But I do think that we ought to have a Committee of lawyers on matters of this kind—Now if that is not accepted, when we go into Committee—

MR. CURTIS: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is quite acceptable to the Government. With the consent of the House now I move that this Bill be referred to a select committee to consist of the legal members of the House and that the convenor would be the Solicitor General.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, are you expecting that committee to report before the 23rd?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the point.

MR. CURTIS: On that understanding.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not only on the understanding—Don't take the rest of their natural lives to report. Don't put in any bills for service. It has to be free and gratis, for nothing.

MR. HIGGINS: Just for the honour of the things like the Government directors.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know what the lawyers think they are any more than anyone else. This is the simplest thing in the world to me and it was thoroughly explained by the Honourable the Attorney General. I don't see anything wrong. The lawyers would scramble up the thing so we would have to pay a fee and that sort of thing.

MR. SPEAKER: If I might add, the honourable gentleman and the speaker preceding him are both out of order. It seems that although the legally-trained members of the House might find this Bill very simple they find it extremely difficult to grasp the order of procedure. The debate on that second reading has been concluded with the understanding now that a motion has been made by the Honourable the Attorney General to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. I am busily engaged wondering what to do with the original motion, that is, that the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that the debate had been adjourned, if it has been adjourned.

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should withdraw the motion for second reading before I make the second motion, or perhaps have someone else do so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the idea would be to give second reading, and after that instead of referring the Bill to a Committee of the Whole House refer it to a Select Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will be aware of the fact it is the first occasion we have had this and I am unprepared. However, I see here; amendment was moved to the second reading of the Bill, "that the Bill be now read a second time, but the subject matter thereof which is quite different from the principle of the Bill, be referred to a Board of Railway Commissioners" (Beauchesne, Page 499). A Bill cannot go to Committee until it has been read a second time.

MR. CURTIS: I think the House will be prepared to accept the second reading and have the motion for Committee afterwards.

Motion carried.

MR. CURTIS: I would move, Mr. Speaker, that the subject matter of this Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the legal members of the House, and that it be presided over by the Solicitor General, and that the House not go into Committee of the Whole until the report of that Committee be received.

Motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: And I would name the Solicitor General to be the Chairman of the Select Committee. Now this Bill cannot go to a Committee of the Whole until this report is received.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting Bulk Sales":

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, this

is a new piece of legislation as far as Newfoundland is concerned. Like the Conditional Sales Bill it is one which should be of considerable interest to the businessmen as well as those of the legal profession. The Bill is designed to prevent fraudulent disposition of property. It is designed to prevent a man selling out in whole or in part his business and skipping out of the country and that sort of thing.

"Sale in Bulk" means a sale out of the usual course of business or trade of the seller of stock or parts thereof; or substantially the entire stock of the seller; or of an interest in the business of the seller.

To prevent fraud in sales of this sort, if you wish, you will see the measures taken in Clause 5 of the Bill which says: "...shall demand of and receive from the seller, and a seller of stock in bulk shall furnish to the buyer a written statement in Form I verified by the affidavit of the seller or his authorized agent or, if the seller is a corporation, by the affidavit of an officer, director, manager, or authorized agent, of the corporation." If you turn to Form I, Mr. Speaker, you will see such a form set out, which such a seller must file and a statement showing the names and addresses of all his creditors.

The teeth of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, would be in Clause 11 which sets out: "Unless this Act is complied with, a sale in bulk shall be deemed to be fraudulent and void as against the creditors of the seller, and every payment made on account of the purchase price and every delivery of a note or other security thereof, and every transfer, conveyance and encumbrance of property by the buyer shall be deemed to be fraudulent and void as between

the buyer and the creditors of the seller, but if the buyer has received or taken possession of the stock in bulk, or any part thereof, he is personally liable to account to the creditors of the seller for the value thereof property realized or taken by him from, out of, or on account of, this sale or other disposition taken by him of the stock in bulk or any part thereof.

Although it is new to Newfoundland the Bill has been in force in many other provinces of Canada. This particular form has been drafted by the Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation or the business section of the Bar Association of Canada. I think the principle is a sound one, and I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, again I am quite prepared to agree with the Honourable Minister who introduced this Bill, that the principle may well be sound. But, as he says, it is something entirely new here. I think I speak with safety when I say that I doubt if the business community knows anything about this legislation. Certain it is that those of us on this side of the House have had no chance to look into it. It is a matter that might well, if the Minister is agreeable, stand over for a day or so.

MR. MURRAY: I would go further and follow the principle and withdraw the motion and have it read a second time and then referred to the Committee appointed for the other Bill.

Motion that Bill be now read a second time—carried.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, I move that the contents of this Bill be submitted to the Committee of the

legal members of the House, with myself as Chairman, of course, with all due modesty.

Motion that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee on miscellaneous Bills—Carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act further to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act":

Mr Courage, Chairman of Committees in the Chair.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I explained this Bill on second reading. The reason I am asking the House to go into Committee on it now is that it would be very desirable if we had it ready to receive the Royal Assent before the end of the month, and perhaps it might be just as well to get it out of the way.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 carried;

Clause 4 —

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I understood from the Attorney General that the Criminal Code now applies to this country or that it will on the 1st of April, the new Criminal Code coming into effect, and that the provision as it appears under the Evidence Act appears in the Criminal Code—A witness in any proceedings is compelled to answer any questions. My reason for raising this is because under the Evidence Act of Newfoundland we have a provision here contrary to that—Nothing here contained may render any person compelled to give evidence himself or herself nor shall in any such criminal proceeding render any husband compelled to give evidence for or against his wife or any wife compelled to give evidence for or against her husband—Now is that provision protected or is it the intention of the Government to alter that?

MR. CURTIS: I think the effect of this amendment is to alter that— My honourable friend was quoting from The Evidence Act, Chapter 120.

MR. BROWNE: This is the Summary Jurisdiction Act, Mr. Chairman, and it is quite possible to change the Evidence Act, which is the Act which governs the evidence in summary jurisdiction cases.

MR. CURTIS: It would seem the point raised by my honourable friend is correct, and that section should be repealed or certainly I think the matter should receive further consideration. I think, Mr. Chairman, we might rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, and meantime I will examine the situation as regard that Act, and perhaps the other honourable members would like to do the same thing.

On motion Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again. Ordered sit again tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 p.m. On Monday we will proceed with the debate on the Address in Reply. I hope my honourable friends opposite will be ready to proceed at that time.

On motion the House then adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, March 28, at 3:30 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 28, 1955

AFTERNOON SESSION

The House met at 3:00 of the clock

in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Presenting Petitions

MR. S. DROVER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Raleigh, Carpon Cove, Noddy Bay and St. Anthony Bight. These people are petitioning that the hospital at St. Anthony be placed under the cottage hospital plan, similar to that now in force in most areas of the Province of Newfoundland, where the head of the family pays usually fifteen dollars a year, which covers the entire family.

I would like to say that two years ago a similar petition asked for similar cheaper hospital rates for the people of White Bay and was presented by me. That petition contained almost two thousand signatures. Most of the people of these settlements are fishermen and labourers. These people are in a low income group. I have much pleasure in presenting this petition, give it my support, and ask leave that it be tabled in the House and passed to the department concerned.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees.

HON. F. W. ROWE: (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask permission of the House to table the report of the Royal Commission on Forestry. Because this report has such an important relationship to our whole economy I feel sure the House would wish me to give some background of it so that, if as the Honourable the Premier has said a few days ago, permission will be sought to have this report debated, there will be some background to go on.

Two years ago the Government faced up to this matter of Forestry. There were some things that were self-evident (1) that the forestry operations of Newfoundland were by far the most important single aspect of our whole economy. We knew that tremendous amounts of money were going into the homes of people through this operation; we knew that tens of thousands were dependent upon the forest for their supplies of fuel and for other domestic necessities; we knew that something like fourteen hundred sawmills, big and small, either in whole or in part supported several thousand families. But after these several noticeable things there were all question marks. Were we over using our forestry resources? Were our paper companies assured of adequate supplies for a continuous operation? Were we making the best possible use of the forestry resources that were available to us? One big question was; what dangers threatened, were our losses from forest fires excessive? What was the situation respecting diseases, infestations about which the Government had heard from certain quarters, and some rather alarming reports? What was the Government's position vis-a-vis revenue? Was the province as a whole deriving the revenue from the forestry operations that we should be deriving? What were the implications of the three-mile-limit? Was that still necessary? Was the enforcement of that policy of a three-mile-limit still necessary or was that three-mile-limit policy actually an impediment to the welfare of the people generally? How should the wood on the Labrador be integrated with the wood on the Island of Newfoundland? Finally the all important question—Did we have the resources to warrant expanding our

forestry operations and particularly did we have the resources to warrant the establishment of a third paper mill in Newfoundland?

In view of these questions and many others, the Government decided to set up a Royal Commission composed, in as far as possible of leading authorities in the field. In doing so the government determined that one member of that commission should be a Newfoundlander, and if at all possible one who had had a long experience in the forestry field and who had the respect of the whole community.

Another decision was that the outside members, these members that came from outside the Province, should be recognized as world authorities in the field of forestry. Still another important decision was that rather than push ahead (I am speaking of two years ago) it was decided to wait if necessary even for a year (and that was exactly what was done) in order to obtain persons whom the government considered to be most competent to fill these important posts. Accordingly, just over a year ago the Royal Commission was set up by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor consisting of Mr. Roland Goodyear, who had been, as I am sure all members of the House would know, intimately connected with forests for over half a century, and with forestry operations in Newfoundland. I doubt that there has been one important forestry operation since the year 1900 with which the Firm of Goodyear & Sons, of which Mr. J. Goodyear was president, has not been connected. He has personally conducted logging operations at Notre Dame Bay and Bay of Islands and literally throughout the Province. There was probably not one square mile of territory in the whole island of Newfoundland that Mr. Goodyear

was not personally familiar with. Moreover he has had a long interest in the whole field of forestry. He has even made a personal investigation of conservation measures in Europe.

The second member of the commission was Dr. R. Cameron, O.B.E., B.A., B.Sc. When the Dominion Government first set up the first Dominion Forestry Commission it selected him for that post, and he held that post for twelve years. He subsequently became commissioner of the timber division of the United Nations Timber Economy Division for Europe and of the Food and Agricultural Operation so well known here. Still later he became chief technical officer of forestry for "UNO" with headquarters at Rome, where he spent four years. Dr. Cameron was forestry advisor to the Government of Austria, England, Yugoslavia and Israel. His interest in, and experience in the field of forestry is probably greater than that of any other living person. It will be of interest to know, Dr. Cameron's brother is also a well-known scholar and scientist, well known to Newfoundland. Dr. Allan Cameron of Nova Scotia Technical College at which institution more Newfoundlanders graduate than at any other.

Then as Chairman the government appointed Major General Howard Kennedy, C.B.E., M.C., B.Sc., M.E.I.C. He was a captain in the First World war, was wounded and was awarded the Military Cross. He afterwards worked with the E. B. Eddy Company of Canada as manager of the woods department and later became manager of Quebec Forestry Industrial Association. During the Second World War General Kennedy was in command of the 1st Division of Royal Engineers and later was Quartermaster General of

the Canadian Army. During the Second World War he was made a "Commander of the British Empire". In 1944 he became president of the Ontario Paper and Power Company and Quebec North Shore Paper Company, two of the best companies in the world, probably. In 1946 he was made a one man Royal Commission to report on the forests of Ontario. In 1947 he became chairman of the East Rocky Forestry Board, an organization primarily concerned with forestry resources of the Rocky Mountains, eastern area. In 1950 he became chairman of the United Nations Forestry Division and in 1952 he was selected by the Prime Minister of Canada as the Federal District Commissioner. That is the Commission which reported for the long term expansion for the Capital City of Ottawa. In 1953 he was on the board of commission into the Reserve Army of Canada.

General Kennedy, whom I regret is not here because of commitments down in the United States, I happen to know is an advisor to four provincial premiers on forestry matters as well as to several states of the United States of America. When that commission was set up four years ago it was given very wide terms of reference, and its activities were not hamstrung or fettered in any way whatsoever. The commission had a free hand in making use of technicians in many fields of inquiry. Amongst those I will mention just a few, Mr. J. A. Brodie who is considered Canada's outstanding specialist in the field of forestry control; Mr. H. J. Henry who is an outstanding specialist in interpreting aerial photographs.

Now I may say the commission made a tremendous amount of use of aerial photographs in both Newfoundland and Labrador. Professor Goundrey

who served as economic adviser to the Ontario Commission is now Professor of Economics at our own university.

There is not any place here, nor have I any intention of attempting to summarize the findings of the Royal Commission, I would be failing in my duty, in presenting this report and in attempting to give the background if I did not stress the paramount importance to our economy of this report. Very authoritative figures are given which show that out of any hundred dollars earned in Newfoundland less than \$8.00 are derived from defense and construction activities on our bases. From our fisheries there is just less than \$10 out of every \$100 and from our mining operations just over \$12 out of every \$100 but from our forestry operations, including paper making, almost \$32 out of every \$100, making it by far the dominant feature of our economy today. From this standpoint alone it seems obvious the contents of this report may well affect the destinies, in fact the very bread and butter, of the great majority of the Newfoundlanders. I make no apologies therefore, sir, for saying that every person who makes a pretense of being interested in our economy, our economic welfare, should read this report from cover to cover.

I think perhaps the government is not permitted to implement any or all, at any one time nor in the future any part of this report. Common sense would dictate their energies and powers in the years to come and will be guided by what this report has to say. Some of the recommendations in it are of a long term nature, for example, the commission makes recommendations which in its opinion should come into effect in 1960, and other recommendations which should not come into effect for the next thirty-five years.

The implication here is obvious. This report will, I am sure, be the blueprint for the government for the next fifty years.

I was interested to learn only today that the government of Ontario this year has issued a white paper announcing its intention of implementing certain aspects of the Royal Commission Report made by General Kennedy in 1947, eight years ago. Every Recommendation in this report, in our opinion, has to be viewed in relation to the whole report. The greatest dis-service that any person could do would be to take out extracts and short quotations and put them out of context. It must be emphasized here sir, some of the matter in this report, some of the things mentioned here, depend on the very life of our two greatest enterprises the Bowaters and the Anglo Newfoundland Company mills at Corner Brook and Grand Falls.

These are enterprises which by and large have adopted an enlightened attitude in their approach to the matters affecting the welfare of Newfoundland. Any irresponsible statements based on extracts pulled out of context in this report that would adversely affect the prestige or standing of those two companies would deserve the condemnation of this whole House.

Mr Speaker, serious matters are discussed here, matters dealing with diseases, for example, diseases in our forests; matters dealing with over-maturity of wood, that is wood dying because it has not been used. There is material here for scare headlines which could conceivably raise unnecessary fears amongst our people and perhaps in the investment world. I think that all who deal with this report — although it is not my business perhaps to lecture the newspapers or the radio on their duties—but I do express the

hope, sir, that all who handle this report will give it the necessary dignity and handle it with a sense of responsibility.

The Commission, in studying some aspects of forestry, was forced to work without adequate data. That is an indictment of us. In the past we did not have the data that we should have had collected, that other governments had been collecting perhaps over the last hundred years. We just did not have that data, and of course, as a government, could not collect it in a year or two, I mention that now because there are certain recommendations here that the Commission feel should be confirmed by an independent inventory, a detailed inventory of certain aspects of forests in Newfoundland and Labrador. The Commission has recommended here what we might call a hundred per cent use of all our forest resources.—No such utilization exists today. I don't mean to labour this point, but there are large areas in Newfoundland from which no wood has ever been extracted. There are other areas where the wood is not allowed to grow to even semi-maturity before being destroyed. The Commission has made this recommendation for one hundred per cent utilization, for full utilization of all our resources as to the Island of Newfoundland, knowing that if there were any over-estimation we do have as a province the forestry reserves of Southern Labrador which can be utilized economically to supplement operations in the Island of Newfoundland. We have a great reserve of timber on St. Lewis, Alexis River, Hawkes River, and the rivers of Sandwich Bay. These, of course, are independent of the timber reserves of Lake Melville.

If I were asked to summarize this report in one sentence it would be

that the Royal Commission has recommended a packaged deal. No one recommendation here can stand in isolation, it has to be tied in with the others. This may well mean, Sir, and perhaps this is the time to say it, that we will have to re-orientate our whole thinking especially in such traditional-laden matters and aspects of our economy and way of life as our land reserves on the three-mile limit of the indiscriminate cutting that goes on on some of the Crown reserves and on the three-mile limit itself. I use the word "indiscriminate" because I don't think this nor any other government would recommend abolishing the traditional right of our people to secure for themselves, free, of course, and without any form of taxation or royalty whatsoever, all the wood they need for fuel and other domestic purposes. Nevertheless, indiscriminate cutting is something that, if the recommendations of this report are respected, will have to go.

The overall recommendations of this report envisage what we might call a pooling of our forestry resources to the end that both paper companies will obtain supplies from the logical areas, and to the still more important end that by utilizing the logical areas and by pooling our resources we may develop a third paper mill in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, if the pages would obtain the report from the office I would ask permission to table it.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to offer a word of congratulation to the government on bringing along this report and also to congratulate the honourable minister who presented it in a very fine fashion. We have not seen it of course, and we

dare not make any comment. I do hope that the implementation of this report will add to the prosperity of this country.

I was for seven years a magistrate in Grand Falls area, and I know well the prosperity which the woods have brought to Central Newfoundland as also they have done on the West Coast, I sincerely hope that the recommendations found in this report will bring forth what has been called already, the third paper mill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Giving Notices of Motion

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a Bill, "An Act for the Redistribution of Seats of the House of Assembly".

Giving Notice of Questions

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

- (1) List the various brands of alcoholic beverages including beers purchased for the Board of Liquor Control between the dates February 28th, 1954 and March 31st, 1955.
- (2) Give the names of the firms or individuals from whom these beverages were bought, the names of the local agents for each brand, and the quantities purchased.

- (3) Give the total amount of moneys paid for the purchase of alcoholic liquors, and the total amount realized by the sale of liquors since February 28th, 1954.

(4) Give the location of all licensed Beer Parlours, Hotels, Taverns, and Tourist Hotels in Newfoundland, together with the names of proprietors. Have any such licenses been revoked since Feb. 28th 1954, and if so, for what causes?

(19) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply to lay on the table of the House the following information:—

(1) Were tenders called for the purchase of provisions since March 31st, 1954, for the following institutions: General Hospital, Fever Hospital, the Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases, St. John's Sanatorium, West Coast Sanatorium, the Gander Hospital, and all other Hospitals, Cottage Hospitals and Nursing Stations under the government supervision? If not, why not, and were the lowest tenders accepted in all cases?

(2) What firms or individuals supplied the following items to the various institutions above mentioned and to the Penitentiary, and what were the prices paid in each instance: Eggs, Ham, Bacon, Beef, Pork, Bread, Butter, Fish (Salt and Fresh or Frozen) and Fowl? Also Drugs and Dressings?

(20) To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:—

- (1) Copies of all agreements presently existing between Canadian Javelin Ltd, and (a) the Government, (b) NALCO.

- (2) Have any moneys either by way of loans or guarantees been made available by the government to Canadian Javelin Ltd., or to any of the subsidiaries or associates? Have any such been made available by NALCO?
- (3) Table copies of reports to the Government by NALCO and BRINCO of their activities the past year.
- (21) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries or other appropriate Officer to lay on the table of the House the following information:—
- (1) The total amount of moneys paid to the Newfoundland Fisheries Authority to date to cover cost of salaries, wages, and travelling expenses for all personnel of the Authority? Give the names of persons and amount paid each under these several headings.
- (2) How much has been paid out for the Technical Services and salaries and expenses under this item. And how much for Sundry Expenses?
- (3) What amounts have been paid out under the following headings in the Authority's grant: Fishing Demonstrations; General Engineering; Commercial Pilot Plants; any other heading?
- (4) How much money has been actually spent under Fisheries Development by the Authority at the following places: Quirpon; LaScie; Seldom; Valleyfield; Badger's Quay; St. John's; Merashcen; Change Islands; Joc Batts Arm; Twillingate; Catalina; Trepassey and any other fishing settlements? Give the details as to what work has been accomplished in these places.
- (5) How much money is involved in acquiring the premises at Twillingate formerly owned or operated by Ashbourne's Ltd.? What was the purchase price and what does the property consist of?

Answers to Questions

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 14, Order Paper of Friday, March 25th, which I now table.

Cost of Commission to 28/3/55 is \$68,362.62 made up as follows:

(a) Salaries:		
(i) Hon. P. J. Lewis	\$14,290.32	
(ii) Mr. C. D. Hunt	7,000.00	
(iii) Miss B. Galway	1,884.67	
(iv) Miss A. Lewis	1,667.74	
(v) Mr. Jno. Crosbie	760.83	
(vi) Mr. Carl Goldenberg & Associates.....	17,137.50	
		\$42,741.06
(b) Travelling Expenses		5,418.57
(c) Other Expenses:		
Peat, Marwick, Mitchell Ltd.	\$20,086.26	
Miscellaneous	116.73	
		20,202.99
TOTAL		\$68,362.62

Question No. 17—Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Before entering on the Orders of the Day, an announcement was made, I think on opening day, that special folders would be provided for the use of the members, to hold their copies of bills. These folders are now available. And request for them may be made at the Clerk's Office after the House recesses.

Orders of the Day

Address in Reply

MR. BROWNE: The honour of commencing this debate on the Address in reply has fallen to my lot once again. Whilst it is an honour I feel that the responsibility is greater than ever. In view of the small number of the Opposition Party the burden which falls upon the shoulders of those of us who are here is necessarily very great, and perhaps beyond our powers, this year especially, because on opening day of this session the Premier made a statement laying out the time table that he wishes this House to follow. I took down a note of what he said. He said that the Federal-Provincial Conference may commence on the 26th of April and he intended to go there and bring a number of his colleagues and it was his ambition to conclude the business of the House and prorogue by the 24th, of April, which I believe, is a Sunday. In a later session the Premier stated that his goal was the 22nd of April, which gives us nineteen working days to do the business of this House, so that the Premier and some of his colleagues can go to the Federal-Provincial Conference that might last a week or two. What is the matter with the Premier adjourning the House while he is gone on the Federal-Provincial Conference, and come back and tell us what happened at the Federal-Provincial Con-

ference? I believe behind the Premier's action, suggestion or ambition or whatever he chooses to call it, is something a little more sinister than that. The Premier has something else in mind, and I don't think there is any doubt this year as to what he has in his mind, and that is an election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that sinister?

MR. BROWNE: It is sinister in that the Premier is going to do everything he can, and things that he should not do, as I will show, to try and have an election, and one thing is to stifle criticism. How best can you stifle criticism except by closing the House of Assembly so that the Opposition won't have the time to give attention to the very important matters that are before the House at the time. He should remember, if he wants his government to get a good reputation, that it can only be as good as the Opposition. If the Opposition is weak the government is going to be bad. A strong Opposition always has a beneficial effect upon the conduct of the government.

I would like, sir, at this juncture to conform with the old custom of congratulating the mover and second-er of the address in reply. I grant you neither one of them is here, although interested in this debate, I will grant they are not here to hear some of the comments which I have to make on what they had to say. The honourable Member for Port De Grave who had the privilege this year of moving this motion was at one time a candidate for our party, defeated of course like some of the others, but nevertheless stood as a member of our party. We were associated professionally at one time in prosecuting the Premier I do not know if he has changed his opinion of the Premier, nevertheless

he is on the other side of the House when he should really be over here. If he were on this side of the House he would have had something to talk about. I think that material that is at his disposal, delivered as he would deliver it, would be far more effective than the material he had the other day.

I wish also we had the other member, the member for Placentia West, on this side of the House because I think he too, even though given such short notice to comply with the wish of the Premier to second the motion, would have had a lot more to say on this side of the House, and could have done it without very much preparation.

The Speech from the Throne itself, Mr. Speaker, like last year's Speech from the Throne, gave very little indication of the mass of legislation which was introduced immediately following it, when twenty-five Bills were read off. This afternoon also the Premier introduced the Bill which he introduced at the end of the session last year, to Amend the Act dealing with the composition of the House of Assembly. So we are going to have a very busy session crowded into eighteen or nineteen days, and when the Premier feels it is desirable we will be brought here morning, afternoon and night so that we can get through the time schedule in accordance with his desires.

Now, sir, we were here three months last year, and I do not think that even then we gave proper attention to a lot of the matters that were before the House. How are we going to be able to do it this year in the short time at our disposal. In my opinion it cannot be done properly.

The honourable gentleman who

moved this motion, the honourable member for Port de Grave, said that the Speech from the Throne this year was the most important, but one, in the history of the last hundred years, the most important one being the one which was delivered at the opening of the 1st Assembly in 1855 at the commencement of the era of Responsible Government. Then he said that the Government said of the poverty—One of the things he mentioned was poverty. Well, I took him at his word at the time, and I thought I would check. I looked up Prowse, and Prowse so stated that the three years following the introduction of Responsible Government 1855, 1856 and 1857 were known as the years of plenty, because the prosperity at that particular time was greater than it had been for many years. I don't think that the honourable member could point to the prosperity in this particular year, although I remember the Honourable Minister of Finance last year telling us of his expected income for the year that was going into the pockets of our people. One of the things which he said was that we were going to get more unemployment insurance—That was certainly a prediction in which the honourable minister was right. We are getting more unemployment insurance this year than ever we got. He thought that was a pretty sound thing, because he said, "the more men working now the more unemployment insurance they will be getting later". How any man can look upon it as a matter of prosperity of the country when twenty-one thousand people are unemployed is more than I can fathom.

The honourable member spoke about the good things that the government is going to do. The government it seems is always going to do

good things and never seems to be doing them.

When the honourable the Premier rose to speak afterwards he chided the Honourable Leader of the Opposition with what he thought was too paltry a speech to be made in this great year when we are celebrating the centenary of Responsible Government. He said that the centenary should have inspired the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to make an astringent and comprehensive speech, and he sort of deprecated the idea of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition not being impressed with the tremendous things that were going on in the Caribbean. Now the Premier has a great advantage over the most of us because he and some of his colleagues too have been privileged to visit the Island of Jamaica in the Caribbean on several occasions. The Premier tells us that although he is only a poor man, up to his ears in debt, he is able to go and spend two weeks holidaying on two occasions in the Caribbean.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman, I am sure, does not want consistently to misrepresent me. When did I say, "I was up to my ears in debt".

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the other day when we were discussing a Bill about wills I drew to the attention of the Premier the fact that if he should have died when behind the "Iron Curtain" all his assets might have been confiscated by the Communists. He answered; "I have not got anything, if I die every thing dies with me. Remember now? Well if the honourable the Premier has not got any money at all where does he get the money to travel in such state?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honour-

able gentleman, I am sure, does not want to misrepresent me. I am sure he does not. Would he mind quoting for me where I said what he just said I said, would he mind telling where I said I was up to my ears in debt?

MR. BROWNE: You used the expression, up to your ears.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said my assets are from here up.

MR. BROWNE: Well then I presume—

MR. SMALLWOOD: That does not mean "up to my ears in debt."

MR. BROWNE: I presume what my honourable friend meant was that his assets consisted in the fertile brain from which we have seen so many wonderful things.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, what about "up to my ears in debt".

MR. BROWNE: I take my honourable friend's word that he did not say that. I am sorry I misquoted him— We were probably talking at the same time. But the honourable gentleman told us that he liked going to Jamaica. He spoke of the tremendous industrial development taking place there, two hundred industries. I wonder if he went down there to see how they were managing their economic affairs because they seem to be doing so much better with the industries down there than the industries he established here himself. He spoke about his coloured friend, Mr. Littmore, who came from England to inaugurate a new scheme with the Jamaican Government which it wished to put into effect. He told us about the movement for the Federation of the West Indies. When he was describing it the other day it sounded as though it were to come into effect any day. So I looked

up the Journals of Parliaments of the Empire and looked through the proceedings for Bermuda, the Bahamas and Jamaica etc. and saw no reference whatsoever to it. So I do not think it is likely to come into effect at an early date, as he gave us the impression the other day. Then the Premier told us about being down there two weeks in January of this year and of observing something of great importance to the fish exporters of this country, so that when he came back he informed them what he had seen. So back he goes again and brings them all down with him, a half dozen gentlemen. He told us about the great merchants of Newfoundland, greater than the merchants of Canada. You know our merchants have been dealing with Spain, Portugal, the West Indies for hundreds of years, and are greater merchants than the merchants of Canada. Does the honourable gentleman remember—I know he has a very good memory—does he remember his speech last year about the merchants when he talked about the merchants selling waffle irons and selling cans of beans, and that the merchants were lounge lizards. One of his colleagues equalled him and said the merchants were slouching in the lounges. Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman, I am glad to see, seems to have revised his opinions about the merchants of Newfoundland. It seems now that they do have some qualities which he had overlooked previously. But of course he is not consistent, he was not consistent then. I believe he believes that consistency is the virtue of fools, and changes his opinion when it suits him.

My honourable friend, the member for Placentia West, in his brief speech compared this country's economy with that of Canada and the United States,

and said that we were backward in comparison with Canada and the United States. Of course we have been backward in comparison with Canada and the United States—of course we have been backward—some parts of this country have been backward in comparison to some parts of Canada and the United States, and the average standard of living in this country is below the average in Canada and the United States. I don't know. I cannot say that—But the honourable gentleman was referring to 1932. Indeed that year this country and Canada and the United States were all undergoing a very serious depression which started in 1929, and from which none of those countries recovered until the war started, after 1939. Different places have different characteristics and in Canada, particularly its central provinces are, gifted with tremendous areas of agricultural land, which is the foundation of their prosperity. In addition to that they have great mines of precious metals, they have the greatest waterpowers in the world. Therefore they have centralized in Canada large industries, and it is only reasonable to think they would have a higher standard of living than other parts of Canada which are not so well endowed by nature. But since the war, since the introduction of schemes for social welfare services from the cradle to the grave, all places have improved; That is a world wide thing which goes on in all the countries of the world where the social services have been distributed. It is not necessarily a sound scheme that the government should interject itself so much into the lives of the people; that it should control so much of their economy as it does. But the government has intervened to bring about a better distribution of wealth. At the present time

through the various social welfare schemes, old age pensions, family allowances, unemployment insurance, there is a better distribution of wealth and there is less hardship.

Now my honourable friends on the other side have told us about a committee that is being appointed to revise the terms of union I understood that they were going to act free of charge, but I notice in an answer tabled here that the Honourable P. J. Lewis received fourteen thousand and Mr. D. C. Hunt, Secretary, seven thousand and small amounts to two or three other people; and Mr. Goldenberg, seventeen thousand and Peat, Marwick and Mitchell Ltd. auditors, twenty thousand dollars. Well, naturally men who give their services, unless they are like the honourable member for Green Bay who can afford to act as a director on several large corporations free, expect remuneration for those services. I have no idea how much time these gentlemen to whom I refer, especially the honourable member for Harbour Main, put in on this. I don't know what arrangement was made. Perhaps we will learn later. But the fact is; he at least as a member of that commission has received this money.

The one thing which seems to me should be considered by this committee is the question of the railway. If there is one thing obvious in the difference in service given to this country in comparison with the other provinces of Canada it is our railway services. We still have a narrow-gauge railway. Nova Scotia went into Confederation on the promise of a special railway being built to serve Nova Scotia. Since Prince Edward Island went in, a wide-gauge railway was substituted for the narrow gauge which they had on Prince Edward Island—that took place

in 1916—I remember looking into the matter a couple of years ago in Ottawa, and bringing the matter up. At that time Donald Gordon gave the answer that it would cost a hundred million dollars to put a wide-gauge railway across the island—So what?—I think we are entitled to that. I think we are entitled to a wide-gauge railway, and I think the Chairman of the Committee should keep that in the forefront of his agenda as one of the things that we require. As regard to the difficulty of changing over from a narrow-gauge to a wide-gauge railway I remember that in Prince Edward Island they changed over a hundred miles in one day by putting down what they called a third rail, putting in extra long sleepers and then putting down a third rail. In this way they were able to convert a hundred miles in one day from narrow-gauge to wide-gauge.

Another thing it seems to me, in which we should get consideration in this year of Our Lord 1955 when so much money has been spent for defence purposes, it seems to me that one essential service connected with defence of Canada should be a road across this country. Therefore I think that consideration should be given to that by the committee. The Government of Canada will certainly use any road for its lorries and its military vehicles. If it is built the basic should contribute a much greater part of the cost from that department than we are receiving from the department of Public Works.

In reference to the Municipal Government Program of the Government—This was instituted by the Commission of Government and it has been carried on very well during the past few years. It is certainly a very desirable thing. It was an inevitable re-

sult of Confederation because of having a Federal Government at Ottawa collecting so much in money and taxes it was inevitable local municipalities would have to be formed. As a matter of fact I remember advocating this back over twenty years ago, and introduced a Bill of which I forget the title—it became law—for setting up municipalities. That was in 1932 or 1933. It is obvious if we want men to sit in this House of Assembly and to understand the business of the House and to be able to debate legislation regarding the welfare of the country it is desirable they should be shown through service in their own town and community councils where they should get experience to help them to take positions in the House of Assembly.

Lord Durham, over a hundred years ago when he made his report on self-government in Canada, said that the French Canadians had introduced the business of government in exactly the wrong end, and men who had no experience in running affairs of a parish were intrusted with the destinies of a state.

At this stage I would like to congratulate the people of Corner Brook and Humbermouth and Curling and the other places in that neighbourhood who decided to amalgamate and become a city. I certainly wish they will be prosperous while it lasts and that it will last forever.

Also I should like to say; nearer St. John's a new municipality has been established in Mt. Pearl Park, Glendale. I trust, although they have many difficulties to contend with, that these who have been elected to serve on the council for the community will give their best services, and that they will

be successful in the performance of the duties devolved upon them.

Now, sir, the next item in the Speech from the Throne refers to housing. In some respects the government has done well with regard to Housing. One matter in which they have done especially well, it seems to me, is in regard to co-operative housing. That is a subject in which I have been especially interested since I first saw the co-operative housing project in Cape Breton as initiated by the Late Dr. Thompson. I saw it work down there, and saw what they were doing, and I advocated it. If Mr Pen-son had not been so hard-hearted a man—some honourable members here might know we would have introduced co-operative housing back in 1937, because we had a very sound scheme then. We had cheap land at the time, at four hundred dollars an acre for cleared land, and the Commission of Government gave the people credit for the work put in on their homes. Yet I think the government must be very careful, even though it is a co-operative movement, in the matter of the management of the funds. In that respect it is easy to get entangled. It is not because it is co-operative that it is going to be soundly carried out. The minister himself knows that some co-operative societies got into difficulties through neglect of their rules etc. But last year, apart from the co-operative work, there was no housing programme of the government at all. They skipped last year. We are going to have a housing programme this year, we are told. Why not last year? Was it that the need for the new houses was less? On the contrary the need was greater. Since the rent control was established, there is not the same incentive for private contractors to build homes as there formerly

was, because they cannot rent. They build now to sell but they do not build to rent any more. So the government must step in and assist people to get homes whether by rent or by purchase. There are hundreds of people, I believe the number on the list with the Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply is something in the neighbourhood of a thousand who have their names down looking for homes.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne referred to our Tourist Programme and the Tourist Development Loan Board, and these speakers also made reference to this subject. Now, sir, we don't seem to know where we are in regard to tourists. The Tourist Director tells us we are not ready for it. The Minister of Public Works tells us the road is not ready. Why all the hullabaloo about bringing in tourists we are not ready for. It would be, I believe unfortunate if thousands of tourists should embark on the steamer across the Gulf next summer and come over in motor cars and get off at Port aux Basques and get on the muddy dirt roads and get a bad impression and go back again. Mr. Speaker, the "Evening Telegram" of March 14 said: "If I were the Tourist Director I would not attempt to bring in tourists this year". Mr. Vardy is recorded as having said, "Such is the policy of the Tourist Board". He said; "Another engine going wrong, (referring to the trial run of the William Carson) might help the situation a good deal". That is the situation, the Tourist Director himself expressed a wish that another engine might go wrong so that no tourists would come here. I think that it is pretty serious. Does it not look as if the government has fallen down on the programme of building roads? The Minister of

Public Works complains about the Trans-Canada Highway standards that are too exact and interfere with the construction of roads. We could save \$40,000 a mile if we built to our own standard and have a road capable of carrying traffic for the next twenty-five years. He said, Well, why does he not get that? Why does not the government use its influence to get a road to suit the traffic for the next twenty-five years? We certainly do need roads in this country. The road outside St. John's, around Conception Bay is now on Sundays almost a continuous procession, and I believe there was a great traffic block somewhere around the route yesterday, the greatest seen for years. It is going to cost a lot of money to build that road at the prices that the honourable minister of Public Works mentioned, a hundred and thirty thousand dollars a mile and another twenty-five thousand dollars to pave, i.e. \$155,000 a mile easily. Figure out five hundred miles at \$155,000 a mile, nearly ninety million dollars and I expect the government will have gotten to the end of its credit by the time the road is built at that rate.

In regard to tourists coming across in the steamer to Port aux Basques, they land at a place which is quite close to the famous fishing rivers of the West Coast. I am inclined to think the majority of the people who come are not prepared to fish. There is no place in the maritimes that I know of where people would go along in cars like that and start fishing like we do in this country. The people who come over to fish generally come prepared and will come anyway. They don't need any road. But if it is the idea that people are going to fill cars and get rods and lines and come and fish at the first river they come to there

won't be very many salmon, and the salmon fishery will be a thing of the past. As a matter of fact salmon fishing as a sport is dying out in Newfoundland. There are still inaccessible rivers where salmon fishing is good, but any places that are accessible and these on the West Coast, certainly must be protected or they won't be good for long.

The Speech from the Throne then referred to national historic sites, and referred to Signal Hill. Well, that has not been a new idea. That has been on the carpet for a long time. I don't think there is any question but that everybody would agree that it should be regarded as a national historic site.

Then we come to the question of Sir Richard Squires Memorial Park. The Speech from the Throne seemed to indicate that is already a monument—my colleagues and myself did not see any reference to it—"An announcement has already been made of a plan to create a Sir Richard Squires Memorial Park in the area of Big Falls, on the Upper Humber River."

Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue my speech, but I think it is very disturbing when members are going to engage in conversations in that fashion—I will go ahead however.

I know the admiration of the honourable the Premier for the Late Sir Richard Squires. I don't know whether it was mutual. I do know that the Honourable the Premier models his life on that of the late Sir Richard Squires. Yesterday on the radio, whether it was inspired by the Premier or not I do not know, a record which the late Sir Richard Squires made prior to the 1929 election was played over twice. Now, sir, I would suggest to the Premier as gently as I can, it

is not a good thing for us to fight the battles of long ago over again. If the Premier wishes to do so, and it seems so because he has so many references to what Liberal Governments have done in the past, I am not sure that I shall be able to refrain from making some references to the misconduct of the various Liberal Governments and the misconduct of various leaders of Liberal Governments in the past. I was a candidate for Sir Richard Squires in 1923. I think I am as familiar as anybody else in this House with the achievements of the Liberal Governments and the mistakes they made. But if the Premier insists on rattling dead men's bones he will have to put up with the consequences.

He made reference also to the third paper mill we are going to have. The Liberal Government of Sir Robert Bond brought a paper mill in in 1905, and the Liberal Government of 1923 brought a paper mill in on the Humber and now the Liberal Government of the present day is going to bring in a third paper mill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear! Always the Liberal Government.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, conditions change, and the conditions are entirely different, and have been misrepresented by the Premier in so far as the third mill. As far as the mill of 1923 was concerned, and I have here the Act of 1923, I don't think I need make much reference to it except to point out that in 1915 a contract was made by the Tory Government, if he wishes, by the Government of Sir Edward Morris in which Sir Richard Squires was then Minister of Justice, a contract was then made with a man by the name of "Wilson Caribde" who unfortunately met his death in a tragic accident. If he had lived

we might have had a great aluminum industry established in this country. But he died and war intervened. After the war the government of the day took up the threads and with the natural resources possessed by the Newfoundland Company, a new company called "The Newfoundland Power and Paper Company" was formed. With the assistance of the British Government who guaranteed two million pounds of a debenture, and with a lot of other private investors, got together sufficient money to start that industry. I don't think from anything the Premier has stated to date there is any comparison between that industry started in 1923 and his own.

Now the honourable member for Port de Grave spoke of private enterprise: I think he spoke of the government encouraging private enterprise. Well, we know what happened to the White Clothing Company. That was private enterprise and it went to the wall.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order—I don't think the White Clothing Factory went to the wall. I understand it paid its investment many times over.

MR. BROWNE: The Newfoundland Clothing Company is out of business and the people who worked there, cutters, tailors and trimmers are today working as clerks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are working in another factory.

MR. BROWNE: The White Clothing Factory is an office building and the clothing factory down there is idle. Was that encouraging private enterprise? Who is being encouraged? Were they encouraged, or were they encouraged to get out of business? Certainly a government which initi-

ated so much socialistic enterprise and put so much government funds into other industries could hardly be boasting about the encouragement that it has given to private enterprise.

The Speech from the Throne referred to Fisheries Development. But we have not got very much to go on in that respect at the present time. We must patiently wait and see how this great experiment is going to get on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is at least a fair statement.

MR. BROWNE: Except for this; the recommendations of the Newfoundland Fishery Development Committee are not being carried out. The honourable the Premier cannot show me anywhere wherein they recommended the establishment of an authority such as was passed here last year. These men with a combined salary of \$75,000 have been created a fishery authority, and after they were appointed they went and loaned most of their money to private companies. The recommendations in that report which deal with co-operative enterprise and groups of fishermen co-operatively holding the plants is further off than ever.

Today we are given the report of the Royal Commission on Forestry. It is a great report, twenty chapters and an appendix. We have to review it. I look forward with interest to perusing it. I agree with one statement which the honourable minister made, that we should get the greatest possible value out of our forests. He does not mean we should be chopping them all down at one time but that there should be a sensible method of exploiting our forests to the best advantage while conserving them in regard to the needs of future generations.

We are told about the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture. We have been given more than a hint, and extracts from that report on agriculture which deal with the question of mink. Now I don't know what minking has to do with agriculture. I understand that the raising of fur-bearing animals was a separate thing from agriculture, that is wild animals which have never been domesticated, and a separate thing entirely. But we do know the policy was decided by the government without consulting the House of Assembly. I don't know who was consulted nor whether the Premier consulted the Cabinet or not. But the first thing we know about that was that mink were coming here in hundreds from the middle west. The inducements must have been very great to get people to come from as far away as British Columbia and bring their stocks of mink here and set up in the territory between Whitbourne and Dildo. We don't know what the inducements are and therefore we are not in a position to make much comment on it, except, if this country had certain natural advantages I think that the people in this country should have been appraised of these advantages and should have been given the first opportunity to be able to use them instead of bringing in people from other places to get the benefits.

The report, however, from the report of the Royal Commission of Agriculture, seems to me to be sort of inspired, and one wonders how much inspiration there was put into the people who sat on the Royal Commission.

The honourable minister of Natural Resources is quoted in the "Evening Telegram" of March 1, as telling the Tourist Conference—Well he did not definitely state there would be a paper mill on the Terra Nova River, he

reiterated the government's policy. The Royal Commission on Forestry was asked to recommend a site in the report to be published to that effect. Then we learn from the Speech from the Throne the government does not propose to proceed immediately with the recommendation that the area at the Head of Bonavista Bay should be used as a National Park because of the valuable timber resources there especially, which must be preserved for the third paper mill.

The speech from the Throne then refers to the minerals, Buchans, Bell Island and the St. Lawrence. Now we too know that the Iron Ore Company is already operating in Labrador. A reference is made to the Canadian Javelin Company which owns ore in conjunction with NALCO or in partnership with NALCO has claimed to have discovered another important mine. I think it is called "wash ore" whatever that means. I do not know. But we have not gotten enough information to go upon to be able to say anything about it. Let us hope—let us hope—that Javelin or the Canadian Javelin Company or NALCO, who has this valuable deposit, it can be converted into a useful ore and which would give employment to a large section of our people. I don't know how many are to be employed in the Iron Ore Company but I do trust every effort will be made to get as much as possible to work.

The Speech from the Throne goes on to mention the arrival in this country of Mr. Boylen, a well known engineer. Now it must be very important that Mr. Boylen is here because we have had a lot of distinguished visitors but very seldom one who rates mention in the Speech from the Throne. This one has rated it.

"My Ministers are happy to welcome Mr. M. J. Boylen to Newfoundland, and all Newfoundlanders will be pleased to know that this famous Canadian mining man has become interested in the mineral possibilities of this Province.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, but if we did not have the two companies with such extensive areas as have been given to them by the government, NALCO and BRINCO, we would have thousands of mining men not one alone. They would all be in here. I have that from a great mining man—"What is the use of going to Newfoundland and making a search and finding minerals when you got to hand it over to NALCO and BRINCO?"

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the honourable gentleman know how many did come before NALCO and BRINCO—that is only three years ago.

MR. BROWNE: I heard the Minister say that before.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One prospector in twenty-five years.

MR. BROWNE: That does not say there would not be more.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There might be even two — a hundred per cent increase.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BROWNE: There may be six hundred per cent, like the provincial debt has increased. Anyhow I have it from the words of a distinguished mining man that there would be far more prospectors here if it had not been for the formation of these companies, and I have heard the Premier make the same reply he just made before—He is used to the argument.

It has been a truism, Mr. Speaker,

for members of the Opposition to refer to the Speech from the Throne as being more important for what it does not contain than for what it actually does contain. There was one important subject which was not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne at all. I am referring to the storm which was raised in Conception Bay from the citizens over here, over the new rates that were authorized by the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities to be charged by the United Towns Electric Company. I have here the statement given by the honourable the Attorney General on March 25th, and from it I have taken two or three extracts in order to clarify what I have to say. I note, Mr. Speaker, the application for the increase in rates was made on March 23rd, 1953, over two years ago. The order granting the increased rates to the United Towns Electric Company was made on September 24, 1954, eighteen months afterwards, or sixteen months afterwards. It was a long time for the Commissioners of Public Utilities to consider the question of increased rates.

Now who are the commissioners of Public Utilities, and what are their powers? I have here the Act dealing with Public Utilities Chapter 249 of the Revised Statutes. "The Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint three or more persons"—I believe they were appointed but one went away. There is Mr. Grant Jack, Mr. Framp-ton and Mr. Gosse. Mr. Gosse has gone away.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Gosse is here.

MR. BROWNE: If he is, I understand he is not working as a member of the commission. That is news to me, any time I have been down there

he has been away. It does not make much difference. Now—"Each Commissioner shall hold office during good behaviour." These gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, on this Public Utilities Commission are told—"Look here, as long as you behave yourselves and do what is right you can remain in your position, you cannot be moved from your position." The next section says:

"Unless otherwise directed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council a Commissioner shall cease to hold office when he attains the age of seventy years."

In other words a man may go on beyond the age of seventy if the Lieutenant Governor in Council wishes. In other words these men were supposed to be made independent men, they were given that security that they held their office during good behaviour. They are not like any other civil servants but are like Judges of the Supreme Court, that can only be removed by an address from two-thirds, I believe, of the Legislature.

Under Section 5: "The Attorney General may from time to time designate a member of the staff of the Department of the Attorney General or any other person who is a member of the Newfoundland Bar to be counsel of the Board".

His duties include the duty to represent and appear for the Board in all actions and proceedings involving any question under this Act or under or in reference to any Act, order or proceeding of the board, and if directed to do so by the Board to intervene if possible in any action or proceeding in which any such question is involved, to commence and prosecute all actions and proceedings directed

or authorized by the Board, and to expedite in every way possible final and just determination of all such actions and proceedings; to advise the Board and each commissioner when so requested in regard to all matters in connection with the powers and duties of the Board and of the members thereof, and generally to perform all duties and services as solicitor and counsel to the Board, which the Board may reasonably require of him.

"The Board shall annually in respect of the services of such counsel, pay to the Minister of Finance the sum of three thousand dollars which shall be credited to the Revenue of the Department of the Attorney General and which shall form part of the annual expenses of the Board."

"Where the Counsel of the Board appointed under sub-section) is not a member of the Department of the Attorney General, he shall be paid in respect of his services as Counsel such sums as the Board sees fit."

Now who is the Counsel?

The Counsel is Mr. Donald Dawe a partner of the Attorney General in the legal profession, and he receives the sum of four thousand dollars a year.

Now when this application was put in, a hearing was held that extended over several months. According to the statement of the Honourable the Attorney General, an electrical engineer from Ontario and an independent firm of auditors were called in. Therefore everything was done to see to it that all the evidence was put before the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities.

It had plenty of time to consider and deliberate. Then they came to

their conclusion and made their decision. In the meantime there was one interesting thing that happened. The interesting thing that happened was that the company that operated and the people who operated the United Towns sold out their interest to a group headed by the financial firm, Nesbitt, Thompson in Montreal and Pitfield, two investment houses. As the Premier said the other day the firm of Nesbitt, Thompson is, I believe closely associated with the Power Corporation of Canada which is also associated or has been associated with the government, having done some considerable work for it. So they took over, and it was not until they took it over the order was published granting the United Towns an increase in rates, and these rates were granted. Domestic rates were increased and commercial rates were increased considerably. The people around Conception Bay and other places outside St. John's getting their supply of electricity from the company protested. The protest amounted to a roar, and the government could not ignore it. But if the government tries to say that they did not know that the Commissioner of Public Utilities was going to give this order, then I think they are going to find very few people who believe it, because knowing the Premier as we do and knowing how he has a finger in every pie, knows everything that goes on, knowing that nothing escapes his notice, not the slightest trifle which he could disapprove, not a single thing goes on with which he has the slightest connection; and he has always had a considerable interest in the United Towns Electric Company because if he is going to electrify the farm on Roaches Line I expect he will have

to ask the company to extend their lines down there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman wants to continue he will abide by the Rules of the House, and if he does not he will not continue—that is understood. I hope that is understood.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the honourable gentleman is making that statement to you or to me. Perhaps he will clarify—What he has to say is usually very clear.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a debatable point. I will remind honourable members not to make personal allusions in debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: Is the honourable gentleman not trying, he went as closely as he dared to it, without actually saying it, he was trying to suggest an improper motive on my part, that any interest I might or might not have in a certain farm might cause me to be interested in having electricity brought to that farm bought from the company, and that I might therefore be under the necessity of approaching the company in question, and therefore I would not approach them with an independent hand. Is not that what he is trying to say?

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman would not think of such a thing.

MR. BROWNE: It would be a natural thing, I should think, for a person living in such a remote locality.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are so innocent—so harmless.

MR. BROWNE: With commercial operations going on there it would be natural he would be very anxious to get a supply of electricity to run his farm more efficiently.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A harmless individual.

MR. BROWNE: I think the honourable gentleman is getting personal now.

MR. SPEAKER: Bordering very closely on it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, that is an independent body, and we are told that after they had deliberated, after they had considered, after they had given their judgment, they were ordered or directed by the Attorney General to go and start this thing all over again go around and hold inquiries, go to Bay Roberts, Whitbourne, Harbour Grace, Carbonear, Placentia, and then bring back a report. Now the statement given here by the honourable the Attorney General a day or two ago was naturally a little modified from what appeared in the press earlier. I have here both statements as they appeared in the press; The Commission itself has been directed to make a full report to the government of its findings—It does not make much difference—Here is a public commission with a standing equivalent to a court, that has given its findings and now it is ordered to have a rehearing. No wonder a newspaper can come out and say as the "Daily News" did the other day, that the public cannot be criticized if it regards this new directive from the Attorney General as a lack of confidence in the Commission, and that the government can not have a good opinion of the ability of the Commission to perform its duties.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman must not quote a news-

paper statement of a speech made in the House. That would be bringing in outside opinion.

MR. BROWNE: I did not intend to do that, sir. I was going to proceed along that line anyway. However, the commission had its hearings at Bay Roberts, Harbour Grace, Carbonear and I may add Adrian Dawe wrote a letter to the Daily News on March 7, in which he said:

"Sir:— At a public meeting held this afternoon in the Public Bldg. as announced in the Daily News on the subject of an inquiry into an electrical rate increase.

"On being questioned by me regarding rate of increase asked for by the United Towns Electric Co. Ltd., and that allowed by the inquiry board, it was stated that 65% was applied for by the Electric Co'y as for that allowed by the Board I understand it to be 15%—but could not obtain clarification of this point—it was clear though about the 65% part of it.

I have had some considerable experience in the States on applications for increases of rates by the Public Utilities to local boards governing said increases, but never in my experience have I heard anything like the lame excuse put forward as a reason for allowing this exorbitant increase which we as taxpayers in the town of Bay Roberts know to our sorrow has gone into effect to average of 50%—furthermore we as taxpayers are asked to pay for expansion to other parts of the Avalon Peninsula and which point was admitted by the chairman of the inquiry here today.

From the original inception of the electric company, was not capital expenditure raised by an offer of securities, namely stocks, bonds or by government loan (or is one to surmise

that the credit of the company not being sufficient to float capital funds for expansion), why the change in the procedure in raising funds this time for this increase is certainly not a temporary, one for a year or two, but very likely a permanent one, as to whether it remains in effect—make no doubt of it—is clearly up to the public of Newfoundland.

Are the ordinary security financing markets closed to the United Towns Electric Co. that for some unexplained reason they have no recourse to these ordinary methods of financing?

Just how was this increase authorized—on a percentage basis by the board applied to? Or on a basis of wattage applied for and specified by the company as being that authorized by the Board? It would be interesting to have this point elucidated.

Just what percentage of increase in the months of Oct. Nov. Dec. since this increase went into effect will the books of the United Towns Electric Co. show? I will warrant one pretty close to the 50% specified as that obtained here in the town of Bay Roberts as a general average.

Thanking you Mr. Editor in anticipation of publication of this letter, I remain,

Yours truly
sgd. Adrian Dawe.

Bay Roberts.

P.S. As I go to mail this letter, a Bay Roberts firm showed me that their increase was 122%. sgd. A.G.D.

In other words the Chairman of the Board is quoted as having admitted they put up the rates to customers around the Bay because they wanted to make extensions to certain other places. Now there is nobody who

could possibly object to an extension of electricity to places desiring it, and I congratulate my honourable friend, the Minister of Provincial Affairs on a function which took place the other day in Renewes when the lights were turned on and all the shadows melted away. I suppose all my friends up there as well as his friends expressed their pleasure at having the electric lights. Yes, we would like to see electricity extended. But is it right we should extend it at the expense of other customers? Who should pay for that extension?

Then at Carbonear the commission had a rough time. Mr. J. B. Powell, who is, I guess, probably one of those in Conception Bay most interested in the extension or rather the development of electricity, because he was instrumental over fifty years ago in establishing a public utility company, appeared before the commission, and it is stated in the press here that the increased rates were allowed to interest financiers in Montreal. Later your report checked with that statement—to interest financiers we have been asked to pay higher rates for electric power;

The Attorney General now has decided the rates are too high. He has asked the company to cut the commercial rates immediately by one cent a kilowatt hour from January 1, and then accept a report of the findings of the commission who went around. They did not need to go around at all. One writer from Bay Roberts, one of these places, says; this is the biggest piece of bluff for the commission to go around. They had the rates, knew what they were and knew what the old rates were, and they had spent eighteen months on it. Why should they want to go around

and see what the rates were? They had all that before.

Well, somebody seems to be wrong here. If the commissioners are wrong, and if they are not qualified to fulfill their duties then you need new commissioners. If they were right then the government should not have interfered with them because it will destroy any confidence the public had in that commission.

Now, sir, the most serious omission in the Speech from the Throne was that there was no reference to the new industries. It was the same thing last year, nothing in the Speech from the Throne about the new industries, such an important part of the Premier's programme. That is what he had been elected for, that is what he went to the country for in 1951, our new industries, new scheme of guaranteed industries—and there is not a word in the Speech from the Throne for two years in succession. There are two kinds of industries; government owned and government sponsored and subsidized, with a mandate to the people—Alas the new industries! Alas poor Uriah! Is the programme dead? Would the minister like to read all the words couched in utter superlatives used to describe the man who inspired them and industrialized them, and the wonderful men who came here to establish them?

Mr Speaker, the question of the new industries is the one uppermost in the minds of all thoughtful people today. My honourable friend from Placentia West made reference to a little old lady who was so grateful for forty-dollars a month pension, and told the Premier to keep on going. I remember down in one of the settlements along the Southern Shore, meeting a

similar old lady who said; "Are you Mr. Smallwood? I said; "No, certainly not. I am opposing him as hard as I can." She said; "Oh he is such a wonderful man and sends us all a beautiful bit of money". The people who must decide the destinies of the country today are not the people who are getting something like that little old lady getting the \$40 a month pension. Those at that time of life who are getting that are naturally delighted to receive it, and nobody envies them. Unfortunately that little old lady knows very little about either our financial or economic position. The people who must find the taxes are the workers. They must find the taxes to pay the old age pensions and all the other social benefits, the miner, the fisherman, the lumberman, the professional man, the clerk, mechanic; the worker in every walk of life. These are the people, merchants and fishermen, employers and the toiling masses, all these people must find the taxes. And time goes on, Mr. Speaker, and every day our capital supplies are drained away, not gradually but in great quantities, like a river running to the sea, which never returns. If the government will not set up a Royal Commission to examine into the state of these industries at once it will be negligent in its duty to the people of this country, not only to the people who are here now but to their children and the generations who are coming after them who have to pay in the long run.

Now, sir, the Premier is a man of very little experience. It is a long time since I first met him. I know what a great reporter he was, what a distinguished journalist he was, how eager, how bright, how active, how alert, how full of energy, how full of ideas. I know about his gift of elo-

quence. I know how long he practised it in the MCLL, and I know something, on a little, of his socialistic ideas—He always leaned a little to the left.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And still do.

MR. BROWNE: He still does. I think he leans heavily to the left. He always yearned to do something great, something big. I do not think I can improve upon the lines written by an old friend in his "Wayfarer" in the "Daily News" on October 11, 1952:

"(1) Development Programme: The Industrial Development Programme of the present government has now reached a stage where it is possible to examine it in the light of how well it has been conceived in both its specific details and its relations to the total economy of the Province. That does not mean that there has been time enough to pass final or even positive judgments on the programme. Much remains to be proved. On the other hand, these past three years have seen an unusual and strenuous drive to build up a diversified economy in this island at a cost of almost one half of the pre-confederation surplus and a considered survey seems to be required.

It is difficult to disassociate a review of the kind from the personality of Premier Smallwood. This is his programme. It is his policy. If success should attend the development drive, it will be his monument. But he happens to be a person who excites strong feelings among friends and opponents. That creates an atmosphere in which objective examination of anything he has done or plans to do runs into trouble on one side or the other. Praise and you are regarded as a staunch supporter. Criticize and you become his deadly foe. That is a risk that everyone takes who

tries to assess objectively anything that is done in a heated political environment. We realize the risk and are indifferent to it. All that we can promise is that these few articles, while not an exhaustive examination of the development programme, will aim at bringing it into rational perspective.

Our own concept of the form that industrial development should take has been put forward with some insistence and not too much effect during the past twenty-five years. Back in 1932 we went to the new Prime Minister who had taken over in difficult times, with a skeleton plan for the employment of skilled technical help to explore the possibilities of development.

In 1933, when we were invited to give evidence before the Amulree Commission, we prepared a brief memorandum as a basis for discussion. This is part of what we said at the time.

"The present witness suggested several months ago to the government that a commission should be appointed which would undertake a thorough survey of the country's resources, embracing every possible industry. When accurate information of this kind is available, the government might then make a determined effort, by personal contact, to enlist the sympathies of capitalists in other countries for Newfoundland's potential industries".

This is a position from which we have not deviated. We found in the early days of Commission of Government only one sympathetic listener. He was Hubert Penson, Commissioner of Finance, who brought the New Industries Committee into being. The Chairman was the Commissioner for

Natural Resources, J. H. Gorvin, but he never had enough interest to attend any meeting after the first one. Ultimately, largely through the efforts of Senator Pratt, this committee became the Industrial Development Board, of which the Commissioner of Natural Resources was an ex officio member. In all his years in Newfoundland, the last commissioner Mr. Flynn, failed to attend a single meeting of the Board. With that kind of interest what was attempted had necessarily to be limited in scope and effect.

It had been laid down by Lord Amulree in 1933 that the first duty of the Commission of Government was to rescue the island from the peril of collapse and thereafter to establish a long-range plan that would put an end to the periodical relapses which threatened the economy. But the civil servants controlled the new government. When the Industrial Development Board was organized, Mr. Geoffrey Shakespeare, then Parliamentary Under-Secretary to the Dominions Office, was in Newfoundland. We attended a meeting at Government House at which he was present and it was obvious that he had been schooled to believe that the purpose of the Board was political. It was in that time of repressive atmosphere that the Board was established. (As a side-light on Mr. Shakespeare we recall that at a meeting with him at a Board of Trade Council Session, we asked him directly if Newfoundland would be put into Confederation without first having self-government restored. As the minutes of the meeting will disclose, he repudiated the idea most emphatically).

In any event, the Commission of Government missed the opportunity of a lifetime and the belief in a diversi-

fied economy for Newfoundland was not very strong when along came JOE. It is his policy that we shall examine in the articles to follow.

"Development Programme (2).

Industrial Development as a broad and progressive programme had never received serious official attention in Newfoundland. Some of the more advanced thinkers in public life lived and worked in the last century. The concept of a Railway across the Island was closely allied to the need of opening up the country to make possible a diversified economy. Thus more than 70 years ago there were far-ranging minds to be found in the infant and struggling colony. Later the ill-fated and bitterly controversial railway contract of 1898 had its foundation in the prospects of wide development. The basic concept was that the Reid interests could not want the lands they were ceded if it was not their intention to develop them.

Generally, however, thinking on economic lines was largely a matter of expediency. In each new crisis up to 1935 some exceptional event occurred to tide the country over in emergency and take some care of the needs for new employment opportunities.

The building of the railway was the first of these. Then came the mines at Bell Island and Green Bay. After these there was the first great industrial enterprise, the newsprint industry at Grand Falls. It was followed by the inflationary era of the first world war and the aftermath of post-war deflation. It was offset by the Humbermouth project. Next all minds turned with new hope to a mill on the Gander which failed to materialize and by 1939, a feeling was prevalent that we had come pretty well to the end of our resources and must

look principally to the fisheries for new development.

That is something this columnist has never believed. Back in 1932, at the time of the Ottawa Conference on Imperial Preference, we argued that assembly plants could be set up by American Manufacturers in Newfoundland to put into their products the necessary capital Empire content to gain preferential entry into British Empire Markets. This was treated with derision. In our first interview with the first Commissioner for Public Utilities in 1934, we talked about diversified industry and were laughed at for our pains. This kind of frustration faced everyone with the belief that where you have a fine intelligent labour force, ample power resources, industrial sites at tidewater, and an important strategic situation in relation to world markets, you have also the basis for industrial development. One of those who has always thought along this line is the present Premier, and he is entitled to that credit.

In 1949, he found himself in a position to put his theories to the test. It was a realization of opportunity that comes to few men. And from the moment that he became Premier of Newfoundland, the history of economic development policy took a new form. To a large extent his personal history from that time forward, because Mr. Smallwood has made industrial development the goal by which he stands or falls and his has been the dominant influence in all that has been done in the economic field since he came into power.

He encountered some immediate disappointments. He had expected that the coming of Confederation would be attended by an intensive

interest by Canadian big-business in Newfoundland Development. He had proclaimed that prospect in his manifesto for the general election in 1949, and was unquestionably perturbed by the failure of mainland industrialists to come through. He was still in the initial stages of formulating a programme, and while he went to the United States to see what could be done to drum up interest there, he was ready also to clutch at any thing that promised well. The fisheries were much in his mind at the time, and public funds were loaned to various developments. It was an impulsive moment, goaded by the idea that we could learn a lot from more advanced fishing nations, that he fell into the expensive Icelandic Herring Venture.

In the course of his American visits he had sought and made useful contracts. He went after the Rockefeller financed International Basic Economy Corporation, hoping they might find in Newfoundland a challenge they would be glad to accept. He discussed also the prospects of a cement industry with Cement and General Development to New York. Still at the stage when he was sure he could infect large industrial organizations with his own faith in and enthusiasm about Newfoundland, his public utterances were somewhat too enthusiastic. It was about this time that he enunciated the controversial slogan: "develop or perish". During this period, he realized the need for someone with the capacity to give technical direction to his project and time was largely marked until the man was found. He arrived in Newfoundland on May 23, and it was from that date that development began to take its present course.

It appears that Mr. Berlin inter-

viewed the Commission of Government and talked about setting up a commission which would undertake a thorough survey of the country's resources, embracing every possible industry. When accurate information of this kind is available, the government might then make a determined effort by personal contact, to enlist the sympathies of capitalists in other countries for Newfoundland's potential industries.

Back in 1932, at the time of the Ottawa Conference on Imperial Preference he argued that assembly plants could be set up by American Manufacturers in Newfoundland to put into their products the necessary Empire content to gain preferential entry into British Empire Markets. This was treated with derision. All the credit must go to the Premier and all the blame if there should be blame.

Herring Venture — Should I stop to say that cost between four and five hundred thousand dollars: Two men dropped into his office one day, one who could speak English and another who could speak nothing but Icelandic. Out of that casual call upon the Premier the country had to pay nearly half a million dollars. Then IBEC— We had a beautiful little souvenir the other day, and we are to get some more. Then that man arrived in Newfoundland on March 23, 1950, and it was from that date that development began to take its present course. That man is still in Newfoundland, and is going to be here, I believe, for several years longer, but he is no longer at the right hand of the Premier. That man was our friend, Dr. Valdmánis, now a prisoner in the penitentiary.

The honourable the Premier has

plenty of good intentions. I don't think there is anybody, even his enemies, and I am not one of his enemies, there is no one who will deny that he had good intentions. But the road to Hell, Mr. Speaker, is paved with good intentions. Good intentions are not enough for a Premier. He had to have more than good intentions.

Let us begin by examining these industries. Let us first commence with the Birch Mill. I believe this did not receive the approval of Dr. Valdmánis. It has never been denied that Dr. Valdmánis disapproved of it, and the Premier and the government must take full responsibility for this expensive piece of socialization. One day in the Fall of 1950 I noticed land on the Topsail Road where streams and marshes were and where in my youth I used to swim and trout, all had been removed, and the whole landscape changed. The Birch Mill was being born.

Now let us look back at the contract, the Birch Contract. Here is the contract, signed on December 1, 1950 between His Majesty the King and represented by Hon. Joseph R. Smallwood, and Chester Dawe, by which the operator would acquire a site for the erection of a factory, erect a factory, acquire and install modern machinery and put it in operation, all at the expense of the government. He was given a free hand and he used his freedom to the utmost. The government then will lease that factory to the Operator for a period of fifteen years from the date the factory is in readiness for an amount at an annual rate of one half the annual profits. Who thought about profits in this connections?—The Premier must have thought there were going to be profits. Then it said how the net profit should be calculated. The net profit should

be calculated by deducting from the gross revenue every year an amount equal to the full normal depreciation allowed by the taxation division of the Department of National Revenue. The government never received any profit, and the government never received any depreciation at all. That depreciation should have been paid over to the government in any case, because the whole thing was built by the government's money, with public money of the people, taken from the the people, money saved during years, paid in taxes by the people; and it was given to Chester Dawe to put into this plant to operate it for fifteen years, and he had to pay depreciation. The usual amount, I believe, is 20% depreciation. Say it was only on two million dollars, \$100,000 the first year should have been paid. Instead of paying us we had to pay the Newfoundland Hardwoods hundreds of thousands, millions of dollars, for the privilege of having the birch mill at the Steadies and Donovans on the Topsail Road.

"The government and its assignees should not be liable for any operating losses for any year."

Does the Honourable the Premier remember inserting that clause? What a farce! What a fantastic farce! "The government shall not be liable". Who else is liable for all the losses in connection with this industry, these fertile children of the Premier's brain?

One clause alone in that is correct; "All at the expense of the government." Was anything ever attempted in this country or any province of Canada as crazy as this? Not only that, but the mill was built without any supervision by the government. That mill was built without anyone being

appointed to examine the bills that were presented, not to certify them either as to costs, quantity nor as to quality, and in the long run there was no one in the government service who could sign these bills so they could pass the auditors and be paid except the Premier himself, the Minister of Economic Development. We knew he did not have the time, and, if I may say so, if he had the ability, sir, he did not show it, to examine these bills properly. He could not, it was impossible for him to do it. The government should have had a check of the work on that industry, to check on all prices and all quantities and qualities. I gave an example last year of one item, two conveyors supplied by J. C. Pratt and Company, Limited, on which the government lost practically a thousand dollars. Now there was an inquiry into that, and we don't know what was the result. But the point is the government lost a thousand dollars, and the person who supplied them made fifty per cent profit. What profit was made on the \$350,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, it is so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The matter was thoroughly investigated, as I have already announced publicly, and no evidence whatsoever could be found.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is out of order. He is not entitled to interrupt me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if he will allow me.

MR. BROWNE: No, I will not allow you. You should have made it before and the Attorney General

should have made it. Lay it on the table here so we can examine it. What profit was made on three hundred thousand dollars supplied by Chester Dawe Limited, with the other general retail prices for \$350,000 worth of building supplies? What profit was made on \$100,000 of goods and services supplied? What about the \$100,000 supplied by Snows Iron and Electric Works? Is anybody able to tell us that? Was there one service supplied by tender? Was a tender called for anything in connection with the construction of the Birch Plant, just one? Was there any one tender? Will the Premier tell me that? Was there any effort whatsoever made to check and see that the country got value for the money that was put into this socialist enterprise — I forgot, that is a private company, — I never heard of a private company built and established entirely with government funds, that is the first one. As sensible men sitting here, what do we think of such procedure? There are some men over there on the other side of the House, reasonable men, what do you think in your conscience, in your hearts, of such procedure? Would you do it again if the Premier came to the Cabinet tomorrow and said, Mr. Dawe wants another birch mill contract just like the one before, would you sign it? No you would not, not one, not a man would sign it, in the face of experience. But you should have known before and should not have trusted, the honourable members in the government should not have entrusted expenditure of such a vast amount of money to the honour of a man without adequate protection. Is it any wonder that prices and costs of this tragic experiment in socialism went far beyond expectation? The Public Ac-

counts are here to tell the story — 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954. I believe the estimated costs were in the vicinity of one and a half million dollars. In 1952 \$1,780,000 plus \$211,000 working capital. In 1953, \$1,780,000 plus \$946,000 working capital. In 1954, end of March \$1,780,000 cost plus working capital \$1,821,000 plus a guaranteed bank loan \$525,000 — Total cost to this country \$4,135,000. Oh yes! As sensible men looking back on that — I see the Minister of Education in his seat — a businessman — would such a businessman give a contract to a person and say; "here, build a plant for me, go ahead, all at my expense and we will go fifty-fifty on the profits" and take no stock of the quality nor quantity nor prices of the articles that went into it? He would not be in business long, nobody would be in business long. Up to the 14th, of January 1955 the government had not received one cent return on its capital investment nor one cent of interest nor one cent of depreciation of which there was supposed to be 20%. That, Mr. Speaker, we are told by the Premier is a private company. This is the private enterprise which the government tells us it is so anxious to encourage. But since we were here last year this company has changed hands too, and now it is working again. It closed down for a while. I notice great stocks of lumber have been moved from Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited, and I believe, moved to Chester Dawe Limited's yard. Now I don't know anything about it. I am not making any charges now.

I have a question on the Order Paper asking the Premier to give us some information.

Mr. Speaker, I presume, as I intend to move an amendment to the Address

in Reply, I could go beyond the ordinary time allocated?

MR. SPEAKER: You mean a vote of non-confidence.

MR. BROWNE: Yes. What is going to be the future of this industry which was built at a cost of over four million dollars? The absence of any reference in the Speech from the Throne to the existing industries certainly calls for comment. The people, I think are entitled to know all about the transaction from Chester Dawe Limited to somebody else without the public being apprised. Why should not the public be informed? Why are we not told?

That is one industry. I propose to refer to more than one of the government sponsored industries. We in the Opposition feel we must take the earliest opportunity to draw to the attention of the public of Newfoundland the seriousness, the appalling condition that exists, and has existed, appalling, I say, in some of the new industries. I don't know whether the members of the government are really informed, if they are, and I think the honourable member for Green Bay should be, they ought to be appalled. I intend to propose an amendment to the address in reply calling for examination into this. I would like to think that men on the government side of the House have the interest of the country at heart and will realize that this is only a reasonable proposition to bring up. I may be strong in my denunciation of expenditure, nevertheless, the fact remains, here is an industry which cost the country four million dollars to date in the expectation it was going to give profitable returns. Now is it not reasonable we should know all about it? Why did it not give

returns? What is it to be in the future? That is only one — Was there waste? Was there extravagance? Was there incompetence? Was there dishonesty? I believe there was, and I don't believe there is a parallel to be found, surely not in the history of this country of Newfoundland, and I don't think there is a parallel to be found in the Dominion of Canada. Good intentions are not enough to excuse so serious a waste of the greater portion of the surplus funds of the present government.

Now to consider the Cement Plant; This cement plant was supposed to cost less than three million dollars. It was commenced in 1950, and was the first of the government industries inspired by Dr. Valdimanis. I heard it said, and that has not been denied, he wished to establish one a year. But the Minister of Economic Development was so ambitious and so anxious to industrialize the country that he insisted that his director general of Economic Development proceed with others. The cost was then raised to 3.7 million dollars. If you look in the "Public Accounts" you will see that there. The cement mill was then sold to the North Star Cement Limited for \$3.4 million dollars — and the shares in the company of \$100,000 — That is a fine piece of high finance — And the funds for the purchase were advanced by the government. They gave them the money to buy it from the government. The total cost to Newfoundland was 4.7 million dollars on which this government has not received one cent interest or one cent of working capital. It was in connection with the contract for the construction of this plant that Dr. Valdimanis is supposed to have charged the sum of ten per cent. What has happened to the investment of nearly

five million dollars of Newfoundland funds we do not know.

The next government industry was the Gypsum Plant. The original price was in the neighbourhood of \$2 million dollars and was raised to 2.5 million dollars during the fiscal year 1952, and the actual cost at November 28, 1952 was \$2,950,000. The cost at March 31, 1954 was \$3,556,000, which I think is over a million dollars more than estimated. I have here another quotation taken from the "Evening Telegram — "The first gypsum sale to the markets in the United States".

The Premier, this afternoon and previously, spoke about his brains, the thing he possesses from this up, brains — It does not require very much brains to spend money, but it requires a good deal of brains to spend it sensibly and get good returns from it. I am sure that the Premier has read the report of the Industrial Development Board on the question of Gypsum. If he has he would have recognized the inherent difficulty of this country going into the manufacture of gypsum wall-board, would know beforehand about the industry. Now this much must be said for Dr. Valdimanis, I believe the gypsum plant despite the ten per cent he charged, was built cheaper than it could be built by any company from the Mainland. They evidently had that advantage at the start, but the government had to face competition from the Industrial Gypsum Company of Canada, which I believe is a subsidiary.

I went in to see that factory last summer, and I found it only working on one shift, an eight hour shift, because the company had put up a big plant in Montreal which supplied all the markets in that vicinity. That

is why the Newfoundland Company now must look to the United States. Just think of the competition it has to face there with the International Gypsum Company, one of the greatest companies in the world, the greatest, I suppose, gypsum plant company in the world.

Then the Birch Plant 4.2 millions, gypsum 3.6 millions, cement 4.7 millions; twelve and a half millions of the surplus gone into these three plants and not one cent yet returned to the country. Now does not that suggest the desirability of having an impartial inquiry? What is to be the future of these industries? Are the members on the government side of the House satisfied to go on like that? — Pouring good money after bad. If that was the first phase of the disastrous financing, what was the second phase? These were only the Premier's first ventures. He called a snap election then in 1951, all the members here remember that, looking for a mandate from the people, after spending up to that time six millions in socialized enterprises, the Premier closed the Assembly and went to the Country for a mandate for government guaranteed loans. Now I don't know whether the money was running out or he was a little worried about the endorsement of the public, after throwing all that money into one hundred per cent government enterprises. Now he comes out and says: "Will it be all right for us to guarantee fifty per cent loans to companies setting up in business. He now wanted permission to put up 50% when they had already put up 100%.

There was no need of such an election. As a matter of fact if the Premier had gone to the country without any issue he would have won, but I hope for the sake of the country it

will never be possible for him to win another. The Opposition was weak and completely unprepared. The government at that time, and especially the Premier was taking and receiving credit for all the social benefits of Confederation, and the majority of the people are apt to think that the Premier should get credit for that. Now the Premier today must be judged on its record, for what it has done, and not what the St Laurent Government has done or what the government has done in Ottawa. He won the election but in the course of the election an incident happened without precedent in the annals of Newfoundland. I refer, of course, to the kidnapping of Dr. Sennewald at Gander Airport by Max Braun Wogau, the present director of Superior Rubber Company, a handsome, charming Latvian, who on that occasion must have had the iron hand in the velvet glove when he met Dr. Sennewald. The Premier did not hesitate to telephone the Prime Minister and ask for an RCAF plane.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Excuse me Mr. Speaker —

MR. BROWNE: Well, I heard it from the lips of the Prime Minister of Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Prime Minister did not say I had telephoned him.

MR. BROWNE: Oh! the Prime Minister was consulted by the Minister for National Defence as to whether he should send an RCAF plane to bring Max Braun Wogau to Gander to kidnap Dr. Sennewald. The Prime Minister is supposed to have said: "Is he a civil servant? The answer came back "No, he is not a civil servant." I wonder what he was? There is a word for such

a man. But there is no doubt about it, the Prime Minister was deceived into granting permission into having a plane sent. The Premier is a smart man, a smart man — The Premier was not going to allow Dr. Valdmanis to go on the air and say what he thought of the Newfoundland government and the methods used in bringing people out from Germany. No, Gordon Higgins has to be a lot brighter and has to get up a lot earlier in the morning to get ahead of him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right, and the same thing applies to the honourable gentleman.

MR. BROWNE: Thank you! It was a big laugh. The honourable the Premier had the laugh, but — "He laughs best who laughs last".

MR. SPEAKER: Let me interpose there — I am not calling the honourable member to order, but the role of relevancy is broad in this debate, but there is such a thing as reviving matters of past history for the purpose of debate. Perhaps it would be wiser to confine the criticisms to the government and not so much to the individual.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, what I am going to refer to — I don't know the doctor nor Max Braun Wogau, Director of the Superior Rubber Company, but Mr. Speaker, I hope such opinion as you have just expressed will not preclude me from reading to you what the Premier stated after the election, to be the mandate he received, and the mandate which he intended to proceed with. That mandate in itself is the most interesting document — I have it in my hand — It is a broadcast — "Meet the Press" Dec. 21, 1951 — The Premier being questioned by Mr. Jamieson:

Mr. Jamieson: "Do you consider it a clear mandate for your economic development programme?"

Mr. Smallwood: Yes, I think it is as clear a mandate as any government ever got since Newfoundland began. In all but three districts the Liberal candidates increased their percentage of the total votes cast. Last election each Liberal candidate elected polled thirty per cent of the total number of votes cast. This election they increased their percentage. It is a tremendous endorsement I would say, of our policy of new industries. I don't think there is any doubt about that."

MR. BROWNE: Our poor people, were not aware of what they were letting themselves in for.

He was questioned again, and was asked about the timing of the election:

Mr. Smallwood: "Now as for the timing of the election. The issue was very much bigger than the cost of the election. A hundred thousand dollars as the cost of enabling the people to decide whether they would back this industrial programme or not was a very trifling cost."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I ask what the honourable member is quoting from?

MR. BROWNE: I am quoting from a transcript of a recording made of a broadcast by the Premier. Do you wish to dispute it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no it is true. The words are true.

MR. BROWNE: The more the better. It is nice to hear them again.

"It is really very small-minded on the part of anyone who ever mentions the cost of a general election. It was a very democratic thing to go back to the people, who are the masters, and ask them to endorse or to condemn the particular policy of the government. If they did not have a mandate to go ahead with, and before going ahead with it go back to the people and ask them for a mandate."

Well, now, the Premier is not serious certainly—if he thinks the people really realized what was going to be done with the new industries.

"But in the light of the tremendous issues at stake it is the depth of intellectual insolvency to drag out the cost of an election."

I will now skip over a couple of pages:

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, read it all. That is good stuff — for a while let us have some good common sense.

MR. BROWNE: I must say it is amusing frivolous. But I do not wish to indulge in frivolities this afternoon.

Mr. Chafe: Well, now, as the Premier has explained, the government has been returned to power on a clear mandate, now I'd like to ask what is the next move in the industrial development program?

Mr. Smallwood: Well, now the position is this: We have started two kinds of industries, two kinds. There are three of one kind, and more than that of the other kind."

Mr. Browne: They were all started yet he looked for a mandate.

Mr. Smallwood: The first kind are those industries that the government built themselves with their own money, the public money, out of the surplus. First the Cement Mill in Humbermouth. Then the Plasterboard Mill, the gypsum plasterboard and wallboard, and third, the Birch Mill in there at Donovans. These three industries have been built with government funds out of the surplus. The government owns them. The public owns them.

MR. BROWNE: Then—Listen to this:

"When these are sold the cost which was taken from the surplus will be put back in the surplus, and any profits made will go back into current account revenue of the government."

MR. BROWNE: Would the Premier please tell us when the cost is to be put back?

"...and any profits will go back into current account revenue of the government?"

MR. BROWNE: Let us hope and pray — let us all get down on our knees every night and pray the money will come back into current account revenue.

"Now that is the first class. There won't be any more like that".

MR. BROWNE: That is good. But I wonder if the other kinds were not equally as bad.

"The government has no intention of building any more industries out of the surplus."

MR. BROWNE: Unfortunately that was not so.

"Now the second part are industries which we encouraged to come into Newfoundland from the Continent of Europe where nobody has any dollars. In Europe nobody whatever, no private individuals, they are not allowed to own a dollar.."

MR. BROWNE: Now a reference to the firms:

"These firms, great firms, very good firms, enormous firms, some of them not all of them, are very wealthy, very powerful, very skilful, very experienced, but they haven't got a dollar to bless themselves with, not a dollar amongst them. As the saying goes, 'Not a dollar to jingle on a tombstone.' They have their own money. They are very wealthy and powerful in their own money, but their money is no good over here."

Then he goes on to say:

"...we take very careful steps to satisfy ourselves that these firms are highly reputable and skilful and experienced.

Mr. Jamieson: But how do you find that out. I mean, how do you find out whether a firm is a good reputable firm...."

Mr. Smallwood: There are international credit bodies. You are familiar with Bradstreet & Dunn here. You can get the rating of any company in North America from Bradstreet & Dunn, and similarly on the other side of the ocean you can get the ratings and the credit standing and the history and the record of any firm, in any country in Europe on this side on the Iron Curtain."

"...Now, having decided that they are, we say to them; if you want to start an industry in Newfoundland, we know you have got no dollars, but you bring over your machinery, bring your steel for your structures, for your pattern, your buildings. Bring cement, bring your material and machinery and equipment, and so on, and that will have a certain value. Now whatever that value is that is your investment in Newfoundland. You have to form a Newfoundland company and that company has to own all that property. Now it is to that company, that Newfoundland Company, that the government extends the helping hand. How? By taking money out of the surplus and giving it to them? No.

Mr. Jamieson: That is what the Opposition has been saying?

Mr. Smallwood: I know that they have. I know they have. The Opposition say more than their prayers, far more than their prayers. Especially in this election they said far more than their prayers."

Now he goes on to say:

"In fact we say to an European: 'Come to Newfoundland, form a Newfoundland Company, bring your machinery, your supplies, your equipment, your material. Whatever that is worth is your investment. Then issue your bonds, sell your bonds on the open market. We will guarantee these bonds so you will have no trouble to sell them for dollars. That will give you the dollars you need.' You know gentlemen, that is exactly how Corner Brook was built."

MR. BROWNE: Corner Brook could not have possibly been built

on such foolish scheme as that, which is one of the silliest statements I have ever seen.

It goes on to explain how it was built. They did not have a cent but they had factories and machinery. Of course they did have factories and machinery, and the Reid Newfoundland Company had great resources of water power that developed 100,000 h.p. at Deer Lake, and a great resource of forests. But these enormous people do not have anything at all like that, as I am going to show. I could go on and read what the Premier said: He reported what Sir Richard Squires said to Sir. W. G. Armstrong Whitworth, Co. I don't think there is any need to make any reference to that. It is entirely wrong.

Mr. Geoff. Stirling was also in on that, and Mr. Stirling was wise and sceptical and a hardheaded businessman, and could not just swallow that, hook, line and sinker and asked: "It is true that the government doesn't actually have to put up the money in order that it dig into the surplus, only insofar as every industry is a success, but if the day comes — let us take the morbid side — and these industries didn't succeed, they failed, and the bonds became due, wouldn't it then automatically bankrupt the government by having to fork out the guarantee for these bonds? I mean what is the good of a guarantee on a tombstone if you are inside the tombstone?" Well I think Mr. Stirling showed a great deal of wisdom. But the Premier went on:

"Right the answer is, no. If all the industries whose bonds we guaranteed, if they all failed, every one of them without exception, that is your claim? If they all failed, Well, now you will admit that is a

bit of a sweeping assumption, isn't it? But take the worst case, take the worst case where every single industry failed and cannot pay the interest on the bonds. In that case the government of Newfoundland has to pay the interest. What is the interest at 5% on twenty-five millions? . . . " about one and a quarter millions. One and a quarter million a year it would cost the treasury if they had to pay all the interest all the time on all the bonds. This is a big assumption. That is taking the worst, if it could possibly happen. "Now what does the Treasury take in?"

Then he went on to show what the Treasury took in. Then :

"and the saving in dole, because in even the best times relief costs a million dollars a year. You cut that in half, that is a saving of half a million. Now, some may argue that a dollar saved is not a dollar earned, but from the standpoint of the Treasury of Newfoundland if you are paying out a million dollars in relief and new industries come, and as a result of the new industries you pay out only half a million, then you are saving half a million and the Treasury is better off by that half million, isn't it?"

Then Mr. Jamieson began to get sceptical :

"But do you think it is a reasonable assumption that any or all of these industries could keep going and keep employing these men, but at the same time not be in a position to pay off a single cent of the interest "

And the Premier answers

"It is quite conceivable."

If suppose they could keep going for

ever and never be able to pay back any interest?

"Mr. Jamieson : How long can you get by in these industries without paying anything on the principal? I don't know enough about high finance today. Can you go on forever just paying the interest?"

"Mr. Smallwood : Well, no. You go on for the life time of the bonds. Now when the life of a bond is up, when a bond matures, the bondholders want their principal back in addition to the interest they have been receiving during the life of the bond. Well, if you have a sinking fund, that alone pays off some of your principal. The rest of your principal you get by renewal, issue of new bonds for another ten years. That is commonplace, that is done all over the earth."

"Mr. Stirling : Well, looking at the gruesome side of it, I have it figured out here that if—of course the re-issuing of bonds is one of the answers—if the entire industries did not make money and the government had to pay 5% interest each year for ten years and at the end of the ten years they had to make good all the bonds, which would be 37½ million dollars?—but of course Mr. Smallwood answered that question by saying they could re-issue the bonds.

Mr. Jamieson then asked:

"How about Newfoundland's credit? We are all talking about the Newfoundland government backing bonds. Now I know you can have one man's name on the back of a note and it is not worth a darn. Have you—you naturally have investigated it. There will be no trouble in selling these bonds?"

It is very important to note there were never any bonds issued in connection with any of the companies, not a bond. The government supplied all the money, not a bond was issued. What a farce. The Premier said Wood Gundy and Dominion Securities were after him to guarantee bonds. "You know," he said, "We have the lowest public debt probably in all North America, \$10 a head." It is \$65 a head today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No it is not.

MR. BROWNE: \$65: I will calculate it for the honourable gentleman. All right it was \$10 a head in 1951. We borrowed \$22 million since. How much is \$22,000,000 if it is not fifty-five dollars a head for 400,000 people. It has gone up five hundred per cent in four years and less than four years, three and a half years. At this rate we will soon be ahead of Quebec, with the next lowest, which is \$80 a head, which it was not. It was much lower than that. But we will be ahead of Quebec and ahead of the rest of the Provinces of Canada with this drag on the Treasury by the Premier. We will come to other references I would like to make on this delightful "Meet the Press." I suppose it was the most interesting weekly programme the press have ever given on C.J.O.N.

"I gather then," said Mr. Jamieson; "that the government would not consider it too risky or anything of that sort, to carry on beyond that figure if it meant extra industries on the same basis?"

"Oh," said the Premier, "If it is sound to go to twenty-five million and that proves successful and sound and sage and profitable, by the same token you can go another twenty-five million and if that proves

sound and successful and profitable you could go another twenty-five million. If these industries are sound, that is the basis of it all. If they are sound then you don't have to stop and decide now what the limit will be. Decide that as time arrives and you can test the thing out."

But Mr. Speaker, if they are not sound, what then? Are you going to continue then the responsibility, as the members supporting the government have the responsibility of these industries. If these industries are not sound, if the schemes are shown to be unsound and are losing money, the responsibility is on the members of the government, they are the ones decided the policy would be carried out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to refer to another government industry. This time I am going to refer to the Superior Rubber Company of Holyrood: The agreement was made on the 3rd. of March, 1953. Now we can assume, I suppose, that the others were made in the first flush but the Premier now was experienced, and this ought to be the best of all. He had experience now, four year of experience in the government. This time we should really get it. This is the best company of which Mr. Max Braun Wogau is director. This ought to be good, with the kidnapper director, he ought to know about rubber companies. Here is the agreement: "The Province of Newfoundland hereby guarantees the payment of interest on the due dates, at the rate not exceeding five and one half per cent on the loan or loans not exceeding in all the sum of one million dollars raised by the Company in accordance with the said agreement and repayment on the due dates of the loan or loans so raised." Then we got the agreement.

" . . . The government will lend or cause to be loaned to the company under government guarantee . . . " That is that the company would go to a commercial bank and raise the money and, Mr. Max Braun Wogau goes into a bank and says, Mr. Chairman, I want a million dollars on Superior Rubber Company, a fine business we got started and the government is going to guarantee it. I am the man who kidnapped Sennewald in 1951." Did he go into a bank. I don't know. If he went in that is not how they got the money. There is one gentleman in this country, the Auditor General, who tells us what happened. The government found all the money, there was never any guarantee, and if there was it was never met. The money was supplied and when the obligations were met the government had to pay over one million dollars in connection with that industry. They were supposed to bring out machinery and plant equipment from Germany.

Now, Sir, last year in this House I was informed when I stated rather timidly that I had heard there was a machine in there in the Rubber Company which was second hand. "Oh yes," stated the Premier "most of it is second hand machinery, but good." He described one in there that kneaded rubber like dough. I remember saying "the government seemed to need a lot of dough. They would need a lot for these industries." But I have heard a good many comments since on this particular industry, I was told several things about this industry, but I was hesitant about mentioning it. I did see the beautiful houses they built for the staff in there, lovely houses. It is worth the while of the honourable members when in Holyrood to go up the Witless

Bay Road to see the magnificent houses the senior members of the staff occupy. I heard that they were paying low wages, that the products was inferior, that a salesman had gone into the plant and said; "Look here, that stuff is not fit to be put on exhibition. They are unsaleable." Not long ago an outpost merchant said to me; "I bought a dozen pairs. I sold five pairs and have not sold a pair since. The people who bought them went around the village and told every one they were no good. I have sold fourteen dozen pairs of another kind of rubbers since."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand here a copy of an affidavit by one of the senior members of this Rubber Company, which I would like to read.

"My name is Frank Pronold. I am of German birth and have lived in Canada since Easter 1929. I have been a Canadian citizen since 1953. I am married, and have two grown daughters.

"I worked at British Rubber in Montreal for eight years and at Dominion Rubber for one year. I worked as a designer and pattern maker.

"I joined Superior Rubber Limited on May 25, 1954, as designer and pattern maker and personnel trainer.

"The plant should be closed down at once for a period of four weeks for a complete re-organization from the top down.

"It is losing money steadily. Capital from the government is being pumped into it at the rate of \$25,000 a month. Only \$3500 is being paid out to Newfoundland employees.

"The plant is badly constructed

and has had to have several structural alternations.

"Footwear produced at the plant is almost invariably defective. Income from the sales average about \$1200 a month. At least 60% of all sales have to be refunded.

"A shipment of approximately 20,000 pairs of rubber boots produced at a cost of \$15 a pair was dumped to a jobber in Montreal for \$1.25 a pair.

"The first \$5,000 proceeds from this sale was sent to Germany to pay Mr. Grube for machinery which he shipped to the factory in Holywood.

"At least one machine there is "Marshall Plan" goods. It is a new Singer Sewing machine, single needle type. It bears a triangular plaque about one and a half inches to the side with a replica of the Stars and Stripes. It bears the following words in German:

"FÜR DEN WIEDER AUFBAU
EUROPAS
GELIEFERT VON DER
VEREINIGTEN STAATEN
VON AMERIKA.

Translation of the above is: For the rehabilitation of Europe sent by the United States of America.

The serial number of this machine is 11W155 W1202381.

Some of the machines in the factory are new. But some of them are very old, dating at least from the First World War. They had the rust chipped off, and were painted over to make them look new. So far as I am aware none of the Europeans connected with the plant have any of their own money invested in it. All of the investments came from the Newfoundland government.

"Salaries of management are ridiculously high for a plant of its size.

Max Braun-Wogau, the manager, gets \$600 a month and his wife \$400 plus expenses. The split between husband and wife is arranged for income tax purposes. He is also supplied free with a house and a car. "Baron deHahn, the plant manager gets \$700 a month. Before coming here he worked for British Rubber in Montreal for \$45 a week. A German salesman who speaks a little English has been brought here recently at a guaranteed \$100 a week for a year. Thirteen other Germans are on their way here now.

"A new machine valued at \$40,000 has just been installed after six months effort. It doesn't work. Test runs on it were a failure. No sales are now being made and the markets have been lost because of bad production. "Superior" is the name which no purchaser will buy any more.

"The \$40,000 machine which was newly installed was paid for twice. Its installation costs were inflated by Grube and Max Braun-Wogau, who first ordered the Office Manager to falsify the installation report, and when he refused to do so, took the matter out of his hands and turned in a false report to the government inflating the cost of installation for just one part of the machine (the foundation) from a true value of \$2,500 to \$9,000. The government refused to make payment for this.

"CANADA"
NEWFOUNDLAND
St. JOHN'S
TO WIT

I, Frank Pronold, make oath and say that the contents of this statement are just, correct and true, to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

(Sgd) Frank Pronold.

SWORN before me at St. John's
aforesaid this 24th day of
February, A.D. 1955 :
(Sgd) Rupert Bartlett

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a statement, an affidavit. If the government wants to see it I am prepared to lay it on the table of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not worth the paper it is written on.

MR. BROWNE: It is worth inquiring into.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not worth the paper it is written on.

MR. BROWNE: We will hear more about that from the Premier, I take it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I dare say.

MR. BROWNE: If that statement is correct—

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is from the pattern maker, he should know.

MR. BROWNE: Well, there are other things, if the Premier wants to bring them up—if it is correct the government, the Minister, has been hoodwinked.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If it is correct!

MR. BROWNE: The Government was hoodwinked, or violated its own agreement. Certainly can't deny that. There is no pretense to carry out the authority given, under any Act of this legislation. Here is the point: Here is an affidavit to which a man puts his signature and swears. Now is it sufficient to say it is not worth the paper it is written on? Does it not justify questioning? What we are asking for here is that the matter is so important that it is necessary to have an investigation. Won't the govern-

ment agree to have an inquiry into these things?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has already been investigated very carefully.

MR. BROWNE: We want an impartial investigation into the whole transaction. The government spent over a million dollars in the construction of this plant and I have heard it stated that the government is losing \$25,000 a month over it. Now it is not private interest. I don't think the Premier nor his government had a mandate from the people of Newfoundland to spend money like that. I have been informed of other companies. I believe the Atlantic Hardboards is one of which the Honourable the member for Green Bay is a director. I believe that company is producing more than it can sell, more than twice as much. And recent events at Harbour Grace in connection with Gold Sail Leather and Koch Shoe Limited demand attention. My colleague and leader here on my left intends to deal with these two companies. But from the statements I have heard recently from high officials of both companies there is justification in the belief that fraud on a grand scale has been committed in connection with these industries. The people of this country were in a dangerous position, the credit of this country is at stake in connection with this transaction, and we are going to become a laughing-stock if we don't make some effort. We must not be carried away, and members on the opposite side have a responsibility to themselves far beyond their loyalty to the Premier, responsibility to the people, the whole people, not merely their own constituency but the whole people of the country, and must not be prepared merely to take his word for it, but have the thing investigated. I

don't take his word for it. I can't, it is too serious. I want an impartial public investigation.

We have headlines enough: "Fisheries Development"—"Christmas Message to the people of Newfoundland"—"I believe in Development of the Fisheries." What about the time he got a mandate from the people for industrial development? What about that? There is no mention of that, Mr. Speaker. "Jobs at Javelin 4,000—Press will give more facts" Let us hope so. But I am afraid that the Premier is using these things for red herring. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, there is a challenge to the government in all these statements that have been made. There is here a challenge to the members on the other side of the House, I think that we all must want to know the truth, we all must, the backbenchers, the men on the front benches, we all must know the truth as to what is the exact state of affairs, and if the statements given by the Premier or any officials of the government are sound and sensible we will accept them and be delighted to hear them if there is a true and correct answer to this, and if there is no need for an impartial investigation. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the honourable and learned member for St. John's East, that the following words be added to the Address in Reply:

"We respectfully suggest in Your Honour that in view of the conviction of the former Director General of Economic Development, Dr. Alfred A. Valdmanis on a charge of fraudulently obtaining from the Newfoundland Government a large sum of money, during the construction of the Cement Plant, and in view of the grave allegations of further and more far-reaching fraudulent and dishonest misconduct

on the part of the promoters of several of the new industries, and in view of the great financial loss Newfoundland has sustained up to date and is likely to continue to sustain by incompetent management and otherwise, it is absolutely imperative, if the credit of Newfoundland is to be preserved, that a Royal Commission, presided over by a Judge of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, should be immediately set up to make a thorough investigation into the methods used to establish the new industries, including the negotiation of contracts for the purchase of building sites, the purchase, importation, supply and evaluation of machinery, building materials, raw materials and equipment needed for the erection and subsequent operation of the plants and factories of the said industries, and into the operation of the said factories and plants and sale of their products, and generally an examination into the present financial structure of the said industries."

MR. SPEAKER: This amendment offered by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West, seconded by the honourable member for St. John's East constitutes a vote of non-confidence: Any honourable member speaking from now on will be speaking to that amendment and not to the main question. However a debate on an amendment must be relevant thereto. The honourable member who has signified his seconding the motion by nodding his head has not forfeited his right to speak to the main question (however, if he speaks to the amendment he will be speaking to the main question.

MR. HOLLET: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate providing I don't lose my right to speak to the question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No—No adjournment.

MR. HOLLETT: I move it, any way.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The debate goes on, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why the debate should not continue.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no motion before the Chair other than this amendment of non-confidence. Does any other gentleman wish to speak to this motion, otherwise I shall put the question of the amendment.

MR. J. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I am afraid I am a little bit hazy as to what Your Honour said.

MR. SPEAKER: If you speak now you are speaking to the main question. If no honourable member wishes to speak I shall put the question on the vote of non-confidence.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to speak this afternoon because I have a very bad cold and I am afraid my voice is not going to last for too long.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I did not know the honourable gentleman has a cold, and I don't think any one in the House would wish to impose on him the burden of speaking if his voice is not in good condition for the purpose. I would think, therefore, that it might be agreeable to the House if we did adjourn the debate, if the next speaker in it is to be my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, and his voice is not quite right for speaking. In that case I feel we would all wish to adjourn the debate, then meet to-night, rise at 6:00 o'clock and come back at 8:00 o'clock and go on with the ordinary business on the Order

Paper, so that we leave tomorrow afternoon free again for debate on the Address in Reply, in the hope that my honourable friend's voice may be suitable then to enable him to speak, or if not, then perhaps some other member of his party.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the remarks which the Honourable the Premier has made. So if the House is agreed and with your consent, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion the debate was then adjourned.

Second Reading of Bill, An Act Respecting the Fisheries Assistance Fund.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister the other day if he would defer this. I still am not in a position, unfortunately, time has not permitted us to deal with this matter, and I would ask, if he would not be agreeable to defer it again, as it is a rather important matter.

Debate on second reading of this Bill deferred.

Second Reading of Bill: 'An Act to Provide for the Protection of Justices and Other Public Authorities.'

MR. CURTIS: I beg, Mr. Speaker, to move the second reading of this Bill, which is a Bill to provide protection for Justices and other Public Authorities. During the past year, Mr. Speaker, the need for an Act to provide for the Protection of Justices became apparent, when a party took action against a magistrate in respect of his conviction by the magistrate, for drunken driving and the suspension of his license.

MR. HIGGINS: In Grand Falls.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in that case the action was outlawed by virtue of the provisions of the Criminal Code, and also the judgement of the Supreme Court trying the case. There was an inherent power for the Supreme Court to stay the proceedings and the statement of charge was stricken out. However, if the case had been different some difficulty might have been met because at the present time there is no statute for the protection of justices. Section 5 of Chapter 95 of the Consolidated Statutes, 3rd Series provides in part that the English Act of 1844 designed for the protection of justices, Victoria, Chapter 44, entitled "An Act to Provide Justices of the Peace from vexatious actions for acts done by them in execution of their office" should extend to Newfoundland. However, the whole of the said Chapter 95 was repealed by 14 George VI, Cap. 12 of the Statutes of Canada which provided for bringing the Criminal Code and Criminal Evidence Act into force in Newfoundland. This Bill would apply provisions similar to those contained in the English Act as well as in the Acts of British Columbia and Nova Scotia, the terms practically the same as were in existence prior to the repeal of this Act in 1950 when the Criminal Code came in force here. Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the previous one has been repealed, as the Honourable the Attorney General states, by the Parliament of Canada, then something else must be found to take its place. It would not do for Justices to administer laws if they did not have a certain amount of protection. I have only looked at the Bill casually, and presume if there is any

comment to be made on this particular section of it, it will be done in committee.

I note in connection with Section 5 that there is a provision that if the Justice has no jurisdiction and injures a person the person injured may maintain an action against him.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, there is no protection.

MR. BROWNE: If he has no jurisdiction then he may have an action brought against him. It is only as far as his jurisdiction that it is required that there should be malice intended against the justice. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, from a hasty examination (I suppose I should not admit that) we agree to second reading and will consider the matter more fully when it goes into committee.

On motion bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 of the clock I will leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock.

MONDAY, March 28, 1955.

NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

Mr. Courage in the Chair.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Fire Prevention Act."

On motion second reading of this Bill deferred.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Disabled Persons Act, 1954."

DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, this Bill is self-explanatory. It is designed to Amend the Disabled Persons Act 1954, which, as the House knows, is the subject of a Dominion-Provincial agreement which makes possible allowances to disabled persons and is expected to come into force on the 1st of April 1955.

This amendment is not one of considerable substance, but it is one which is normally part of an Act of this kind. It provides that where any allowance is received by a person under this Act through misrepresentation or fraud certain steps are to be taken to recover the amount so overpaid.

"Where by reason of misrepresentation or fraud an allowance is paid under this Act to a recipient, the amount so paid is from the date of the payment thereof a debt due by the recipient or by his estate, if he is dead, to Her Majesty in right of Newfoundland."

The clause I just quoted is normal, I say, as an amendment to a Bill of this kind and generally all these amendments proposed are designed to cover situations where individuals receive payments under the Statutes wrongfully.

The amendment, Sir, I contend, is not contentious, and I move the second reading.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the honourable minister has said in regard to this new provision which is to be inserted. There is only one thing new to me, perhaps he can tell me whether it is new or not when he replies, i.e., Section 11B. That is where a person has obtained an allowance through mis-

representation or fraud the recipient of his estate is or is about to become entitled to any property, the officer may by registered letter demand that the person indebted or about to become indebted or who has the custody or control of the property pay over or transfer the money or property to the Board on account of any debt due by the recipient or his estate under Section 11A. The note at the side says "Attachment of property deliverable to recipient." It seems a strange way to attach property, by merely sending a registered letter and demand the person transfer the money or property to the Board. It seems to me to be a new provision, but I may be open to correction on that particular clause. Probably the minister, when he replies, will tell us if these clauses were copied from some similar legislation, and if a clause similar to that is in effect in regard to any other social assistance given by the government.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, the same point has occurred to me. That clause 11B seems to me to be in conflict with 11D which provides for the recovery of any debt under 11A or 11B by ordinary process of law. I was wondering, as my honourable colleague from St. John's West was, whether this is some new method of attachment, which, so to speak, short-circuits the ordinary process of the court?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I think more or less the same remarks apply to 11C even if a disabled person died and left a will it appears the Board can go beyond that and get it administered over and above — I wonder if the Attorney General could give us any idea on that? There is nothing wrong with the principle generally.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, I hazard the view that probably all other points which the Opposition members have raised might very well be settled in committee, because I think there is no variation in principle here from the others on which this is moulded, the Old Age Assistance Act and the Blind Persons Act. The officer designated there would be the Chairman of the Board. Where it indicates below that "he may demand" that is all it is. I take it that due process of the law would follow where that demand is not carried out.

The side note in clause 11B, clause 1 does not seem to be consistent with the substance of the provisions. That is why I say all the points raised relative to this might be dealt with without prejudice in Committee of the Whole.

On motion Bill read a second time. Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Fire Prevention Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill which is a Bill to Amend the Fire Prevention Act. Actually Mr. Speaker, the Bill is not very important, it just improves the wording of the Act. At the present time there are two sections that deal with inquiries into fire, section 5 and section 20, and the object of this amendment is to just make these two sections read so that this would be more clearly understood.

For instance the amendment now to section 5 gives the fire commissioner power to investigate, the cause, origin, extent and circumstances of fires in such areas as may be prescribed by the Minister, and hold inquiries under section 21. Now the

original section just read that the fire marshal or commissioner may investigate and hold inquiries into the cause is really just a re-wording which improves the section and makes it work better with section 21.

Section 21 is amended to fit in with the amendment to section 5.

Section 5 of the Bill gives the Lieutenant-Governor in Council power, instead of adopting a long Code verbatim, to adopt a Code as a Code by naming the Code. These Codes are well known and well recognized. The idea of this Code the Lieutenant-Governor in Council will be able to adopt is the St. John's Building Code, the St. John's Electrical Code.

MR. HIGGINS: We have not got one. It is Utopian.

MR. CURTIS: But the Canadian Code or American Code or some other, just by name, either in whole or in part. The only object of this section is to enable them to do it by description and by reference rather than by wording, stating it word for word.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, there is just one question which the Minister can no doubt clear up very quickly. When the word "Inquiries" is used—"The Commissioner shall investigate the cause etc. and hold inquiries"—is it contemplated he will take over the duties presently performed by magistrates of holding inquiries and calling witnesses and examining them under oath? Will that dispose of the magistrates altogether? That seems to be the only new thing there.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot see the purpose of that first

amendment, section 5 already reads—
 "The Fire Commissioner shall under the direction of the Minister investigate and hold inquiries respecting the cause, origin, extent and circumstances of fires in such areas as may be prescribed by the Minister."

Now the new amendment, there the only addition that I see is to hold inquiries respecting fires under Section 21. But what difference does it make what section he is holding inquiries under, if he is given general power under section 5. Why bring in now that the fire marshal shall investigate the cause, origin and extent and circumstances of fires in such areas as may be prescribed and hold inquiries etc. under section 21? Probably I missed the point when I looked at it first. It seems previously he had a duty to investigate and hold inquiries but now he can, and the only time he had power to hold inquiries is under section 21.

Section 21 has also been amended. The first section has been repealed. I cannot say that it makes the matter very clear, I take it last year when this Bill was introduced first, before it became law, that very wide powers were being given to the Fire Commissioner and examination now shows that he was given very wide powers. Well it seems to me that putting in the words "Subject to the approval of the Minister" does not seem to make very much difference there. I take it he is going to get his information through the police. It has got to come through the police, and a great deal of his information will come through in reports through the Department of the Attorney General. I don't know whether they will be routed direct to him or not.

MR. CURTIS: Under section 20.

MR. BROWNE: "Any report required to be made under this section shall be mailed or delivered to the Fire Commissioner within ten days after the occurrence of the fire or within such longer period as the Fire Commissioner may prescribe." It is hard to understand what that means: A fire takes place and a report has to be sent in. Here in St. John's he could telephone the Fire Commissioner, and say, Mr. Ryan, we just got word there has been a fire at so and so, but we are not in a position to give you any report on it for another fortnight, can we have an extension, and under this new section he would be entitled to that. The adjuster must also forward a report in writing to the Fire Commissioner, and every person sustaining loss, so that there are three people making reports now, the insurance company, the adjuster and the person who sustains loss, and it provides that report has to be done within ten days. I don't know that there is very much difference, and I don't see much point in bringing in an amendment, such as we have here. I am sure it would not make much difference whether it were introduced or not. I would have liked to have heard from the Attorney General the reason for bringing in the Bill to make such refined amendments. I think he will admit they are refined, and as far as his remarks show we can be justified in saying so. Perhaps he could tell us something more when he replies.

Now the more serious part of this Bill is in the last section, because now we have a new section, although it is supposed to be an addition to section 24 of the Act. Section 24 deals with the question of regulations, and there is a string of regulations, 14 of them, dealing with various matters; and

in addition to that a Code may be adopted. I think that is a good thing to have that provision here, that the electric Code or some standard should be introduced and from time to time as these Codes or rules are varied and amended in the places where they are adopted, I presume that we would keep in touch with them and bring them in here. I think perhaps my learned friends here on my left would tell us this: Here in the city of St. John's there are two Codes, I think, one the British Code and the other the Canadian Code.

MR. HIGGINS: We won't go into that—There is a third Code.

MR. BROWNE: When the Minister is replying he might refer to the reason why these amendments are introduced.

MR. CURTIS: It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to reply at any length now to the points raised by my honourable and learned friends. I will say in reply to the honourable member for St. John's East, if he remembers correctly, I think last session we adopted legislation making it unnecessary for magistrates to hold inquiries into fires unless particularly requested to do so. Now it is our intention to have these inquiries made by the Fire Commissioner as and when it is suitable, and in districts where he cannot visit, or it is inconvenient for him to visit, we will, of course, ask the magistrate to hold inquiries just as we have been doing.

I will be able to deal more fully with my honourable friend, the Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's West, when the bill goes into committee. Actually the principle of the bill is admitted. There is nothing controversial in it. It is purely a refinement in the wording, and I think

if he or I, or either of us, would take time to just study the amendment and read it with the bill we would see there is nothing really serious in it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the bill.

On motion bill read a second time—ordered referred to a Committee of the whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue and Audit Act."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I think with your consent we could defer that one, and go on to No. 14 on the Order Paper.

Motion on second reading of bill deferred.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting the Coming into Force of the Civil Service Commission Act, 1953."

HON. G. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Civil Service Commission Act 1953 was brought into force on the 1st of July 1953 by proclamation and this proclamation was made on the 4th of July. In actual fact the proclamation should have been dated earlier than the date of the coming into force of the Act. This Bill is designed to remove any doubts as to when the Act came into force. I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I must say I did not follow what the honourable gentleman said. I assume what he meant was that the date of the publication was inconsistent with the date mentioned in the proclamation in the Newfoundland Gazette.

MR. POWER: The Bill is designed to remove any doubt as to when the Act came into force.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member speaks he closes the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't close the debate—Hang her down—this is heavy stuff.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I might perhaps help the situation by explaining that this was a bill which was to come in by proclamation and instead of the proclamation being issued before July 1st it was issued July 4th, four days after, and the question arose as to whether or not it would be correct to bring in an Act by proclamation retroactively. So the purpose of this is to make it absolutely clear that the Bill has come into force.

On motion bill read a second time—ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949."

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Government is requested each year by the Department of Finance at Ottawa to amend our Corporation Income Tax Act to bring it into conformity with any changes they had made there. There was a change in the Federal Act in 1954 and this corresponding amendment in our Act is set forth in the attached bill, because of the tax rental agreement we must fall in line with their income tax act.

On motion bill read a second time—ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act."

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to set certain sales within the ambit of this

Act, even though the tax had been paid on such goods when it was sold. It also brings certain regulations with the Act. This was thought to be preferable after our two or three years of experience, and also because of the fact that the Social Assistance Division is on Water Street, and the Department of Finance on Harvey Road, and as the Deputy Minister of Finance is in charge of the Administration of the Act, with regard to getting advice from the Deputy Minister to the people on Water Street there is a lot of delay. So we decided to delegate the powers of the Deputy Minister to the officer in charge down there, Mr. Bearns, and that is what this Act is proposing to do.

Another point is that the minimum fine is \$25 instead of \$200. The magistrates were hesitant to impose such a heavy fine and usually handed down a suspended sentence. Now we are asking to have the minimum \$25.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I feel sure the honourable minister must appreciate the difficulty of our giving any careful consideration to bills of this kind when matters are being pressed forward so intensely by the Premier. This is an important bill. Although I have only had a chance to glance at it, I think there are some new provisions here that deserve greater consideration in principle than we are able to give it without some little time to study it. I notice here one clause, Clause "1". "By inserting immediately after subsection (2) as subsection (2A) the following: "(2A) Where tangible personal property on which the assessment was paid at the time of purchase is returned to or repossessed by the vendor a refund

of such assessment proportionate to the amount of the purchase price which is refunded or credited to the purchaser shall be made or taken within one year from the date of the purchase."

and

"(8) When a person undertakes the construction or repair or improvement of real property on a lump sum or fixed price or unit price contract basis he is deemed to be the consumer of the tangible personal property consumed or used in such undertaking and is subject to assessment on all such property."

and

"(9) When a person undertakes the construction or repair or improvement of real property on a time and material or cost plus basis he is deemed to be a vendor of all the tangible personal property included in such undertaking and as such shall be registered and shall collect assessment in respect of such property on the basis of the price at which he invoices it to his customer."

Now, I wonder if that means that every carpenter who undertakes a job of repair on a house, even though the smallest kind of a job, whether he is to make a cupboard or to do some minor work, if he has to register with the Department and then collect an assessment in respect of the property on the basis of the price at which he invoices to his customer. In a case like that I don't think he invoices to his customer because he will charge on a time basis, and pay the social security assessment when he buys the stock, and then the customer will have to pay it. When a person undertakes construction or repairs on a time or material or cost-plus basis he is deemed to be a vendor. Now I cannot

understand how far—when the minister is replying, I wonder whether he would tell us whether he has given consideration to the question of how far that is to go in regard to personal property. If a person gets a chair repaired, I take it the material that goes into it may be taxed, but I am at a loss to understand what else, surely not the time he spent—he is being paid by the hour. Surely it is not intended to charge for labour, I understood labour was exempted from the Social Security Assessment and it was only on materials used. But it would look as though under this subsection something new has been added.

Regarding the question of fines: I think we drew attention last year emphatically to the question of fines that were being imposed. I did oppose it when it was introduced last year. However, it is certainly a good thing and we cannot oppose it, in fact we are in favour of the reduction. It must be remembered that a lot of people who do not pay, and are therefore liable to prosecution, and on conviction to punishment, are small shopkeepers and small tradesmen and it certainly would beggar them if they had to pay a fine of \$200. So I must compliment the government on its merciful attitude in this respect, in making this amendment to reduce the fine.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, if the honourable gentleman would do the same on occasions, and show a merciful attitude.

MR. BROWNE: The honourable gentleman who asks that is not showing very much mercy to us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I mean a little mercy on our eardrums.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the

Minister, when he is replying, will be able to explain, I feel quite sure, the provision to which I have drawn attention in section (b).

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I am quite in accordance with the congratulations being showered on the Minister for reducing the fines. But with respect to section 7, (section 32 of the Original Act) I would direct the attention of the Attorney General to what would appear to be somewhat of a contradiction in practice. In the new amendment to the Criminal Code which comes into effect on the first of April, the Honourable the Attorney General is as familiar as I am with the fact that, under section 1081 for certain offences the magistrate's jurisdiction to impose suspended sentence was contingent upon the consent of the counsel representing the Crown. After due consideration the Committee went into that matter and recommended to the Federal Parliament, and the Federal Parliament adopted their suggestion that there be now no restriction on the right of discretion of magistrates. It seems to me a curious contradiction if the Federal Government in the Criminal Code sees fit to extend the jurisdiction we here, on a matter which might conceivably be a matter involving 60c. or so from some unfortunate old woman who had not collected some coppers from a customer, should say the magistrate must fine her \$25. It seems strange to me and I would appreciate the comments certainly of the Attorney General on this. Why must there be any limitation on the discretion of the magistrate? Why must we insist there be a set amount? Surely we must have some confidence in the discretion of people whom the government appoint as magistrates.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, the fact that I am in the midst of celebrated lawyers makes me hesitate to get up very often, but there is one point which strikes me as being off the track and is probably in the old Act too—When a person undertakes the construction or repair or improvement of real property on a time and material or cost plus basis he is deemed to be a vendor and is liable to the tax. To me that seems to be a ridiculous sort of principle. Even when a person is spending money in order to repair real property and making it more presentable he would be taxed under this Social Security Assessment Act. I may be all wet on this, but it strikes me as being a bit incongruous. For instance I have a house on any street here in town and want to get it repaired. I suppose painting would amount to the same thing although it does not say painting there, but I am taxed three per cent on such repairs. It seems to me a bit ridiculous. This is one of the principles in this thing anyway but I am certainly opposed to it. It would tend to keep people from repairing their premises. I may be wrong, but if that is the principle I am opposed to it very much.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I think my honourable friend has misinterpreted the Act. It stands to reason, if we have a social security tax people have to pay it. The object is just to determine just who is to pay and when. If you buy the material and a carpenter puts it in place you pay the S.S.A. when you buy the lumber or nails or whatever you use. If, on the other hand, he buys the material this just sets out how it is paid. I think if my honourable friends would just take time to read the Act.

MR. BROWNE: When are we going to get the time?

MR. CURTIS: You had it since last Thursday. Mr. Speaker, I must say I would agree with my honourable friends opposite and make a stand against such legislation if the points involved in any way were serious. But, Mr. Speaker, these are purely small and minor and not very contentions changes, nor of much consequences. All the amendments on the Order Paper are like that. It may look like a lot of business twenty-five Bills, but they are just normal amendments which my honourable friends on the Opposition, if they wanted to, could read and digest in an hour. I have no doubt, even the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: Are you speaking to the principle?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, I am. Now Mr. Speaker, with regard to the fines: We find that the magistrates are too kind, too inclined to suspend judgement, and I notice one of my honourable friends opposite who is always asking them to suspend judgement—I hear over the air he does it. This is to stop that nonsense. If a man breaks the law in this case he has got to pay the fine. The fine is not large. It is only \$25. But in a criminal case, and I think my honourable friend will appreciate the difference, there may be a jail term involved and the magistrate rather than send a man to jail says: "Well, in this case I will suspend sentence." But when it is a fine that is due because a person has broken the law, the government must take a serious view of collecting taxes. If we find that a man is not paying his taxes and we have to bring him to court he jolly well should be

fined, and why should we be too lenient towards him—he usually can pay the lawyer that defends him. We think he ought to pay us that money.

However the Act is a minor one really and there is nothing contentious about it. As long as we have the tax I think people will admit we must collect it. The magistrates would not impose the \$200 fine as they thought it a bit stiff, but a fine of \$25 is not unreasonable, and if a person violates an Act intentionally, well \$25 is a small amount of punishment, and the magistrates from now on will have to impose the fine.

On motion Bill read a second time ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act."

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, some difficulty has been experienced by the apprenticeship branch of my Department in endeavouring to identify apprentices as to transient employees. At a meeting of the Board they made a recommendation, after carefully considering the matter, and recommended that the Apprenticeship Act be amended so that apprentices may be indentured to a permanent corporation such as a union for instance which could obtain some continuity of appointment for apprentices. That is the reason for adding this clause to the former section of the Act.

There is nothing contentious about it, and I move the second reading of the Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time—Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of the Bill, "An Act Respecting the Preservation of Historic Objects."

HON. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this is a piece of legislation, I think, long overdue. It has to do, as can be seen from the Bill, with objects of historical nature and historical objects. From time to time archaeologists and conceivably branches of learning have come down to Newfoundland and conceivably find objects of real value to Newfoundland, particularly as we are in fact about to reinstate our museum. As things are at the present time there is nothing to prevent anybody from removing such objects like the cannons at Ferryland, Signal Hill and Castle Hill. There is no legislation to prevent these from mutilation or destruction. This Bill gives the Minister some power either to acquire such objects or prevent them from mutilation or destruction or to protect local historic objects from being removed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is nothing personal in this.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to what the honourable Minister had to say and I was expecting he would give us some illustration of the objects which have been removed in the past. I take it he is aware of some of those, and the Bill would not be introduced if it were not so.

I notice an object of an archaeological nature means an object found in or forming part of the soil, which was or shows evidence that it was constructed, shaped, erected, inscribed or otherwise produced or modified by man earlier than the year 1900 and the remains of any race of human beings or animals now extinct in New-

foundland. I suppose any of us who came on earth before 1900 are historic objects by this time.

There were two objects which I know were removed from this country, one was the famous Basque Stone at Placentia which was in the Protestant graveyard, a famous stone supposed to go back to the 16th century which was taken away from the churchyard. That was a great loss. And I believe some archaeologist came down here and discovered eggs of the Great Auk. The Great Auk is now extinct. It was once found, I believe, in many thousands on the "Funks" where they used to be slaughtered by the thousands by the fishermen and used for burning. Anyhow they were wiped out. This archaeologist discovered the eggs and took them away, when they should have been brought to the museum and preserved there because they were unique.

I am glad to see the Minister has given such attention to the preservation of historic objects. While we are on the subject, he mentioned the museum. He might have taken advantage of this occasion to tell us something about when the museum is likely to be opened. They have been five years working on the museum now and it is not open yet. The Minister might also tell us something about his success in obtaining the services of the British museum expert coming out here, when he is coming, how long his contract is going to be for, what he is going to do, and if it is going to cost very much. I don't think there is much use in having a museum if it is not going to be open some time. Even if it is only a small museum the children should be allowed to see it. There is not much use in preserving historic objects if they are going to be kept in secrecy. So I sug-

gest to the Minister that he would try and expedite the opening of the museum.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, in reply I might say the Bill is designed to protect the sort of objects he has in view, Basque Stones and eggs of the Great Auk. It could conceivably arise, we could discover something belonging to the ancient Vikings, which as you know would be of unique value not only to Newfoundland but of world wide interest. I think it is in our interest to enact legislation to keep these things here in Newfoundland.

With regard to the museum, we have been able to get in touch with the keeper of "Ethnography" at the British Museum, a most distinguished man, eminent in ethnology, in fact considered an authority. He has under his care at the museum something like eight hundred thousand exhibits. We have arranged for him to come out on a purely cost basis, just travelling expenses. The keeper of the museum, Sir Thomas Kendrick, has been kind enough to give him permission, and no fees will be charged—just his travelling expenses. At the moment he is engaged on a television show in England called "Animal, Vegetable and Mineral."

MR. BROWNE: "Twenty questions?"

MR. MURRAY: No. This is a different thing. They get various things from different experts and show some sort of historical object and question what it is. It is amazing how they put their finger on exactly what it is. It is a very popular show at the moment. It will finish on the 25th of April—His name is Mr. Adrian Digby. He will come as a consultant with the curator and various people around St.

John's who are interested. He is to submit a report.

On motion Bill read a second time—ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the School Attendance Act."

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this bill. The present Act sets forth "... all children under ten years of age who live one and a half miles from a school of its denomination, and a child of any age living more than two miles from any school..." The government has now approved the policy of the setting up of regional high schools and central high schools, and buses may be used to bring children perhaps ten or fifteen miles. This amendment is therefore necessary so that the School Attendance Act should apply to children living a long distance from a regional high school or central high school who may be brought to school by bus.

I may say there are several of the regional high schools operating now under this system at the present time, and it is very successful.

On motion bill read a second time—ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act."

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, this Act as it presently stands, provides that any by-laws which the Newfoundland Teachers' Association make are subject to the approval of the Council of Education as well as to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Last year when this association became an incorporated body, it felt

it should be like other incorporated bodies and be subject only to the veto of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. This matter was brought to the attention of the Superintendents of Education and they agreed with this decision. Inasmuch as they agreed the teachers are not out to make an association of themselves for the betterment of the teaching profession, and they agreed the association should make their own by-laws, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

There is another amendment there which is also connected with a Bill coming along in a moment or so. At the present time the Secretary to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association is a pensioned teacher, but they are now asking permission, in case they should bring in a younger teacher who may only have ten or fifteen years in the teaching service as secretary, they asked that we would pass a Bill enabling them to give this younger teacher permission to continue as secretary of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and still be considered as a teacher, thereby holding his rights as a pensionable teacher. I think that is really necessary, Sir, if not, my personal belief and the belief of the government is that they will not get or retain a teacher to give up his profession and become secretary of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, unless his pension rights be carried on.

I move the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the only observation I would make, is that I cannot see any difference in the new law in Section 7 from the other one—Oh yes! "On recommendation of the Council" that is the difference. All right!

DR. POTTLE: They go direct to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

On motion bill read a second time—ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education (Teachers' Training) Act."

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, in this amendment, this year the government accepted in its entirety the brief put up by the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. It contained in its recommendations an increase in salaries which have already been granted, as well as the revoking of various teachers licenses. At the present time they have a group of teachers known as "C" License. The Newfoundland Teachers' Association believes that this grading is not worthy of a license, and they are asking the government, which we agreed to, in their belief, to call "C" Licenses "Probationary Licenses." In order to do this we want to have the probationers constituted as teachers so that they would be able to come under the Teachers' Pension Act. It is just a continuation of the Bill previous to bringing in the secretary of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and making him pensionable as though he were another teacher.

On motion Bill read a second time—ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, there are four or five amendments to this Act made necessary by experience and requests put forward

in the last year by the Federation of Municipalities.

The first one is merely the removal of some ambiguity in the wording of "Chairman" and "Mayor."

One of more serious importance is the adjustment of the term of office of new and existing councils to make possible the holding of a general election on the same date. This particular request was brought forward at the last annual meeting of the municipalities, and the government agreed with the procedure as put forth.

A second part of that section makes provision for appointing members to councils where the number of councillors fall below that required heretofore. It happens sometimes, or it may happen in case of resignations that the members remaining on the council are not sufficient to constitute a quorum and consequently before an election may take place there must be some machinery to carry on the business.

Section 5 provides that all the elections shall be held on the same date, every four years. Then there is another amendment which empowers the councils, if they require machinery, to rent mechanical equipment, if they wish to do so. It also gives them power to refer to the electorate when and if necessary, any proposals on which a plebiscite may be required.

Section 7 empowers the councils to restrict the class of persons who may be given, for instance, the right to ply taxis, i.e., gives them the same control over taxis and vehicles in their locality as the St. John's City Council exercises in St. John's at the present time. It also enables them to provide parking places and stands, and regulate trailers and trailer camps within their municipality.

Finally because of the repeal of all present Municipal Acts, section "A" becomes redundant and hence it is repealed.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, if I had known that this Bill was coming up tonight, I think I would have tried to get a few moments to prepare a few notes in connection with the Bill, A Bill to Amend the Local Government Act. As the Minister knows during the week I had something to do with the study of the Local Government Act, and I think it is the most complicated piece of business I have ever seen turned out by any legal department in this country. I hope it is clear to the ministers, it was extremely difficult to follow all the intricacies of the different amendments. The main statute was passed in 1940, in 1952 there was a revision, and then in 1953 an amendment and also in 1954 and now in 1955 an amendment. Does the minister really believe any municipality in the country is going to be able to follow all these conflicting amendments. Is it necessary year after year to introduce amendments to this legislation on such an extensive scale. Here we have eight pages of amendments tonight. Now I do not know how many people have given any consideration to this Bill—very likely a lot of it is only routine and not very important—but it seems to me to be very complicated. I notice here now—and this might mean anything either—perhaps the minister can correct me when replying—but the new section 5 deals with plebiscites—"Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the Council may order the holding of a plebiscite in the municipality controlled and managed by it for the purpose of determining the

views of the electors in the municipality on any matter and shall in any order made under the subsection (a) set the date of the holding of the plebiscite on any matter." Now that seems to me to have a very wide scope, when you can introduce any matter into a plebiscite. What is the purpose of giving them power to get the views of the electorate on any matter? Surely, it would be some matter in regard to the affairs of the municipality, and not on matters outside their jurisdiction. Perhaps such a matter as whether they should be allowed to have a beer tavern or whether a license should be given for the sale of hard liquor, would that be such a matter? If so then there is a conflict between the powers given now to municipalities under this amendment and powers given to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council under the Alcoholic Liquor Act. At the present time if any community has to hold a plebiscite they have to get a petition to the Lieutenant-Governor in regard to the sale of alcoholic liquors. This does seem to be a very much simpler form and perhaps might be more desirable. But I do wish to be clear on what we are going to decide—Whether we are going to give municipal councils power to decide on any matters. It seems that is too wide, and I would suggest when this matter comes up in Committee the minister should be prepared to limit the scope to which this plebiscite section may apply, so that it would be on matters with which the municipalities are more directly concerned than general matters.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am quite surprised to hear the honourable gentleman express surprise at the number and variety of amendments to this Bill that was passed back in 1940. If there is anything surprising

it is the fact that there have been so few amendments. I would be a little surprised to find that for the next half dozen years or more, any year, when there was not at least one amendment to this Bill. What we have to bear in mind is that local self-government is still almost totally brand new in Newfoundland. With the exception of the Municipality of St. John's the first local government in Newfoundland was the Town Council of Windsor, which was formed during the life of the Commission of Government. Since then it is true that some 35 or 40 or so of our 1300 communities in Newfoundland have become organized municipally in some form or another but it is still only a small number of places. The oldest of them, Windsor is not yet twenty years old. Compare that with the situation in almost any other part of North America, with the exception of little Prince Edward Island where local self-government is almost as rare as it is here in Newfoundland. In all other parts of Canada and throughout the United States municipal government, local self-government came in with the beginning of settlement. It was brought in to North America direct from England and they have had it ever since. We are just beginning to get it. It has got to start as a process of trial and error. We have got to find out by doing, how municipal self-government will work in Newfoundland. The more councils there are, and the longer these councils operate, the more experience they will get, the more experience our department of Municipal Affairs will get, the more experience the Federation of Municipalities will get, and between the three of us, the councils, the government and the provincial or professional body of municipalities, the more experience we get

the more amendments will have to be written. There is nothing surprising, there is not anything unusual about it, it is very practical, very simple. I expect to see amendments year by year to this municipal bill for quite a few years to come. I would hope, in fact, I can well imagine, amendments being made this year and repealed in a year or two as they are found not to be practical. I would hope that in the course of time we would have built up here on this island a system in local self-government which does not exist today.

MR. BROWNE: Could I ask the honourable gentleman if he is aware that the town councils do not know the law as it exists today on certain matters because of the complications of the legislation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not surprised to hear that at all. I should imagine there are a great many people in Newfoundland who do not know the law on this, that and the other thing directly affecting them most intimately. I would say, I would hope that in the course of time in Newfoundland we will have built up here a wide body of knowledge, a wide body of experience in the art of local self-government. As we do, and as we get more and more decentralized agents of government out around amongst the people, and more and more of our people get that special training in the art of self-government at the local level I believe the result will be seen here in this Chamber, in this very room, in a higher standard of knowledge of the problems of government in Newfoundland.

I had no intention of speaking to this subject except that I was drawn to my feet by the rather surprising remarks of the honourable gentleman

who seems to have forgotten altogether that local self-government in Newfoundland is so new that it is still wet behind the ears, and that the government is so new in dealing with these problems that it too is wet behind the ears in this particular matter and I admit it quite frankly. On the other hand we are learning, and we are progressing and Newfoundland is definitely moving forward steadily in the field of, and in the art of local self-government.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure, of course, whether the members of the opposite side of the House are wet behind the ears or whether they have water on the brain, they might have either. I should think this section is a very convenient one for the Premier: "Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the Council may order the holding of a plebiscite in the Municipality controlled and managed by it for the purpose of determining the view of the electors in the Municipality on any matter and shall in any order under this sub-section— . . ."

I was wondering if the telegram which he received from the district of White Bay from various local councils and municipalities, whether they had a plebiscite before they wired the Premier to come down and represent them in the next election. I wonder if the Premier held a plebiscite of members to find out whether it is correct to hold a press release and put on all the radios in St. John's they were calling for a man of this—

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think that has to do with the matter.

MR. HOLLETT: It has to do with municipal councils, Sir. I don't see why the Departments of the Government or the ministerial officers must

have the right to do as was done today on the air—that was in connection with municipal councils. I believe messages came in from various places in White Bay from councils and so forth making or asking the Premier to go down there next election, and he immediately made a press release.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Jealousy will not get you anywhere.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't call that jealousy but tomfoolery on your part. I see nothing wrong with the bill.

DR. POTTLE: I just want to make a brief remark to underline what the Honourable the Premier said a moment ago. As we very well know, one of the principal developments taking place in Newfoundland in the last two years has been the expansion of local government. I think we should look at this whole question without any feeling of, (shall I say) partisanship. Now the reason why there are so many amendments has been explained. After all we had already such a term as "Town Councils" which involves a larger body of people in a concentrated area and Rural District Boards of Trustees right down to the lowest, the smallest possible organization in a municipal area. Now as long as that is taking place we must certainly expect amendments to the original statutes. It seems the Opposition has criticized us because we are doing so much by regulations and thereby taking the power away from the House. This bill goes in the other direction by spelling out the legislation instead of asking the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to make certain regulations—prescribing a dozen different things the powers are here set out, as under Clause 7 for instance, which provides a variety of responsibilities. So that, as I say, this bill does take the place

of a great many regulations for which we have been sometimes criticized by the Opposition. Now I will say further: If we wish to have one notable example of an Act which has been amended over and over again, possibly the best example of all is the St. John's Municipal Act, the oldest municipal Act in the province, dating back from 1925. There is scarcely a session but that we are asked to amend the St. John's Municipal Act, and I am quite sure the honourable member for St. John's West will bear with me in what I say. I say this lastly, Sir: Here is the best example of what I am speaking about— Now in answer to the Honourable Member for St. John's West who says the people who belong to town councils, the members of town councils are possibly most puzzled and perplexed because of the variety of legislation. Well, there is nothing to prevent the Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply from doing what possibly the St. John's Municipal Council has done, for all I know, consolidating, unofficially—I am not suggesting this to the department, but it can be done in an office consultation pending the legal consolidation, for the benefit of members at large.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, if I may add just a word or two to what has been said in reply to the honourable member for St. John's West—May I point out not only are we dealing with a body which in 1949 had ten bodies and today has thirty-five, which naturally shows not only growth but growth along lines for which we have no exact pattern because our own pattern for local government here in Newfoundland, for local government, is not exactly the same as on the mainland or in the British Isles, and it is being worked out as it were because of our own peculiar local situation. I

can appreciate the difficulty referred to by my honourable friend, the member for St. John's West. He has to bear in mind that certain regulations under municipal government conflict with regulations made by two other departments of government, health and public works. During the short period of five or six years these conflicts are not going to be ironed out. On the other hand this must be said: I believe during the past six years in which we have had local government our councillors in the main have taken an intelligent and keen interest in the growth of local self-government within their municipalities. It is because they have taken such an interest in these local affairs that we have had to come here year after year asking for certain amendments, made necessary in the light of their experience in that five or six year period. As my honourable colleague, the Minister of Public Welfare, has said, if we look at the charter of St. John's for a period longer than he has mentioned, and we note the amendments that have come in here regularly year by year, we can see very well that for many years to come we shall have to come back here, in the light of our experience, and ask for amendments to the Local Government Act.

There has been some sort of a consolidation, but in a growing concern, as soon as consolidations of the past have been effected we immediately find amendments necessary even to that consolidation, and that is what is happening at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the bill.

On motion Bill read a second time—ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act."

M^R. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the Urban and Rural Planning Act are designed to empower the Provincial Planning Board to provide planning for any new municipal area in which it may be necessary to have a plan, in exactly the same manner as the Board is empowered to provide a plan, on request, for municipal areas. Further it empowers the Board to enact the necessary regulations to implement that plan.

It further empowers the Board to make reservations where a plan may not be required, in order to exercise adequate controls.

We had different instances during the last two or three years where sections along the highway and immediately adjoining certain municipal areas, at the request of certain parties, have come to our department asking for some provisions or regulations in order to take care of the prevention of the erection of shacks or something along that nature. So that the law as amended in this particular Bill allows the Board to make such regulations or provision as may prevent the desecration of the highway in any particular area.

M^R. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the honourable minister is referring to when he says the highway. I presume he means the Topsail Highway, because all the roads upon which the public may drive or walk are called highways under the Public Highways Act. I am not sure what he is referring to, but I do understand it is the main highway, say the road around Conception Bay and on the Portugal Cove Road. These

two at least are areas where the Department over which he presides has recently, I believe, indicated that they intend to put up prohibitions. The minister has a chance to answer this, and perhaps could be a little more specific when replying, as to whether this advisory council proposes to act, and to what extent it proposes to act. Because I think the public should be informed as to what is going to be done under a bill of this kind. It is not just brought in to round out the Act or something like that but for some specific purpose, I think the Minister should be specific in describing it, and perhaps should indicate specifically whether the Board intends to work and what it intends to do.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, may I add that it would be impossible to be specific, that is as to what particular localities would be affected by this legislation, because, although we may be aware of two or three places today where such regulations or prohibitions are necessary yet no one can foresee what may be necessary tomorrow. When I referred to highways I was thinking particularly of the Trans-Canada Highway, but there are several instances apart from that where regulations may be necessary or even prohibitions forbidding building altogether. For instance, during the past year we received two or three complaints about land adjoining Seal Cove Barrons, yet had no provisions under the Act whereby we could stop building in that particular area. Now it does not refer to regulations already in existence nor are they appropriate to St. John's. That is already taken care of. If I may mention another one: Some three or four months ago we had an application from a municipal area on the west coast asking us

to apply prohibitions to an area contiguous to an area of one of the municipalities there.

Now for the purpose of protecting the scenic highway, if you like, and for the purpose of trying to keep the vista as attractive as possible, it may be necessary here, there and elsewhere either to regulate the kind of building that is allowed to be put up and the distance from the highway and it may be necessary in other places to prohibit building at all and maintain it as a particular beauty spot. I cannot be any more specific than that—the Act must be of general application.

On motion bill read a second time—ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

First Readings:

A Bill 'An Act to Amend the Education (Teacher' Training) Act.' On motion read a first time. Ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Interpretation Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Committee of the Whole on Sundry Bills:

Mr. Morgan Chairman of Committee:

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Fisheries Loan Act."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I think that now we are going into this, the Minister who introduced it ought to give us some information as to the nature of the contract that is going to be made. I imagine that is all cut and dried and the individual concerned is probably operating and has been for some time, and this is only

to give it legal form. So I think we should be advised as to what the government has done and what it wishes to legalize; how big are the salaries, what are the terms, how big is the pension? I suppose something in the nature of a contract has been made with the three members of the Fishery Development Authority—I wonder if the Minister could give us some idea of the amount of work this Fisheries Loan Board does with the Fisheries Development Authority, who I suppose only make big loans in the millions. The amount of work this Fisheries Loan Board has to do cannot be so very great from the figures that have been produced here last year. It looks to me like any lawyer's office, like the Attorney General or the honourable member for Harbour Main lends more money in a year than the three boards put together, without any charge to the government. I hope when the Minister gives an explanation he will answer these points that I have raised.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries & Co-operatives): Mr. Chairman, with regard to the terms of the contract of the present incumbents, no contract has yet been made. The present incumbent has been acting as chairman of the three boards since July of 1953. He has an understanding from the government that he shall have a contract for ten years at a salary of ten thousand dollars a year, and a provision for a pension for himself and his deputy. The present incumbent, before he was employed as chairman of the three boards, was a civil servant with the Department of Fisheries of Canada. The undertaking to him was that provision would be made in his contract so that he might enjoy the same pension rights as chairman of the three

loan boards as he would, had he continued with the government of Canada. The Chairman's pension is to be calculated according to a formula in effect for civil servants of the government of Canada. The average salary over the ten consecutive years multiplied by the years of service and divided by fifty. In the event of the incumbent predeceasing his wife then his widow receives, during her lifetime or until she marries again, one half of the pension that would be payable to the incumbent, and each child under eighteen years of age will receive, until he reaches that age, a pension of one-fifth of the widow's pension, up to a maximum of four children.

As to the amount of work of the board, unfortunately I do not have the figures with me at the moment. As a matter of fact the last available balance sheets, the House already has them, because, as I recollect, the House did not close last year until after these reports were presented to me, and I tabled them in the House.

MR. BROWNE: They are in the public accounts.

MR. KEOUGH: But speaking in general terms the work of the Board, that is the Fisheries Loan Board, is concerned principally with making loans to the fishermen to acquire boats and gear and equipment. It was naturally to be expected that during the first years of the Board their activity would not be very great. But the activity of the Board has been increasing rapidly. On inquiring recently I was told that last year the volume of loans had been doubled from the year before, and during the current year it is anticipated the volume of loans will be doubled again. As I said; it was anticipated at the

beginning the activity of the Board for a few years would not be great, but as more and more plants are beginning to be established around the island; and previous to the establishments of these plants fishermen did not have a great incentive to equip themselves with better boats and better gear, but as the plants are increasing in number an appreciable number of fishermen are beginning to equip themselves with such to prosecute the fisheries.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, what was the salary this gentleman received when in the civil service of Canada, and what salary is he receiving at the present time?

MR. KEOUGH: At the present time he receives ten thousand dollars a year.

MR. BROWNE: Without having it voted by the House?

MR. KEOUGH: I believe, as far as I know, there is authority in the Act itself for the Board to pay its chairman, and any person that it employs.

MR. BROWNE: In other words he pays himself ten thousand dollars a year. What does he want a contract for if he pays himself?

MR. KEOUGH: The salary of the members of the Board must be decided by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

MR. BROWNE: I asked a question there to which I did not get any answer—What salary was he getting in the civil service of Canada?

MR. KEOUGH: I am afraid I don't know.

MR. BROWNE: I am afraid it was not approaching the salary you

propose to give. It is a very large salary. It is the same or pretty close to the Attorney General's salary. It has not been explained here what particular qualifications he has. I believe the Premier was going to do it the other day, but for some reason or other he did not tell us the qualifications for such a high salary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think Mr. Chairman, this is all out of order. We passed this Bill in principle. We are now in Committee of the Whole.

MR. BROWNE: Surely it is not a matter of principle as to what the salary is to be, whether it is to be eight or ten thousand. You paid ten thousand in the beginning and now come in to legalize what you have been doing illegally.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not illegally.

MR. BROWNE: Under what authority?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Under the Act. Read it!

MR. BROWNE: The Premier knows the questions are pertinent. He read the Act. The Act says, "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council should designate one member to be Chairman of the Board to hold office," etc.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now read out where it actually—"We are in here," he says, "to legalize what we have done illegally." Now prove it. That is what gave us authority to do what we did, and therefore we did it legally.

MR. BROWNE: No, that is what you want to put into the Act. The Act as it stands says "the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall designate one member to be Chairman of

the Board. The amendments says: The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall designate one member to be Chairman of the Board to hold office upon such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council deems fit and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may enter into an agreement with the Chairman to have effect from a date either before or after signing thereof setting forth those terms and conditions and the Chairman shall hold and vacate office in accordance with his agreement." In other words this is going to be another of those retroactive agreements, and I take it, it is going back to sometime in July 1953, when I believe he took office.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How did we pay the salary of Mr. Baxter in the previous years, was that illegally?

MR. BROWNE: I don't know. You are looking for a contract for ten years now— if you do not need the authority from the House why ask for it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not me, it is Mr. Drover who sought the contract.

MR. BROWNE: The Minister tells us he is going to be employed on the same conditions as he was employed by the civil service of Canada, with the same pension rights and he tells us the average salary for ten years or the best salary for ten years, and I guess ten thousand dollars is as good as he can do, ten thousand dollars a year for ten years, multiplied by the number of years in the service, divided by fifty. He is a young man. Does the Minister know his age?

MR. KROUGH: I believe he is forty-two or forty-three.

MR. BROWNE: Well he is good for another twenty years in the Canadian Civil Service. That would be five thousand dollars a year pension. Now when he is deceased his widow will be entitled to receive half that pension. Of course I will agree that nobody can tell how long he is going to live nor how long his wife is going to live, but there is this one particular point—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—May I inquire what clause we are on. Are we going to debate the principle of this Bill all over again in Committee of the Whole? Is that customary in parliamentary practice?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was just going to remind the honourable member that no clause has been read as yet. I suggest we read the clauses, then the Minister will give his explanation as we go along.

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. (1) Section 4 of the Fisheries Loan Act, chapter 212 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, is amended by repeating sub-section (2) and substituting therefor the following as subsections (2) and (2A).

"(2) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall designate one member to be Chairman of the Board to hold office upon such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council deems fit and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may enter into an agreement with the Chairman to have effect from a date either before or after the signing thereof setting forth those terms and conditions and the Chairman shall hold and vacate office in accordance with his agreement.

(2A) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make regulations to provide for the establishment of a pension scheme for the Chairman or for his dependents or for both."

(2) The said section is further amended by repealing sub-section (3) and substituting therefor the following:

"(3) Subject to sub-section (2) the members of the Board shall be appointed for one year and are eligible for re-appointment."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there was one point I was going to ask about: Does the gentleman in question pay into funds the same as the civil service does in Canada? Because the pension scheme in Canada is contributory. In order to qualify for a pension, as outlined, a civil servant has to contribute 6% of his salary per annum. Will Mr. Drover have to contribute toward his pension, or is that going to be given to him without any contributions?

MR. KEOUGH: I am afraid what I said may have misled the honourable and learned gentleman. No, he does not make any contributions to a pension fund. When I said the pension provisions read into the contract for him would be the same as applied to him in the civil service of Canada I meant it would be equivalent as far as his pension went. But it is not contemplated that he shall make any contributions toward a pension fund.

MR. BROWNE: There is one question which nobody answered: What are Mr. Drover's qualifications for such a high salary?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the government's opinion ample.

MR. BROWNE: Could we be advised as to what his qualifications are?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We think they are ample. I have already told the House what his qualifications were. I did that, and I am not going to do it again.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think we got any information from the Premier as to his qualifications for the salary of ten thousand dollars a year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—Are we now asked to vote ten thousand dollars? Where is it?

MR. BROWNE: Right there—"to make a contract."

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the clause to make a contract. The terms of the contract would appear when the estimates are under debate. But the Minister has been kind enough to give an outline of them now in advance. That does not mean, according to my understanding of parliamentary practice, that a full-dress debate should now take place under the guise of this amendment to this Act. I think it is entirely out of order.

MR. BROWNE: I was merely asking the Premier to tell me what the qualifications of the gentleman were.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In its proper time and place, but not under this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: If we are going to have to go into it, it is just as well to answer now because it is going to be asked. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, something about this gentleman who is going to get the privilege of a ten year contract at ten thousand dollars a year and a pension for life and for his family. Why should he be treated any differently from any other civil servant. We have several thousand members of

the civil service and this gentleman has been picked out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—The principle of this Bill may not now be debated. It is unlawful to debate it now. This is only a Committee. The House itself adopted the principle. But the honourable gentleman will not accept that and insists on debating it all over again, unlawfully. I ask for a ruling, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I asked a question: What are the qualifications of the gentleman which entitled him to such a contract? That is the question I asked. Can not someone on the other side answer that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Honourable gentleman has already been answered. He is not going to be answered again. He is now trying to force me to give it again. Go ahead, try.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, sure I will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister how much money has been paid out in loans to the fishermen under the fisheries loan Act last year? Can he say off-hand?

MR. KEOUGH: I tabled the report last year, for the board year ending March 31, 1953. I tabled the report in the last session of the House, for 1953, but I do not remember the figures. The financial year 1954 has not ended yet.

MR. HOLLETT: Could you give us any idea?

MR. KEOUGH: The report will be tabled when it is ready, for the year ending March 31.

MR. BROWNE: Could the minister tell us, did the government put back the \$225,000 it borrowed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, that is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. That is out of order.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering—maybe this is out of order too—Is there really any need for such a loan board now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, that is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. That definitely relates to the principle.

Clause 2 carried. Preamble carried.

Motion — that the committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Development Loan Act."

Clause 1 read.

1. This Act may be cited as The Co-operative Development Loan (Amendment) Act, 1955.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could tell me if there is any business being done under this particular loan board, and what is the extent of it? I have here the report for last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I must call the honourable member to order. We cannot have paragraph 2 discussed under paragraph one.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am not discussing No. 2 but merely asking what business is being done under the loan board.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Out of order.

MR. BROWNE: That is what the Honourable the Premier thinks. I suggest it is not out of order. I suggest to you, sir, surely we must know something about what we are doing. We are asked here to agree to give the government authority to make a contract for ten years with a gentleman in the sum of ten thousand dollars a year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That has been adopted.

MR. BROWNE: Yes. I know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We can't debate that any more. The time to debate that was when the principle of the Bill was being discussed.

MR. BROWNE: I could not ask questions during the full dress debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the proper time.

MR. BROWNE: No this is the proper time, in Committee. That is why we have a Committee. Now I have here for the year ending March 31, 1954, over twelve months ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—Whether or not there ought to be a Co-operative Development Loan Board—whether or not they did their work well—whether or not they did enough work, or whether they did not do well or did not do enough work—whether or not the loans made ought to have been made or not—these are all matters of principle. This is merely an amending Bill to amend the Bill in one or two very limited respects. I submit with respect that the only thing which any member of this Committee of the Whole is permitted by law, by our law, the law of this House, to debate are the immediate, precise items mentioned here in this clause;

not whether there should be a Board, whether it is a bad nor a good Board. These are unlawful in Committee of the Whole stage.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Premier, who raised the point, could show authority for such sweeping assertions. The only thing we can do is to ask questions pertaining to this particular section.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly, line by line and clause by clause.

MR. BROWNE: In addition, Mr. Chairman, to forcing us all in this legislature, he insists now all we can talk about is a comma or a full-stop, reducing the proceedings of this House to a farce.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, if I suggested that.

MR. BROWNE: That is the intention. He is driving the House. He is there with a whip whipping all his own men and whipping us too. We are not going to stand for it, Mr. Chairman. We are being forced on in this mad rush so that he can get to Ottawa. He has been to Jamaica and Germany and all those places.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, surely I can ask a question. I asked a question—What are the qualifications of Mr. Drover to head the Co-operative Development Loan Board?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—What clause are we on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 1.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Chairman, the clause is: "This Act may be cited as the Co-operative Development Loan (Amendment) Act,

1955." I suggest, with, respect, that no member of this Committee is permitted to debate any other clause until this one clause is amended or rejected. Now let us stick to the rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must insist we get along with this paragraph, No. 1. We cannot discuss questions of salaries or amounts which the Board has loaned or has not loaned until we get this paragraph 1 finished. Under paragraph 2 even we cannot discuss the amounts loaned by the Board as it deals purely with the contract to be made with the Chairman of the Board.

Clause 1 carried:

Clause 2 read:

2. (1) Section 4 of the Co-operative Development Loan Act, chapter 247 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, is amended by repealing sub-section (2) and substituting therefor the following as sub-section (2) and (2A).

"(2) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall designate one member to be Chairman of the Board to hold office upon such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council deems fit and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may enter into an agreement with the Chairman to have effect from a date either before or after the signing thereof setting forth those terms and conditions and the Chairman shall hold and vacate office in accordance with his agreement.

(2A) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make regulations to provide for the establishment of a pension scheme for the Chairman or for his dependents or for both."

(2) The said section is further amended by repealing sub-section.

"(3) Subject to sub-section (2) the members of the Board shall be appointed for one year and are eligible for re-appointment."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may ask now what are the qualifications of the gentleman. We are giving him a contract for ten years and preference over everybody else in the civil service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I ruled any discussion on the amount which the Chairman will be paid is out of order, or on the person who will not be Chairman.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words, Mr. Chairman, you are proposing a situation which gives the Lieutenant-Governor in Council the power to delegate one member to be Chairman on such terms and conditions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have already done that, we did it on second reading. Precisely that is what we did in second reading. We adopted that principle in second reading.

MR. HOLLETT: That one principle? Why should we give you the authority to enter into an agreement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is even out of order to debate that.

MR. HOLLETT: Everything and everybody are out of order except yourself — You are always out of order — take a holiday to Ottawa do.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, did you seriously mean I was not entitled to ask what the qualifications of the Chairman were?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Definitely under this there is no mention of any individual.

MR. BROWNE: I want to be clear on this: Your ruling now is that no person has a right to ask the Minister what person has been appointed to administer and what salary he is to receive—you have ruled that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not under this paragraph.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to take the matter further, Mr. Chairman, but I don't admit this as a precedent.

Clause 2 carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment carried.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Industrial Development Loan Act."

Clause 1 read:

1. This Act may be cited as The Industrial Development Loan (Amendment) Act, 1955.

MR. HOLLETT: Before you pass that, I notice by the public accounts—I may be out of order—a remark by the honourable gentleman, a loan or principal amount—

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman—The honourable member may not debate it. He cannot change the title because that has been adopted in second reading. There is no debate possible on this one particular clause.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr Chairman, I am not debating, I am asking a question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Asking a question is debating it.

MR. HOLLETT: Well—We will have the Speaker come in and get a ruling. Mr. Chairman, I must have

a proper ruling on that. If under the heading of the Bill I cannot ask if the fifty thousand dollars has been paid back—Why not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because there is a proper time and place to ask, and that is not now.

MR. HOLLETT: Because you are in a hurry?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not that—it is not the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think this is the time nor the place—it is certainly not the time to discuss the activities of the Board.

MR. HOLLETT: I just asked a question. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could tell us whether that has been paid back.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can tell him, Mr. Chairman, at the proper time, which is not now.

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. (1) Section 4 of The Industrial Development Loan Act, chapter 245 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, is amended by repealing sub-section (2) and substituting therefor the following as sub-sections (2) and (2A).

"(2) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall designate one member to be Chairman of the Board to hold office upon such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council deems fit and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may enter into an agreement with the Chairman to have effect from a date either before or after the signing thereof setting forth those terms and conditions and the chairman shall

hold and vacate office in accordance with his agreement.

(2A) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make regulations to provide for the establishment of a pension scheme for the Chairman or for his dependents or for both."

(2) The said section is further amended by repealing sub-section

(3) and substituting therefor the following:

"(3) Subject to sub-section (2), the members of the Board shall be appointed for one year and are eligible for re-appointment."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Charman, I presume that this Bill applies to the same gentleman as the other two Bills, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister does it apply?—I would like to know what I may ask.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman was, I think, in the House of Commons long enough to answer his own question. If he would apply in this House the knowledge he actually possesses of parliamentary procedure—I am going to see they are carried out. I am the Leader of this House, and the people made me the Leader of the House by democratic vote, and I am going to see the rules are carried out—that is my job, and I will see to it. Is that the words of a dictator if so, blame the people of Newfoundland who put me here to do it by their democratic vote. The answer is that all three Boards have one man for Chairman. That has already been stated within the last three days in this House. It was stated here that Mr. Drover is the Chairman of each one of the three Boards, as it was also stated here that Mr. Callahan is the Secretary of each one of the three

Boards. Then the other separate memberships of the three Boards were stated here in this House. Now the honourable gentleman sees fit to ask, who is the Chairman of this one? He knew but he had forgotten.

MR. BROWNE: I was told, yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: By me — I ought to know—but he asks again to-night.

MR. BROWNE: I asked what are his qualifications?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No—the honourable gentleman asked a moment ago, is that the same man.

MR. BROWNE: Am I allowed to ask that question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman asked—He is very interested I know—and this awful business of having rules and insisting they are carried is a terrible thing, and the little, innocent members on the other side are being tyrannized over because they are being asked, when a Bill is adopted in second reading, that they shall not try to decide in Committee of the Whole whether it should be adopted again or not.

MR. HULLETT: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—May I ask what section is the Honourable the Premier speaking to now?

MR. BROWNE: I don't expect an answer from the Chairman on that point. I would like to get an answer on this point: What is the authority for the ruling or for the Premier's statement that asking questions in Committee on a Bill is out of order? That is what the Premier said — You cannot ask this question and you cannot ask that question. What in the Name of G—D are you able to talk

about! When are you able to ask questions on the Industrial Development Loan Board if you cannot do it when we are debating the Bill? You are going to give ten thousand dollars a year for ten years to the Chairman. What is the purpose of the Bill if it is not to be discussed? What is the good of coming here at all? We are just "rubber stamps" that is all, the whole lot of us must do what the Premier says—get it through—he is going to see to the rules. What have we got a Chairman or a Speaker for? I asked several times and have been refused and expect to be refused again—What are the qualifications for such an exceptional arrangement being made?

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, might I ask a question—Is there to be a separate agreement under each of these Acts or just one all-embracing agreement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: One agreement.

Clause carried:

On motion Bill passed without amendments.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Perpetuities and Accumulations to Certain Funds Established to Provide Pensions or other Benefits."

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. The rules of law and statutory enactments now or hereafter enacted relating to perpetuities and to accumulations do not apply and shall be deemed never to have applied to the trusts of a plan, trust or fund established for the purpose of providing pensions, retirement allowances, annuities, or sickness, death or other benefits to employees or to their

widows, dependents or other beneficiaries.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder could the Attorney General tell me any specific case which brought about the introduction of this Bill?

MR. CURTIS: No, Mr. Chairman, it is just that we have been asked by the Committee on Uniformity of Legislation, to make our legislation conform. Actually, I don't know of any case in the country where this applied.

Clause 2 carried: Clause 3 read:
3. This Act shall be so interpreted and construed as to effect its general purpose of making uniform the law of those provinces which enact it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Attorney General would explain "... its general purpose of making uniform the law of those provinces which enact it."

MR. CURTIS: As my honourable friend knows, very clearly the advantage of having all our legislation similar, so that each province can have the benefit of decisions made in the other provinces — in other words, if Ontario has this enactment, and its courts make certain rulings and tomorrow our courts are asked to rule on the same point, the benefit of the decision of the Ontario Court can be had. For that reason the tendency now is to have as far as it is possible all legislation uniform, so that anywhere you are in Canada, outside Quebec, the chances are the law is similar, and you won't have to make provisions for this law in this province and that law in that province. You can pretty well understand, if a corporation or a fund extends over one province into another the same laws apply in both provinces.

MR. BROWNE: The only objection I see is that most of our civil law especially property law follows the pattern of the English Law. Even though changes have been made since 1925 in England, most of the precedents used by lawyers are English, and it is very difficult to change over suddenly.

MR. CURTIS: But this is only one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are not proposing that all be the same but as far as possible — It would be very convenient to the public and the legal profession if the laws were uniform.

Clause carried.

On motion Bill passed without amendment.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act."

Clauses 1, 2, 3, read and carried.

Clause 4:

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, you will remember that during first or second reading of this Bill I mentioned to the Attorney General that I thought there might be an analogy between this Bill and the Highway Traffic Act, which did not protect a person. Since that time I have had the opportunity of consulting with the Director of Public Prosecutions, who, I think the Honourable the Attorney General will agree, is more familiar with the Criminal Code than any other practitioner in Newfoundland. He explained to my satisfaction at least — but I am afraid I cannot repeat that explanation satisfactorily to the House — that the protection given here is inclusive and it is not at all comparable to the type of answer that one is required to give

under the Highway Traffic Act, which is a matter of filling in a form for the police constable. This is a jurisdictional matter. I must say on more mature reflection I am inclined to think he is perhaps right. However, Mr. Chairman, that still leaves the objection open. It depends on the way you look at it, in the case of death — I am not so much concerned with fire, not so much concerned with arson, but in the case of death it may put a person in peril. It is all very well to say an answer may not be used against a man, but if he has to answer it may well give the police the grounds on which to work, and subsequently put him behind bars. It seems too much to be an abrogation of the rights of individuals not to incriminate themselves.

MR. CURTIS: Actually my honourable friend raised the question when we were last here. I have been looking into it, and into the provisions of the Evidence Act, with which I think it has been suggested this legislation interferes. Now if he will refer to the Evidence Act he will see that protection is given by that Act to a witness and is limited to suits in court, actions in court or inquires into any proceedings of a court. In other words: there is always a plaintiff, a defence or prosecution or something. This section deals, not with such cases, but this section deals with cases where there is an inquiry. Nobody is charged. There has been no prosecution, no action, no suit, but there is an inquiry into what you might almost call something going wrong, an inquiry into a fire. This is not a case of anybody requiring protection. There is really no conflict between the two because one is, as I say, a provision of the evidence Act which applies where

there is an accused and a defendant, but here in this case there is nobody.

MR. HIGGINS: There may very well be.

MR. CURTIS: We hope there will be. That is why we asked for the clause. I assure the House that it is a very desirable amendment — It does give protection to a witness who has to incriminate himself by making it illegal to have the evidence that he has given used against him.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there is one thing about this which I do not understand — Suppose there is an inquiry into a fire and a person is the owner of the house where the fire takes place. He or she is naturally the last person to be in the house and that person is asked: "Well, what was the condition when you left, etc? Did you have a fire on, did you have this and that?" That person then is liable to be asked any question on cross-examination, and kept at it for some considerable time. I wonder if it is not going too far, getting information out of the witness like that even though it may help prosecution to be taken afterwards? Now the prosecution would be under the Criminal Code — Why is the Criminal Code left out?

MR. CURTIS: Because the Criminal Code itself operates under the Canada Evidence Act, which has the same clause in it. This is simply an attempt to bring our provincial law in line with the Federal.

MR. BROWNE: Suppose there is an inquiry, a person is compelled to answer but is only protected from prosecution by this legislation but not under the Criminal Code?

MR. CURTIS: This section says: "A witness giving evidence in an in-

quiry held under Section 115 or section 116 shall not be excused from answering any question upon the ground that the answer may tend to criminate him, or may tend to establish his liability to a civil proceeding at the instance of the Crown or of any person or in a prosecution under any Act of the Legislature.

If, with respect to any question a witness referred to in subsection (1) objects to answer upon any of the grounds mentioned in that subsection and if, but for this section, he would therefore have been excused from answering such question, then, although the witness is by reason of this section compelled to answer, the answer so given shall not be used or receivable in evidence against him in any civil proceeding at the instance of the Crown or of any person or in a prosecution under any Act of the Legislature.

MR. BROWNE: That has only to do with being excused — He has to answer —

MR. CURTIS: Well, we cannot give protection by a local Act against the Federal, but the Canada Evidence Act gives that protection.

MR. BROWNE: Oh the Canada Evidence Act, not the Criminal Code. Does that refer to inquires?

MR. CURTIS: I think that is a pretty general clause.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if you would look it up before third reading?

MR. HIGGINS: Then, Mr. Chairman, it would appear that any unfortunate witness under our own provision and the Canada Evidence Act would be afraid to do anything.

MR. CURTIS: And there would be a lawyer to interpret it.

Clause carried.

On motion bill passed without amendment.

On motion the committee rose to report progress.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the following Bills without amendment:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Fisheries Loan Act."

On motion report accepted — Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Development Loan Act.) Passed with some amendment).

On motion report received — Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Industrial Development Loan Act."

On motion report received — Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Perpetuities and Accumulations in Relation to Certain Funds Established to Provide Pensions or Other Benefits."

On motion report received — Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act."

On motion report received — Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining orders of

the day do stand deferred, and the House at its rising, do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

On motion the House then adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 29, at 3:00 P.M.

TUESDAY, March 29th., 1955

AFTERNOON SESSION

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. DROVER: Mr Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Droverville. Probably this is one of the places which did not wire the Premier. These people are requesting to be placed under the cottage hospital scheme. They also wish to remind the Government that two years ago they were signatories to a petition making the same request.

The people of this new settlement in White Bay are loggers and fishermen. They are in the low income bracket. They request that something be done about the high cost of hospitalization for that part of the district.

I have much pleasure in presenting this petition, Sir, and I also give it my support. I ask leave that it be tabled in the House and referred to the Department concerned.

On motion petition tabled for reference to the Department concerned.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Pools Cove, Bay du Nord and Lally Cove, asking that a

road be constructed from Pools Cove to Belloram.

As the petition points out, Sir, this would greatly shorten the distance from Lally Cove and Pools Cove and Bay du Nord to the cottage hospital at Harbour Breton. By water it is thirty-two miles. The distance would be out in half if this road could be built. The road itself could be built through excellent road-building country, and the distance would be about twelve miles.

This petition, Sir, is signed by more than four hundred residents of Belleoram, Pools Cove, Bay du Nord and Lally Cove. The request seems to me to be very reasonable. If we are ever to have a good economy on the south coast it is going to be necessary to open up roads. This road, which would connect with the road that now runs from Belloram to Coombs Cove, would be of great benefit not only to these places but to all parts of Fortune Bay. I have no hesitation, Sir, in giving it my hearty support, and I ask that the petition be laid on the table of the House, and referred to the Department of Public Works.

On motion petition received for reference to the Department concerned.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply) : Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the central area of Trinity North and the residents of Dunfield, Trouty, Kearley's Harbour, New Bonaventure and Old Bonaventure. It is signed by four hundred people. It asks for the erection of a cottage hospital somewhere within their vicinity. They point out, as they have to me on previous occasions, many of them, that as presently situated they lie between the cottage hospital unit on each extreme end, at Bonavista and at Come-

by-Chance. The people of each particular end reap the benefits of a cottage hospital scheme but they themselves are deprived of these benefits.

I have much pleasure, Sir, in supporting the prayer of the petition. I beg leave to table it and ask that it be referred to the Department of Health for serious consideration.

On motion petition received for reference to the Department concerned.

MR. DROVER : I wish, Sir, to support the Honourable Minister, the member for Trinity North, in the petition he has just presented to the House. I am a native of Trinity North District. I know the area to which he referred. I know the needs of the people. Like many other sections of Newfoundland, I believe that a provincial health scheme should be inaugurated by the Government to care for all of our people.

I have much pleasure, Sir, in supporting the honourable member's petition.

On motion petition tabled for reference to the Department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare) : Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table of the House copies of the annual report of the Department of Public Welfare for the year ending March 31, 1954.

Giving Notice of Motion

None.

Giving Notice of Question

MR. BROWNE : To ask the Honourable the Premier, to lay upon the

table of the House the following information :

On what basis has remuneration been paid to Hon. P. J. Lewis, Q.C., Mr. Carl J. Goldberg and associates, and the firm of Peat, Mitchell, Marwick, for their services to the Committee preparing the Newfoundland case? Give details showing how amounts already paid were calculated.

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development, to lay upon the table of the House the following information :

What amounts of money were paid Mr. O. L. Vardy for travelling or other expenses during the fiscal year commencing April 1, 1954, giving length of each trip and details of expenses charged? Is any money presently outstanding to Mr. Vardy for such expenses? If so, what is the amount?

Give names of persons appointed to the Tourist Board or the Tourist Development Loan Board during the fiscal year 1954-55. State date of appointment with salaries being paid, with name of position to which appointments have been made?

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources to lay upon the table of the House the following information :

What has been the cost of the Royal Commission on Forestry to date? Give particulars of all amounts paid by way of remuneration with names of persons receiving the same.

Answers to Questions

Question No. 18 :

In course of preparation.

Question No. 19 :

In course of preparation.

Question No. 20 :

In course of preparation.

Question No. 21 :

In course of preparation.

Orders of the Day

Third Readings :

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act:"

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Fisheries Loan Act:"

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Development Loan Act:"

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Industrial Development Loan Act:"

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Perpetuities and Accumulations to Certain Funds Established to Provide Pensions or other Benefits:"

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Conditional Sale of Goods"

On motion referred to the Select Committee to Consider Various Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: There is an amendment before the House. If it is the wish of the House to debate the amendment, members will therefore speak to it. The debate is confined to the subject matter of the amendment.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the amendment.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understood the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had the floor. Certainly the motion to adjourn the debate was carried on that understanding. The honourable gentleman began to speak and I suggested, if his voice were not ready at that time, that the debate be adjourned and proceed this afternoon on the understanding he had begun to speak and not that some other member—

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): In that case then, Mr. Speaker, it was a slight mistake. I was under the impression any member on this side could speak before I went on.

MR. SPEAKER: However, the honourable member who calls the adjournment has the right to speak when the order is called.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): But, Mr. Speaker, the motion was made from this side on the understanding, and to oblige the honourable member. There was nothing to stop the other members from speaking yesterday. They did not have a cold.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the House will be satisfied to let my colleague go on or not, because he has an important engagement, and thought he would

have a few minutes to speak on the amendment — but if the House does not consent I will proceed.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment to the Address in Reply, which was made by my honourable and learned friend from St. John's on yesterday. The amendment was that, in view of the conviction of the former Director General of Economic Development etc.—I won't waste any time reading it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this amendment naturally we must find some reason for such support. I would like the members on the Government side of the House to understand that anything I may say I hope it is in the interest of the country, and there will be nothing of a personal nature any more than I can possibly help.

When we moved this amendment which is really a vote of want of confidence in the Government we do not do it just through flippancy or because we wish to talk. I can assure the honourable members, Sir, that we do it because we believe it is most important in the interest of our country. I am quite sure there are members on the opposite side of the House who must be somewhat worried in their hearts over the happenings relative to some of these industries which were brought in by the Government. I am quite sure that all of these industries were brought in by the Government with the best of intentions. I am quite sure they hoped that by bringing in these industries our people would benefit thereby, our country would prosper and that many, many new jobs would be forthcoming. I am satisfied that there have been some jobs that have been forthcoming. But we on this side of the House feel that there is no evidence in sight at

the moment which would justify any further support of putting public moneys into certain of these industries. After all the Government of the day is the custodian of the peoples' money, and it is up to the Government to take due and proper action when they see that there is something wrong, something which should be rectified. They should take immediate action.

There are various things which would make one worried. For instance I have a clipping here from the "Evening Telegram" of recent date, from "Political Notebook"—"No one has yet come forward and offered a statement to the effect that there was graft other than the well known Valdmanis graft in connection with the building of the new industrial plants, if there was it went on at so high a level that few except the principals, who are not likely ever to blow the roost, got wind of it, other than the mere breath of suspicion. On the other hand one would have to be completely wet behind the ears to take on trust Premier Smallwood's assurance that except for the Valdmanis case, there was absolutely no irregularity with regard to the setting up of the new industries. With a shrug and a wave and a loud protest he disposes of the whole matter in the House of Assembly . . ." So it goes on.

That, I say, Mr. Speaker, is a bit disturbing not only to us here—it is unchallenged. The author of that is still a free citizen and walking about this countryside. Therefore, we can only believe that there must be some truth in the statements which are made here.

It goes on to say: "It is claimed that the Premier does not know himself whether his industries are good or bad, sound or unsound, honest or

dishonest. They are conceived in a burst of enthusiasm and born in a welter of political propaganda. No one with even the most rudimentary qualifications for doing so exercised any close supervision over their erection. They were brought here on the say-so of Dr. Valdmanis, who combines within himself all the functions of economist, market surveyor, industrial engineer, accountant, financier and father confessor to displaced Europeans. Now, with the little doctor out of the picture, we are left holding the grub bag with only the faintest inkling of its contents . . ."

He said that. It was unchallenged by any member of the Government.

There is another one:

"Some of the machinery in some of the "new industries" was sold for scrap in Germany before being shipped to Newfoundland."

Now, Sir, we do remember that all the Acts which were passed in this House, and all the agreements which were drawn up between the Department of Economic Development and some of these foreign industrialists had certain sections in them with regard to—well it said something like this—You bring in a hundred dollars worth of machinery and we will advance to you one hundred dollars cash—in some cases these were guarantees, but I will come to that later. It is a bit disturbing therefore to read in the local press, and how much more detrimental to the welfare of this country is that statement, Sir, when it is read by people in other countries of this world—"Some of the machinery in some of the new industries was sold for scrap in Germany before being shipped to Newfoundland." My honourable and learned friend from St. John's West

yesterday read a sworn statement by one of the foreign nationals which stated that not only was one piece of machinery a machine sent off from the good people of the United States of America under the Marshall Plan to aid Europeans—How that got here is anybody's guess, but also in that sworn statement this man showed yesterday or stated that some of these machines were rusty and the rust was scraped off and they were painted, etc.

It goes on: "A company was set up in Germany to buy second-hand machinery and re-sell it to the plants here."

I am strongly suspicious, Sir, if you investigate that you will find that company was "New Technique" about which I had something to say about two years ago in this House.

"The people who owned this company were the same people who owned the plants to which the machinery was sold (at a profit.) It may have been partly a means of smuggling the stuff out of Germany. But it may also have been a means of beating Newfoundland on the "50-50" deal—of inflating the nominal value of the contribution made by the industrialists so as to work more dollars out of the Government."

As I go on, Mr. Speaker, I think I shall prove that was exactly the purpose behind at least one of the firms activities here.

I am quoting still from the "Evening Telegram"—"If this machinery was shipped here under false invoices, set up in the plants and installed at inflated costs, with fictitious work sheets and padded payrolls (and we have been informed that just that was done, in some cases) does not this constitute a fraud against the Government? This

charge amongst many others, has been made by people employed in the industries—people who very likely got a clue or two as to what was going on. We cannot prove or disprove the charge. And we are convinced that the Government is in a state of ignorance at least as great, if not greater . . ."

There again that was a quotation from the "Evening Telegram". Here is yet another one:

"If these plants were investigated someone would go to gaol like Dr. Valdmanis" (The words quoted above are the words of a German Nationalist in a high position of trust in one of the new industries. He spoke them for publication, sitting across from the author of 'Political Notebook') "If I were not to say it nobody would say it. I will lose my job but it has to be said."

I could read on some more, Sir. That being so, Sir, I think there is ample reason and justification for the amendment which was moved yesterday by my honourable and learned friend. But, Sir, we do not have to go outside of this House to find plenty of evidence to substantiate this amendment. As I said, in practically every case the companies who were brought in here agreed to bring in machinery against which the Government saw to it that they got the equivalent in dollars. A very good deal if it had worked out properly. Also these companies were under an obligation, after a certain period to begin interest payments, and they were also under an obligation to raise loans in a commercial manner, guaranteed by the Government. I think I am quite safe in saying, Mr. Speaker, that not in one instance has one of these companies raised any money

from any of the commercial banks nor from any money-lending houses, but they were given cash by the Government. The Government in these agreements guaranteed they would not only back the bonds of these companies but they would also assist them to raise the loans.

I have here the Public Accounts of the year ending 31 March 1954, just a year ago, and I refer to Number 38 of the Auditor General's Report under the heading "Canadian Machinery and Industries Construction Company"; \$2,894,014—The Auditor General said: "Under the provisions of the Loan and Guarantee Act No. 59 of 1954, payment of interest on the Government loan of two and a half million dollars of this company was deferred for two years from the 15th of October 1951, the date of commencement of construction. The first payment of interest thereof fell due on the 31st December 1953 and subsequent payments became due on June 30th and December 31, 1954. To date no payments of interest have been received, and the total amount due as at 31 December 1954, that is a year ago, was \$121,300 interest alone."

Now this Canadian Machinery and Industry Limited, as I remember it, Sir, was given a loan of one million five hundred thousand dollars and at the end of March last year they owed us \$1,894,014, and they owe some more now. I have to state further, the Auditor General says that the insurance coverage presently in effect totals one half the amount advanced to the company by the Government. In other words they are not living up to their contract with regard to the fire insurance which they are supposed to carry.

Now that was one of the biggest companies, CMIC.

I turn now to Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited, \$1,051,589. This amount which represented cash since 1951 has now been increased to \$1,821,570. In addition the Government has guaranteed bank loans to the company amounting to \$525,000. To date the Government has received no return nor interest as provided for in the agreement with the company.

Covering the operation of the Birch Plant: Now that, of course, was a company wholly financed by the Government, built by the Government, and the operation of which was leased to Mr. Chester Dawe for a period of fifteen years. I don't know officially but I understand that the operations of this company are now taken completely out of his hands and handed over to somebody else. I would strongly suspect, if one is allowed to suspect, these people taking over have already been advanced some money. But I want to stick to facts, as far as possible and show that in addition to the cost of building that plant the amount of \$1,500,000 represented cash advances since 1951 and was increased to \$1,821,000. They have made no payment on that, paid no money back, paid no depreciation on any of the buildings or machinery during all these years, during the past four or five years.

Newfoundland Tannery; William Dorn Limited: That was one of these companies, Sir, which the Honourable Premier assured us, I believe, was certainly a success, \$423,544 to date—the date of construction of the plant is September 1951, consequently the first payment of interest by the company on the initial loan became due 31 December 1953, interest is also due on subsequent loans made to the company. To date no payment of interest has been made and the amount

outstanding as of 31 December 1954 was \$21,746 in interest alone.

Atlantic Hardboards Industries, Limited: During the year 1953-54 Government guaranteed bank loans to the company as follows: September 1953, \$40,000; March 1954, \$278,999. In September 1954 the Government was called upon to make good these guarantees.

Now that is an official document by the Auditor General, which spoke for itself. I could quote other companies too, Mr. Speaker, in exactly the same way, only a little worse condition than these that I mentioned. Are the honourable gentlemen on the opposite side of the House satisfied with that statement there? Are they satisfied that everything is going all right; and when we make this motion by way of want of confidence in the Government on account of these new industries, don't they agree with us that we are justified?

I think, Sir, in the past it would have been much better if the Government had come out with all the particulars regarding these new industries and cleared the atmosphere a little bit. For instance, only today, I was told of something which happened only just recently, and I don't know if I can say it, but it was very disturbing.

This is a copy of an answer to a question by me in 1953: "List the items amounting to \$27,500 noted in the Auditor General's Report as advances not in accordance with the term of the Agreement between the Government and Chester Dawe, Limited, or contrary to the provisions of the Revenue and Audit Act 1951? The answer is a letter:

"Mr. Smallwood

I attach copy of Question No. 53

directed to Minister of Finance by Hollett. I have replied to the effect that the Question should be directed to the Minister of Economic Development.

2. Mr. Hollett is referring to the following comment of the Auditor General on the Birch Plant:

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the honourable gentleman is quoting, but it sounds to me like a private document which does not belong to the public, which does not belong to the House—as though it had been rifled, for example, out of my desk or rifled out of my desk in Canada House or picked up or lost out of my pocket. It sounds like a private document. Would the honourable gentleman identify it clearly.

MR. SPEAKER: I was myself a bit puzzled by that. It did sound like a private document.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I explained it in the beginning. It was question No. 53 asked by me on the 10th of April, 1953. This is the Government's answer. That was brought into the House, Sir, and tabled by the Honourable the Premier and passed to me by the Clerk of the House in 1953. Whether the Honourable the Premier let it slip by without noticing I don't know, but I assure him there is nothing of a personal nature in it. If you like, Mr. Speaker, I would pass it over and let him have a look at it, before I read it. It was tabled as part of the record of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I merely questioned it because it did sound like a personal letter. If the Honourable the Premier wishes to see this letter?

MR. SMALLWOOD: (No. Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed: Frequently I have personal notes sent to me by civil servants around in various Departments, to which notes they attach a formal answer. Such a personal note will refer to honourable gentlemen by their last names for convenience, and certainly it is never included. This is just a typewritten note, there is no writing on it at all, it is just a typewritten sheet of paper. Frequently a note is attached to an answer, and I always detach the note and just give the formal answer which has been prepared for me by the official in question. Sometimes I leave them on my desk, sometimes on the floor. In future I will tear them up in very small shreds.

MR. HOLLETT: That was tabled in the House, and passed to me in answer to a question.

MR. SPEAKER: I can only say the honourable member will have to use his own discretion.

MR. HOLLETT: "It was also observed in the course of audit that certain charges were either not in accordance with the terms of the Agreement or were contrary to the provisions of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951. Items falling in this category, amounting to \$27,550 have been set up in the books of the Newfoundland Hardboards Limited as an account receivable."

"3. The breakdown of this figure of \$27,500 as requested by Mr. Hollett is as follows:

"(I) Management Fees:

(a) Dnfresne, MacLaglin & Associates

\$12,000

(b) Lumber Products Manufacturing & Export Ltd. (for services of Mr. W. H. Savage)

\$500 \$12,500.00

"(ii) Life Insurance premiums for policies on life of Mr. Chester Dawe in excess of \$200,000 authorized by Executive Council

3,958.00

"(iii) Travelling expenses of Mr. Chester Dawe not properly accounted for

11,093.55

\$27,552.55

"The Auditor General is of the opinion that (i) and (ii) above are not in accordance with the Agreement and that (iii) is contrary to the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951. You may or may not agree.

"This information is forwarded to enable you to table reply as you see fit.

(Sgd) J. O. G.

Controller and Auditor General

1/4/53"

Remember, Mr. Speaker, I am endeavouring to show you why we have moved such an amendment as we have. The Honourable the Premier laid it on the table, as such, I have only quoted it, Sir, to show why the Auditor General disallows a Bill amounting to \$27,000. What was done with it afterwards I have no knowledge. But that is actually a small item.

We have to remember, Sir, when we entered into Union with Canada we were given a sort of a clean sheet, our debt was lifted from us and the people immediately began to receive their due benefits under the Terms of Un-

ion. Our debt then, I believe, amounted to only about \$4,000,000. When I speak of debt, Sir, I do remember, and you too, Sir, I suspect, when our debt took from our people annually five millions dollars before any moneys could be spent by the Government on anything else, five million dollars had to be paid out. Indeed it was that debt which had been built up over a hundred years which caused the loss of our Responsible Government or the suspension of it. When we got back that Responsible Government under Confederation that debt was taken from us and we owed about four million dollars. I think that the interest our people had to pay was slightly over one hundred thousand dollars. We also, Sir, and I have said this before, and I suspect I will have to say it again, we also had cash in the bank and cash assets accrued to approximately fifty million dollars. Ten millions of that was put in the bank at Ottawa or somewhere on the Mainland at any rate. The position today, Sir, is that the other forty million is gone; we have borrowed, ten million a couple of years ago and that has vanished; we borrowed a further twelve million last year—that too has vanished—as a matter of fact it had vanished before it was borrowed, considerable of it. That is \$62,000,000 from a position in which we were debt free and a position in which we had approximately fifty million dollars in reserve, in the surplus. I am quite sure everybody on the other side of the House knows they must be concerned, and we have to ask ourselves how much further can we, a little Province with only moderate natural resources, how much further can we go before somebody will take a wrong turn and bring us up sharp?

I am a bit concerned and disturbed, Sir, over the fact of all these new industries which have come in here. They signed an agreement, these companies, by which they agreed that they would pay back the money as soon as they could; that they would negotiate a commercial loan with some commercial bank immediately, or as quickly as possible on the Government's guarantee. These companies, Mr. Speaker, have not been able or have not tried to raise one dollar under the guarantee of the Government. Why? Is this Government's guarantee no good? I don't think so. Why did people who have lots of money, lots of dough to lend, why did they not jump at this and lend money to OMFC and to these others, the cement plant, if you like, the glove factory, Koch Shoes, the cotton mills and all the others? Why did not the banks, the lending houses, why did they not take up the Government's offer on that and lend money to these companies? That in itself, Sir, should have caused everybody in this country to take time out to consider just where we were going.

I was referring to the time when we came into Union. I can quite believe and we all believe as did everybody else in this country that the Honourable the Premier who won the first election in fine style, I am quite sure that he made up his mind that something drastic would have to be done, and so he started out. We well remember, Sir, some of the first ventures of the Government were described by the Premier himself as flops, and flops they were. I think of the Icelandic flop costing us over a half a million dollars. You remember the enthusiasm with which it was announced that Mr. Rockefeller was coming in here, and how IBEC

was making its survey to find out what all our natural resources were. That cost a lot of money, Sir, and to date we have not received a report from IBEC. What it cost, goodness only knows! But we have not received the IBEC Report yet, although we have asked for it many, many times.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is off the subject now.

MR. HOLLETT: I am sorry Sir, I was leading up to a point, to the reason why we had to move this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is strictly concerned with the industries.

MR. HOLLETT: At any rate we were all enthused, everybody was enthused particularly the "Sunday Herald" and Mr. Jamieson, and they are still enthused of course. I will quote a clipping from the "Sunday Herald" of October 1951: "True to our prediction of last week, Premier Smallwood is all enthused over the latest trip to Europe. He is convinced that there are the biggest possible days ahead for Newfoundland, and with any luck he believes that more will be done to advance this Province during his administration than has been accomplished during the past four hundred and fifty years—When Newfoundland entered Confederation it marked the beginning of a whole new era for the Province. The Government which took office at that time had to have imagination or it was not worth its salt, said the Premier. It could either sit back and do nothing and allow Newfoundland to continue in the same old rut, or it could start out boldly and go all-out to change things. The Premier chose the latter course, and he is convinced that it is paying off."

Another:

"The Smallwood loyalty to Dr. Valdmanis is unshaken by recent events. Mr. Smallwood is more impressed than ever with the capability of the Economic Director, and has "pledged" that if Dr. Valdmanis has to go I go too is no idle boast"—so says Mr. Jamieson—"He is ready to place the originators of the recent rumours regarding the former Latvian Minister—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to interfere with the honourable gentleman's fun at all. He is now quoting the "Sunday Herald" and "Harold Horwood" he has not come to Gordon Higgins as yet. What is the relevancy? There has to be a debate on the Address in Reply which allows much more latitude, but this is a debate tied down very rigidly to a particular amendment. Now, why can we not debate that. The honourable gentleman, of course, is led and guided by the nose by the gentleman on his immediate right and should wait to get his advice.

MR. HOLLETT: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think that will have to be taken back.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I withdraw that.

MR. SPEAKER: The remark ought not to have been made.

MR. HOLLETT: As to the point raised by the Honourable the Premier—the amendment is, in view of the conviction of the Director of Economic Development, Valdmanis—I am just coming to him. Is the Honourable the Premier getting nervous?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the fact that the name, Alfred Valdmanis, is mentioned in the amendment give a

license to members of the House to go on for the rest of the afternoon talking about Alfred Valdmanis, and what some newspapers said about him? Does the rule of relevancy allow that? This is not the Address in Reply, it is a particular amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: It would be rather difficult to decide that.

MR. HOLLETT: "For the first time this week the recent ugly rumours concerning Dr. Valdmanis came out in the open, said Premier Smallwood, who terms the current rumours nothing but a filthy lie."

MR. SMALLWOOD: These were the rumours about his having shot two thousand Jews, a filthy lie.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know what the rumours were.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman does not know, why read that?

MR. SPEAKER: When the honourable gentleman here quotes newspapers in debate as a fact he makes himself responsible for the facts. Things may not be said in quotation which cannot be said in the House by a member in his place.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, Sir, at any rate, let us get back to the time when the learned Dr. Valdmanis came on the scene. Everybody knows the enthusiasm with which the Honourable the Premier and Dr. Valdmanis started out to bring new industries. I believe the doctor persuaded another doctor, the Honourable the Premier, that there ought to be some sort of revolving fund put by to build one plant a year, sell it before building another, sell it before it is built really, and then keep on doing that, one industry a year, I believe, is what Dr.

Valdmanis was asking for. And they made pretty good progress with regard to the cement plant, and certain industrialists in Germany were contacted and eventually a contract was signed between the firm of MIAG and the Government.

Now we all wanted to see new industries. We still want to see them. And I can assure the Honourable the Premier and the members opposite that we here would be only too anxious to help in every possible way, not only for the industries which are here but also for those industries which may be brought in in the future.

I have here also another disturbing statement. We all remember, Sir, the doctor and the fate of the doctor and how he was convicted recently for fraudulently depriving the firm of MIAG of \$250,000, I believe it was, and defrauding the Government. In some cases he defrauded the Government and in some cases MIAG, I don't remember which.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): The charge was "Defrauding the Government."

MR. HOLLETT: I don't think he was attested on that charge, but we don't need to go into that—defrauded the Government. I remember, Sir, two years ago asking the Honourable Minister of Economic Development the why and wherefore, the reason for a certain ex gratia award to the firm of MIAG, and I was told that was an amount that had been awarded them on account of prices going up, labour being higher and so on. We have to remember, Sir, that a firm contract was made between the Government and MIAG to build the plant, and the cost was 2.8 million dollars. I see no reason why the Government

should have had to pony up another what we call *ex gratia* award. I also asked the question, if there was any significance between the amount of that *ex gratia* award, last year, I think, and the amount which was supposed to have been taken away from MIAG. At that time I was told it was merely a coincidence that the two amounts were alike. Mr. Eric Kirmse, he is an employee of the firm of MIAG in Hanover, Germany, and he was a chief engineer—He states in this document: "I was aware of the contract which—

MR. SMALLWOOD: What document, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HOLLETT: It is an affidavit.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Made where and before whom and on what date?

MR. HOLLETT: It does not seem to say. But I believe it is an affidavit made at a preliminary hearing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Into the Valdmanis charges?

MR. HOLLETT: Made the 2nd day of October, 1954 on the charges against Valdmanis for defrauding MIAG.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I did not want to disturb my honourable friend, but if Kirmse is, and I think he is, an employee of MIAG, I submit that charge is not disposed of, therefore it should not be used at this time. I want to give my honourable friend all the leeway I possibly can. I understand the case disposed of is Benno Schilde.

MR. HIGGINS: I understood it was MIAG, the larger case.

MR. CURTIS: No. The case disposed of was Benno Schilde.

MR. HOLLETT: My understanding was, Mr. Speaker, and I inquired about that at the registrar of the courts, at the office, and my understanding was that it was the firm of MIAG which was disposed of.

MR. CURTIS: My honourable friend is wrong. The Benno Schilde case was disposed of. The MIAG case, which is the larger case, is still pending.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand from the Attorney General and also the Solicitor General, they identify that paper as a piece of evidence likely to be used in some future court action?

MR. CURTIS: Maybe.

MR. SPEAKER: It would be improper to read it in the House.

MR. HOLLETT: I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the MIAG case was disposed of and I can still quote some document.

MR. CURTIS: My honourable friend's colleague at his left was the solicitor for Dr. Valdmanis.

MR. HIGGINS: No. Let us get one thing straight. I am not and never was solicitor for Dr. Valdmanis. I have had, shall we say, a paternal interest in the affairs of Dr. Valdmanis, but I was not retained, never accepted a retainer, and feel free to speak my mind on the honourable gentleman if the occasion ever arises.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know if the House would take the "Evening Telegram" as an authority? Sept. 18, 1954.

MR. SPEAKER: The House cannot take any newspaper as an authority.

MR. HOLLETT: I will table this

if necessary. There seems to be some doubt, that is the only reason why. "Dr. Valdmanis charged with fraud involving \$450,000 of Economic Development money changed his plea to guilty choosing to ask for a light sentence.—

MR. SPEAKER: I must say at this point, by the wildest stretch of the imagination I cannot link the trial of Dr. Valdmanis with this amendment. I really cannot see how that is—

MR. HOLLETT: I just want to show the "Evening Telegram" people started here—stated that—you are correct—it was Benno Schilde. I thought it was MIAG.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now that the "Evening Telegram" says so the House may take the Attorney General's word. We can accept it.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes—an ex gratia award—

MR. SMALLWOOD: When were you talking to Valdmanis last?

MR. HOLLETT: Now that raises that point: I spoke to Dr. Valdmanis once in my lifetime. That was about two years or two and a half years ago. We shook hands, and I have not spoken to him since.

MR. SPEAKER: No doubt these reminiscences will be interesting and touching but certainly not pertinent.

MR. HOLLETT: Certainly, Sir, I don't intend to say anything that will compromise the good doctor nor tend to make his case more difficult. In that case I shall have to change my thoughts a little and veer over on Benno Schilde case, how you pronounce that I am not quite sure. But in the matter of Benno Schilde the

doctor has gone to jail for defrauding that firm of \$120,000. That I believe came from the firm of Benno Schilde and \$40,000 came from Industrial Machinery and Engineering Company.

I am sorry, Sir, if I have to delay the House a little. I dare say I will have to give up because my cold is so bad I can scarcely speak anyway.

I took the trouble, Sir, with regard to this Valdmanis case to look up the various amounts of money which were put in to an account in New York—

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think that is at all pertinent. I do not see how it ties in with the amendment at all, in view of the conviction. The man has been convicted and sentenced. That is over, and "in view of the grave allegations of further and far-reaching etc. . . it is therefore imperative that a commission be set up." I fail to see how the trial or sentence of Dr. Valdmanis would be pertinent to this debate. Please continue:

MR. HOLLETT: I must point out, Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning your ruling, Sir. Dr. Valdmanis was the trusted employee of the Government. He was Director General of the Department of the Government which spent millions of dollars and as such director I am sure that the Government and the Honourable the Premier must have given him their confidence in every way. They had faith in him. They had so much faith in him that apparently he was able to hoodwink them to the tune of \$200,000 in the Benno Schilde building of the gypsum plant.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I don't like to interrupt my honourable friend, but it seems to me it is time

we must know where we are and whither tending, I mean in the course of this debate, with a speaker wandering all over the place, getting lost, stolen or strayed. Now the position is, there is an amendment before the House and that amendment refers to Dr. Valdmanis on a charge of fraudulently obtaining from the Newfoundland Government a large sum of money during the construction of the cement plant. Now, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is limited, I submit, in his references to Dr. Valdmanis to the construction of the cement plant. Now he cannot refer to the construction of the cement plant because the cement plant was built by MIAG and the charge with respect to MIAG is now pending, so he cannot refer to that. He is now trying to refer to Benno Schilde, which had nothing to do with the cement plant. So that I submit any references he has been making now are improper. If he refers to the MIAG case it is improper because the matter is pending. If he refers to Benno Schilde case he is doing it improperly because the motion limits him to the cement plants. So I submit, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend should try to keep somewhere within reason.

MR. SPEAKER: I have allowed, I think the House will agree, more latitude than this amendment really permits. The debate should be strictly to the amendment. If the honourable member wishes to continue his speech?

MR. HOLLETT: I am quite sure my references even though they involve Dr. Valdmanis would show incompetence or otherwise whereby this country was deprived of \$200,000. I feel it ought to be relevant to the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: That was not the point at question.

MR. HOLLETT: On another occasion, Sir, I might point out, I suppose, we have already done that today; the cement plant was supposed to have cost 2.8 million and it actually cost 4.7 million dollars. The House will remember that last year, Sir, I raised the question about monies paid to W. J. Lundrigan in Corner Brook in connection with the building of that plant there in Corner Brook. I pointed out at that time, and I repeat it now, that according to the documents which we received in answer to a question, the Government was under contract with Mr. Lundrigan to the extent of five hundred and seventy thousand dollars, but in all they paid out on that contract eight hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars. There was the case of the Eastern Machinery and Engineering Company the chief director of which was Mr. Leja. My understanding is that Mr. Leja at the same time he was a director of that company was also an employee of the Government. I may be wrong, but I think not. I have seen references to certain of Mr. Leja's trips into St. John's relative to the building of the plant out there, which apparently I cannot quote at the moment. But I am reminded of the fact that Eastern Machinery and Engineering Company was one of the companies which paid back, or paid over some money to Valdmanis, and I believe that the Government later instructed a payment to be made by one Dr. Hertz. If the House will remember I asked a question about that last year, and that amount was exactly the amount of the ex gratia award. At least it was exactly the same amount as was paid over to Dr. Valdmanis. You say, Mr. Speaker, that

I cannot refer to that payment which was made to the bank in the account of Katherina Matias, and I am not allowed to refer to them in connection with Benno Schilde.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not follow the honourable member. I have to be guided on these matters which have been in court, by the words of the Attorney General and the Solicitor General. I might point out to the House that a statement made by any Minister in his place is made upon honour and must be taken as correct. The Chair cannot rule on a point of law.

MR. CURTIS: The question, Mr. Speaker, is hardly a point of law. The honourable member is asking if he can make any reference to Benno Schilde. Why I object to his talking about Benno Schilde is just because it is not involved in the amendment.

MR. HOLLETT: This refers to other industries besides the one in which Valdmanis was involved, several of the new industries.

MR. SPEAKER: That is why I ruled out the discussion of the trial of Dr. Valdmanis. I could not see it had anything to do with several of the new industries. That does allow the honourable member to discuss several of the new industries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Your Honour, if I might be permitted, may I state my view? Whilst the honourable gentleman might be debarred from discussing the MIAG case because that case is at the moment sub-judice, he is not debarred from discussing the Benno Schilde case nor any other case that is not sub-judice. He may, I hold, discuss quite freely the Benno Schilde case in which Valdmanis pleaded guilty, and for which

he is now serving a term in jail. I think he is free to discuss that here in the House. He must do it, of course, within the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: If I may say so—I am not accusing the honourable member of wasting time, but it would be a waste of time to discuss the trial of Dr. Valdmanis. He has nothing to do with the facts at all. It is the industries that are the subject of the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have a ten minute recess?

House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to Mr. Leja who was an employee of the Government. Later, I believe, he was head of the machinery plant out there, Eastern Machinery and Engineering. I also came across some information with regard to Mr. Leja during that period when he was an agent of the Government. He made a trip into St. John's in company with a German nationalist, bringing with him some fifty thousand dollars. The two men arrived. They arrived in this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and they went into Dr. Valdmanis' office, and they gave him the fifty thousand dollars. Now I am informed that Mr. Leja at that very time was an employee of the Government. I also came across another item, Sir. I am trying to show the House how necessary it is that a commission of inquiry be had into the new industries and other things in relation to the Government's activities. I find that some fifty thousand dollars were paid to the firm of Freeman, Hill and Lewin by the Govern-

ment on account of a recent contract. The situation was, Sir, the cement plant was to be built, but, if Dr. Valdimanis could sell it so much the better. So he made a contract with this firm in New York, and the Government, I believe, agreed to sell the cement plant as soon as it was built, but later reneged on the agreement, and this firm became indignant and demanded a breach of contract. It seems to me the Government paid over the sum of fifty thousand dollars. I believe that fifty thousand was charged up to the building of the cement plant.

Now we also heard the statement made by my honourable friend on my right yesterday with reference to the Superior Rubber Company Plant. I do not want to repeat that, but I do think it is a mortal shame that this Government — and I don't think they would really knowingly be a party to taking out of Europe machinery which had been sent over there by the good people of the United States of America to rehabilitate European countries. Our information is that not only this single one which was referred to yesterday belonged to that class but others as well. As I said, I don't think that our Government would knowingly agree to that. But there is one thing I cannot understand, Sir: Our Government must have known that no machinery could be sent out of Germany only by devious ways — and I use the word devious advisedly — without the equivalent in dollars going back there. So it looks to me that there might be a little conniving on this side of the Atlantic as well as on the other. Who did the conniving is another matter. Because you see, Sir, the contracts were all dollar for dollars—You send the machinery and we will give you the dollars—

Now, Sir, I have made a statement today, and it was made yesterday by my honourable friend, about certain machinery in the plant at Holyrood. A certain statement was made whereby it was stated some of the machinery was rusty when it came. That might be quite possible with new machinery, I admit. But it also said these machines were rusty and the rust was scraped off and they were painted. Whether that was so or not was another matter. But I do think it was absolutely essential, absolutely necessary, that the Government should have had some competent man to look at that machinery when it came in here, before they paid over other peoples' money to the people who brought it in. I cannot find anywhere where it was the responsibility of any one individual — I remember asking the Premier here on one occasion, he said, I do it. Well, I know very well the Honourable the Premier, like myself, would not be able to judge as to the value of any machines coming in to this country from Germany nor anywhere else. At least that is my opinion.

Now I want to say a word or two about Koch Shoes. There have been tremors on the air about Koch Shoes. First I refer to the agreement. I won't read it all Sir, I will read part of the Schedule. The Government was going to guarantee some \$750,000 — "The Government will make loans available to the company as follows: The sum of \$20,000 upon request, which amount is to be expended in acquiring a site, payment to be made upon the certificate of the Minister of Economic Development. The sum of \$65,000 upon request, the amount to be expended upon the site of the foundation, and (c) upon delivery in Newfoundland of steel building material and machinery an amount equal

to the landed cost, certified by the Minister of Economic Development, made up as follows: Invoice cost, duties etc."

I read that to show how Koch Shoes and all the other companies were to bring in the machinery at its face value and they were to receive from the Government an equivalent value in dollars. That was the same as with all of them. Now, Sir, our information is that with regard to a lot of these machines—there was a firm in Germany known as "Herrman," and that firm was controlled by Mr. Koch's father. Our information is that Mr. Koch, the senior man, was insolvent, and therefore for a period of some twenty or thirty years was unable to deal in business—so this particular company whose job was in connection with some of these deals, particularly with regard to Koch, to go out and purchase machinery to be brought over here to establish the new industries—Our information is that on certain of these machines; take the cost of Gold Sail Leather Goods, there was some machinery brought in to the value of \$12,600. There was a second invoice where it was invoiced at \$10,800. That we are told was done for customs purposes, whatever that may mean, and for sales tax purposes. Federal sales tax—all very good. But that machinery, Sir, was entered at \$12,800, was entered on the books of Koch Shoes for \$54,986. Why? It is explained here thoroughly: "Upon delivery in Newfoundland of steel buildings and material equal to the amount . . ."

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker—Will the honourable gentleman now say what he is quoting from?

MR. HOLLETT: I am not compelled to give the source, Sir,

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is quoting from documents on his desk, would he say what the document is?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is entitled to know.

MR. HOLLETT: If he is entitled I can tell him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It would not be a stolen document, would it?

MR. HOLLETT: I would not know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman should know. He ought not to come into this House and quote stolen documents, and treat this House to them. He ought not to dare to do it.

MR. HOLLETT: I did not steal any. I agree with the honourable gentleman. All I can say is that I did not steal them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are they stolen or not? What are the documents?

MR. HOLLETT: The statements are made based upon agreements which are registered in the Registry of Deeds, and for which we paid the good sum of \$2.90. That is the agreement. I do not think that is stolen. Made at St. John's in the Province of Newfoundland 1953. I have another one here, I won't read it unless you insist. The man Schaffers over there, Leather Goods, was given a 25% interest in the business in connection with this thing here. At least he was promised it, but he has not yet received any certificate to indicate that he has a 25% interest in the business. What I am coming to, Sir, is the question, is it correct? Is it true? That is why we want a Commission of In-

quiry. Is it true that machinery was, so to speak, smuggled or brought into this country at a low evaluation for the purpose of duty and sales tax and then is it true that that machinery was entered on the books of Koch Shoes at two and three and four and five times the evaluation? Further, is it true that on the entries on the books of Koch Shoes this Government dished out money by way of loans to the amount shown on the books? That is one of the reasons why we want a Commission of Inquiry. There is another case, we are given to understand, where \$130,000 worth of machinery was entered on the books at \$400,000 and against that, we are reliably informed, a loan was given.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman says, "We are informed," "We are reliably informed" then again "We learned"—the honourable gentleman who is advising him again, popping up and down since this House opened like a jack-in-the-box, and cannot keep his mouth shut while sitting down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, has the Premier a monopoly on talking in the House. I don't think he should make a comment like that. I have not said anything to him.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not out of order to counsel a colleague.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, as long as his colleague is willing to be led around by him.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My point of order is first. I take it back—I take it back because obviously it is not so. That he is led around by the nose by

his honourable colleague, that is obviously not the case.

My point of order is, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman on at least twenty occasions in my own hearing and presumably Your Honour's hearing and the hearing of the whole House said; then again we are informed, then again we learned and then again we are reliably informed. Ought he or not to give the House some information as to the sources he learned from? Who told him, was it Bill Roost who told him? Is not the House entitled to some indication of where he got it? Can any member just come in here and rattle off, I heard this and that and again I am informed and I am reliably informed—Can any member do that? As a means of indicating the new industries? Is there nothing more substantial than that and stolen documents? Is that all there is?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is responsible for the statements that he makes. I do not know that I can rule out a remark like "I am informed" or "I am told." I do not see that that is out of order. The honourable member is responsible for the statements he makes. If he is quoting from some document or other he certainly ought to identify the document to the House so that the Chair could rule on it.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If the Honourable the Premier wants to know the source of my information, it is one of the officials of the company, or three of the officials of the company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The stolen documents.

MR. HOLLETT: What stolen documents are you talking about? I

resent that, Mr. Speaker, I understand someone got the RCMP to look for stolen documents.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, and recovered some of them. Is that what the honourable gentleman is quoting from, using the information from those who did the stealing? Is he quoting the thief?

MR. HOLLETT: How do I know?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman ought to know. He ought to know if he is quoting a thief, if he is holding up the time of the House quoting a thief.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to ask the Honourable the Premier where the hen house came from on Roche's Line—I do—Superior Rubber Company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a lie, unadorned, unadulterated, completely and absolutely a lie. If ever there was a lie on this earth that was it. Now I am going to ask the honourable gentleman to retract undeservedly, unqualifiedly, and ungrudgingly, a complete retraction of that statement now before he proceeds.

MR. HOLLETT: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then the honourable gentleman will have action taken against him. I have not accused him of being a thief but of possibly quoting a thief, not a thief himself. I want an unqualified retraction that I have or my son-in-law or anyone belonging to me has anything that came from Superior Rubber Company—a complete, absolute, unqualified retraction, complete and ungrudging.

MR. HOLLETT: I retract "Superior Rubber," I may have made a mistake.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What about

my name and reputation? You may have made a mistake!

MR. SPEAKER: First of all, the use of the word lie is unparliamentary. It is just as easy to say, what the honourable gentleman said is untrue, and then ask for a retraction to be given or an explanation to the satisfaction of the honourable member and the satisfaction of the House. The matter has not been proved. But carrying it further, one honourable member has made a statement and has been asked for a retraction—is the retraction given?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to that point—Does Your Honour realize what the honourable gentleman has said.

MR. SPEAKER: Quite clearly. The honourable member has objected to it on the grounds it is not true and asks for a retraction. That is the understanding?

MR. SMALLWOOD: And all I get from it; "I might have been mistaken."

MR. SPEAKER: I had not the opportunity to hear the reply.

MR. HOLLETT: I retract the statement about the Superior Rubber Company, I may have made a mistake about the particular company. But I would like to point out on the point of order that the Premier accused me of associating with thieves, which I have not done.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not understand that— It was "stolen documents."

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said the honourable gentleman was quoting thieves. I retracted the statement. He is now magnanimous enough to say he is mistaken in the name of the com-

pany. What is the name of the company if it is not Superior Rubber? Does he know of any company—Come on, be a man!—Let us have a little honour!

MR. HOLLETT: I don't think I am going to waste the time of the House getting that now.

MR. SPEAKER: I must say a member attacked in a personal, private capacity has a right to demand a retraction.

MR. HOLLETT: I ask you, Mr. Speaker, wherein did I attack the Honourable the Premier? I asked him where he got the hen house on Roche's Line? I asked him what company, I said I knew. I did not make any charge against the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You said "Superior Rubber Company." Now you have not said what Company. Is it one of the companies receiving anything from the Government? I am dealing with you! I will be answered! I have a tongue. Maybe I will tell a few things I know.

MR. HOLLETT: That is quite obvious.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe I will tell a few things hiddeu out of charity up to now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—If honourable members would give the Chairman opportunity to settle the matter without this cross-fire and continuous loss of temper—As far as the Chair is concerned; I will admit provocation. The honourable member departed entirely from the subject under discussion, and has made a personal attack, if you like, or used words which were opprobrious to a certain member who objected and asked for a retraction. It seems to involve the honesty of

the honourable member concerned. I say he has a perfect right to ask for an explanation. Since it is done in the time of the House then I think the House has a right to an explanation or retraction of the statement.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker—

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member qualified his retraction. If the honourable member is satisfied I merely want to know.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, must I retract the statement that I made? I asked the Honourable the Premier where he got the hen house, how much he had paid for it and from what company. I said I probably did make a mistake with regard to the company. I have some papers which tell me. I will retract everything if it is essential to the well-being of the House, but I would ask Your Honour to remember that I too was accused of associating myself with thieves, on a number of occasions.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us not confuse the issue. It is an entirely different matter. I am forced to speak more plainly. The honourable member accused an honourable member on this side of having property in his possession which belongs to some company or other. That is, as I read it, an accusation of obtaining stolen property or obtaining something illegally. I cannot permit such an accusation to escape my notice.

MR. HOLLETT: I certainly did not illegally get possession of this document, but I withdraw the statement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied. The fact that the honourable gentleman asked the question that bears no other construction

than that it is an insinuating question. But in the context of his speech it is a most vile question. He asked the question—"Would the Premier tell us where he got the hen house, from what company, what it cost and what he paid for it?" Now in the context of his speech which he is making that will bear only one interpretation to our friends in the press box, some of whom will be so happy to publish it. There is only one interpretation it is possible to place on it; that is that somehow or other the Premier has been caught by the Leader of the Opposition, or if he has not been caught there is a strong hint, a strong suspicion about it, that somehow the Premier or a member of his family or both of them have benefited illegally, improperly, dishonestly in connection with a hen house or some other piece of property. That is the straight and simple inference which must be drawn from the statement that was made, and which must be withdrawn and any implication of dishonesty. I am going to say now; I am not going to let the honourable gentleman make another speech or complete this one, as far as the House will support me, I will not allow him to go on until he completely withdraws any implication of impropriety or dishonesty on my part or any member of my family. I am entitled to that—my name means too much to me.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member must not usurp the power of the Chair.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, that is the point I was going to make. I consider it the right of any member to protect his reputation, but surely, Sir, the Speaker is the one to say who is and who is not to speak and under what terms.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the House

may depend on me to see the proper course is followed, and I will not be hastened nor moved by any amount of debate. I am not concerned by what the press may say. I am concerned with the appearance of this in Hansard. I gathered the same inferences as the Premier himself did from the unfortunate statement of the Leader of the Opposition. I would be grossly delinquent in my duty if I allowed the remark to pass without explanation. A withdrawal of the statement has been asked for and must be given. It imputes dishonesty to a certain member of the House in his private capacity, having nothing whatsoever to do with affairs of government.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have already withdrawn. I am not casting any reflections on the honourable member. As to his honesty, Sir, as far as I know the Honourable the Premier is as honest as the sun. I have never known him to do a dishonest thing. And I certainly do not impute dishonesty to him with regard to the remark I made. I am sorry I said it. But you must remember, Sir, I did it under a bit of stress. I was accused continuously of associating with thieves. I certainly do not impute any dishonesty to the Honourable the Premier, and I would not want anyone and I would not want the press to say I said that, and I certainly would not want the people of the country to think there was anything dishonest about the Premier nor any other member. If the imputation was there with regard to the Honourable the Premier, I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: That satisfies the Chair.

I would like to add a warning: How good a rule it is in debate to refrain from personalities — Resume your speech.

MR. HOLLETT: This man of the firm of Koch over there Sir (and I am quoting an official of the company) and I understand Mr. Koch gets a salary of one thousand dollars a month from Koch Shoes and \$500 a month from Canadian Leather Goods, Gold Sail, now. Koch's wife gets \$200 from Koch Shoes and \$150 from Gold Sail. In other words a man and his wife in one of these new industries are drawing down a salary between them of eighteen hundred and fifty dollars a month. I think that works out to something like \$23,000 a year. Now that may be quite in order, but I want to know, how in the name of goodness a small firm like that can succeed here in Newfoundland if the top officials are going to get that?

In a debate like this, Sir (call it a debate) there are many things that come to ones mind in trying to prove that there is really a need for an investigation. You see, Sir, the credit of the country is actually at stake, not only the credit of this House, not only the credit of the Honourable the Premier (and I almost said something then but I won't, in connection with a remark he made about me and what he is going to disclose about me.)

MR. SPEAKER: That matter has been disposed off. The honourable member is getting into the personal field again.

MR. HOLLETT: I quote from the "Montreal Times" of February, in "Ottawa Notebook":

"Expatriates of Newfoundland worry: West Germany is worried about development in Newfoundland but hesitates to step in. They can see trouble ahead for some of their expatriates."

That is only a small paragraph, but

it appears in the "Montreal Times" under the heading of "Ottawa Notebook." Now who of us Newfoundlanders, who of us in this House, want to see a thing like that about our little country. Let us get the thing cleaned up. Let us get the industries ironed out, and let us get these new industries that are likely to succeed and get them put on their feet in the proper manner. Mr. Grube, I think, Superior Rubber Company, I think, had some difficulty and was arrested in Germany for possessing some eighty thousand dollars which he had not reported to the authorities over there. Where did he get it? He got it from Newfoundland. Then Mr. Max Wogau, I think it was, flew back in order to get a statement from somebody in authority about that eighty thousand dollars. The statement was made, was given to Mr. Braun Wogau and when he flew back with the statement Mr. Grube was released. We cannot stand these things, Sir, we cannot stand that kind of talk of Newfoundland, we cannot have these things happen—another reason why there should be a Commission of Inquiry. There is a Mr. Leja who received some large amount of money from Newfoundland, and he paid them out to various episodes or commissions, some of them went to New York and some of them went to St. Andrews Fisheries. Then there was fifty thousand dollars sent to a man who it was thought might set up a plant and make a shipping centre at Claienville. That fifty thousand dollars was sent to him in Switzerland as a sort of a guarantee that the Government would give some sort of a contract.

MR. SMALIWOOD: Sent by whom?

MR. HOLLETT: I believe it must have been Dr. Valdmanis.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Some of the stolen goods, some of the ill-gotten gain.

MR. HOLLETT: Why did you let him get the ill-gotten gain?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't say a word against him now!

MR. HOLLETT: Oh yes, he is a crook—too bad you did not find out before.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't condemn him now, your darling friend.

MR. BROWNE: Your darling friend?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was my darling friend—By whom was he paid fifty thousand dollars?

MR. HOLLETT: It was sent to him from the American Express Company, Incorporated, New York.

MR. SMALLWOOD: From them or by them?

MR. HOLLETT: Do I have to answer these questions?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why all this mystery—Tell it. Come out with it. Why protect Valdmanis? What has it got to do with this debate?

MR. HOLLETT: I have a letter from him. It was not stolen. Mr. Edward Zippman—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anything wrong with the letter?

MR. HOLLETT: Not a thing, but I do say he got fifty thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not from me, not from the Government.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not insinuating that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not say that.

MR. HOLLETT: I told the Honourable the Premier my belief about Dr. Valdmanis, Will the Honourable the Premier tell me what relationship that Valdmanis had with the Government on November 21, 1951.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think he was employed with the Government. He was employed by the Government when he robbed all that money, you know.

MR. HOLLETT: Where did he get the fifty thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He robbed it. That is why he is in jail.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't think he actually robbed it, it was paid over.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He thought so when he pleaded guilty.

MR. CURTIS: That is the charge he pleaded guilty of.

MR. SPEAKER: The mutual cross-examination is out of order. I was about to say that with so much debating going on I did have the opportunity of hearing that an honourable member says fifty thousand dollars were sent to a certain gentleman somewhere. The obvious inference is that the Government sent it, so that it is quite proper to ask the question, where does the money come from? Has the answer been given? Otherwise there is an implied charge that it came from the Government. I think that is a justifiable construction.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, it is my contention the money came out of the pockets of the people of Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is my contention too. That is why I had him arrested.

MR. HOLLETT: My opinion of the Premier's straight and above-board step—he is a man. This is a letter written December 10, 1951. That is one day after \$50,000 was sent to Zippman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Excuse me, the money sent to Zippman was sent in the month of January last year, 1954.

MR. HOLLETT: No, that is when he returned it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe he returned it then. The FBI found the records in the American Express Company office in New York, of the transaction, which was the first any of us knew of it.

MR. HOLLETT: It was returned on February 23, 1954.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, that is wrong. It was sent on January 15—I am speaking from memory. It was sent to Zippman by Valdmanis, January 15, last year, and returned shortly after to Valdmanis. I think that is what the record shows.

MR. SPEAKER: Let me say something here: As far as the Chair is concerned a letter written from one member to another is private property. I have not seen the thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. If we are to have the evidence in the Valdmanis case for which he is now serving a sentence in jail, let us have it, but if any honourable friend thinks that it is good practice to pluck little items here and there unrelated, just mysteriously — what about the fifty thousand dollars sent Zippman. That fifty thousand is only one of dozens of transactions we found out about Valdmanis through the FBI and the RCMP. The honourable gen-

tleman is plucking little items out of literally hundreds.

MR. HOLLETT: Twenty-two.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There were literally dozens of transactions in which Valdmanis was implicated, that we found out, many of them we did not find out. And he picks on one and tries to make it sound as though this Government were dishonest. Why is he doing it? He is trying to prove that a Royal Commission should be appointed to investigate the industries, and as a piece of evidence — clearly anything else would be out of order for him to bring into his speech except arguments and evidence to prove his case. As part of his evidence, part of his case, he suddenly produces an amount of fifty thousand dollars and demand to know what it is about, what about this and what about that. Is that not a clear implication? It is not clearly made as an effort on his part to impute some kind of dishonesty to this Government, because he couples with it that fact that I wrote a letter on a certain date, which he says was the day before Valdmanis sent that sort of money. Now why does he couple a letter from me, written on a certain date to Zippman with the fact Valdmanis on the next day, so he says, shipped a certain amount of money to Zippman? What is that done for? Why? I ask Your Honour is that in order? Is it not just skirting at the very edge of making an accusation? Have I no defense against that?

MR. SPEAKER: Less than three minutes ago I ruled on precisely the same thing. I said (I think clearly enough for the House to hear) that if an honourable member says in the course of his speech in debate criticizing the Government, that some fifty thousand dollars was sent out to New-

foundland to a gentleman in another country, the inference that the Chair makes of it is that it was sent by the Government. I uphold the Premier's right to ask, in fact to demand, where the money came from. That is precisely what I have ruled on.

I am about to go into a matter of private documents :

MR. HOLLETT : Mr. Speaker, I am not going into a matter of private documents. The Honourable the Premier asked me to read the letter he wrote.

MR. SMALLWOOD : Yes, whatever is in it will do far less damage if it is read than a mysterious letter written by me. I am not ashamed.

MR. HOLLETT : Don't forget, I am not imputing that the Government sent over this fifty thousand dollars. In my opinion it was done on Valdmanis's directive to the American Express Company in New York.

MR. SMALLWOOD : Who else could have given instructions other than Valdmanis?

MR. HOLLETT : Mr. Leja.

MR. SMALLWOOD : No, Sir, the account was in Valdmanis's name.

MR. HOLLETT : Well, I mean Valdmanis could give the instructions to Leja.

MR. SMALLWOOD : The money was paid out of his account in the American Express Company.

MR. HOLLETT : Anyway Leja acted from Dr. Valdmanis. Do you want to see it?

MR. SMALLWOOD : I am not interested. He is down in jail now.

MR. CURTIS : I would like to see that, Mr. Speaker. I heard so much of that document in the last couple of years, I wondered what I did sign. Mr. Speaker knows any lawyer will sign as a witness any document. I have heard of this document before, I should really like to see it, and have never yet been able to trace it. This is the first chance I have had.

MR. HOLLETT : I am glad to help you.

MR. CURTIS : The very fact my honourable friend mentioned the name.

MR. HOLLETT : If someone has not taken it already! Anyway I will find it for you.

MR. SMALLWOOD : Read the letter I wrote.

MR. HOLLETT : This is one of the best proofs I have ever seen of the imaginative scope of the Honourable Premier—

Province of Newfoundland

Office of the Premier

St. John's, Dec. 10th, 1951

Mr. Ewald Zippman,
Wermelskirchen,
Germany.

Dear Mr. Zippman,

I am writing the following letter to you so that you may use it in any official quarters you deem necessary.

On November 26th 1951 the people of Newfoundland gave an overwhelming mandate to our Government to continue with a rapid industrialization of Newfoundland. In compliance with well established principles in Economic Development, we had, and still have, to establish our basic industries.

We have just started a cement mill,

built by Miag Brunschweig. Our gypsum works, built by Benno Schilde of Hersfeld, will commence operations very soon. In 1952, we plan to establish a ceramic industry for the purpose of producing tile, clinker, plates, pottery and related products.

Our Government thankfully acknowledges the services to Newfoundland of Mr. Zippman of Wermelskirchen who acts as our honorary advisor on our proposed tile industry. We approve of his idea, that having the cement and gypsum industries of our West Coast, we should establish the tile (bricks etc.) industry on our East Coast, Clarenville area, so that a cheap and profitable water transport system could be easily arranged on the basis of bringing West Coast products (cement, gypsum, etc.) to the Eastern Coast, and going back from east to west with a cargo of bricks, tile pottery etc.

But we have a greater idea in mind too.

We are considering the necessity of having one more shipping line from Newfoundland to Montreal, and possibly Toronto; but we are particularly concerned with the idea of having a direct line to Newfoundland — the European Continent, possibly Hamburg. Such Newfoundland-Hamburg line would bring about the exchange of Newfoundland as well as German (and continental European) products with greater speed and efficiency, and at less transportation cost than under present prevailing circumstances where German cargo is being shipped to Newfoundland via Rotterdam or Liverpool.

Our Government is seriously considering the granting of permits and some special assistance to the "Zippa Shipping Company" in Dusseldorf, if they should be willing to come to New-

foundland, and we highly appreciate Mr. Zippman's valuable suggestions with regard to expanding and deepening the already existing Newfoundland and German ties. Nothing could serve this purpose so much, as a Newfoundland-German shipping line. We may even consider the granting of a loan to Mr. Zippman or to his Zippa Shipping Company to facilitate the establishing of such shipping line, incorporated in Newfoundland.

Thanking you for your visit to Newfoundland, and hoping to see you back again very soon.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. Smallwood,
Premier

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is nothing at all in all that, not a thing. How much better to have read it than to have it a mysterious letter. I wrote hundreds like that. Incidentally I did not write it, only signed it. Dr. Valdmánis wrote it.

MR. HOLLETT: I mentioned the fact that that man was given fifty thousand dollars and returned it later. And I say that came out of the peoples' pockets of this country. Where it went after it came back—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Back in Valdmánis's pocket.

MR. HOLLETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to prolong the agony. I could mention a lot of other things, but I only mentioned enough to prove to this House and to every member of the House that it is high time that a Commission of Inquiry should be set up on the part of the Government to go into these things. Let us get the truth. Let us get it straightened out. Let us stop all the rumours. Only today

there was a rumour sent me, and I am pretty well sure it is true. I am not greatly interested, and that is in connection with certain German goods coming in here marked "Made in Newfoundland," to certain of these companies. I say—if the Government have any knowledge of that they should put a stop to it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a matter for the Canadian Customs and not the Newfoundland Government.

MR. HOLLETT: That is your job.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—Irrelevant.

MR. HOLLETT: That is all I want to say now. Mr. Speaker, except to say I do wish that the Government would take—mind you we had to say these things else there would be no justification whatsoever in moving this amendment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is true.

MR. HOLLETT: I only do it in order to show the members on the opposite side of the House that we are, as the Premier once said, fishing in troubled water, and the credit of this country is at stake. All these companies that came in here, I repeat, were supposed to raise money by bond issues under guarantees of the Government, dollar for dollar. They failed to do it, and they still fail to do it. It is about time something was done with regard to clearing up the many, many mysteries cropping up every once in a while ever since this mysterious Dr. Valdmanis arrived here in Newfoundland. Now I have every sympathy with the Honourable the Premier over the Valdmanis affair. I feel quite sure the Honourable the Premier gave him his every faith and trust and believed so much in the man he gave too much of that, and the man actually took advantage of him.

I know if I were in the place of the Premier when that thing happened I would feel pretty miserable over it. I don't blame the Premier. If I were to blame the Premier I would blame every man in the Government, because every man in the Government is responsible for anything like that as much as the Premier. At any rate they should have demanded some knowledge about this man, and this man Valdmanis brought this country into disrepute and brought the Government into disrepute and every Newfoundlander into disrepute. I maintain therefore, Mr. Chairman, a Commission of Inquiry is indicated. Thank you very much.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak to this amendment, but I think the tone and nature of the arguments which have been produced in favour of the amendment make it imperative for me to do so. As everyone knows, as Solicitor General I was in charge of the Valdmanis case. I have as much knowledge of the case as anyone in Newfoundland, I would think. The whole point of this amendment today seems to be on the Valdmanis case. Valdmanis's arrest and Valdmanis's imprisonment are the main reasons put forward by the members of the Opposition today as the reason why a Royal Commission should be appointed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in spite of all the facts in the case, and the facts are overwhelming, the documentation is overwhelming and proves beyond any question of doubt whatsoever that the hands of the Government were absolutely clean in this affair. There is not one thing in all this documentation, all the mass of evidence, reflecting anything but the utmost credit on the Premier. In spite of

that, in spite of evidence most overwhelming, the most overwhelming I have ever seen in a case, there seems to be an attempt to say there is something disreputable, something wrong, something which does not reflect credit on the Government. That seems to be the point of the Opposition's theme and so they will seek to throw mud on, so will sling mud. These are modern tactics, sir, in politics, well known in America, brought to a high profession called "McCarthyism" — throw enough mud and some will stick. I could cite question No. 2 sub-section 2 on the Order Paper the other day — Who was the representative of the Government who held talks with Dr. Valdmanis in the penitentiary?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. I think that matter has been disposed of by the House, sir, previously, and my idea is that the thing is not to be brought up again.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order is upheld.

MR. MURRAY: I will cite, sir, another example of these smear tactics.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order again. Is it correct for one member to get up and accuse a member of the Opposition taking part in a debate of "smear tactics"?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the term ought to be used nor applied to members of the House in the course of a debate.

MR. MURRAY: Sir, I will quote from incidents which took place in today's debate. Mention was made of rumors against Dr. Valdmanis. It was mentioned that the Premier had vehemently defended Dr. Valdmanis

against these rumors. Now what were these rumors, if they were rumors at that particular time, if they were that? Were they rumors that Dr. Valdmanis was defrauding the Government? If they were and the Premier defended him the Premier would be at fault. What were the rumors? That he was anti-Semitic. It came from a Yiddish paper in New York, that he had been responsible for the death of thousands of Jews, a statement subsequently retracted by the Jewish paper. These were the rumors the Premier at that time vehemently defended Valdmanis against, and why not? That is what I call smear tactics. If the rumors were that Valdmanis was defrauding the Government and the Premier defended him, then the Premier would be at fault, but quite obviously the Premier was quite right.

Now let us look at what were the facts in the Valdmanis case. We started out on industrial development. Everyone agreed it was right to do so. Everyone knows, the Government knows, this country cannot expand on a couple of hundred thousand quintals of fish a year. We cannot live in a modern world on such an economy. Our Government and every government previous to us had agreed that industrial development must come into Newfoundland. Now we started off in a better position than most governments. We had money to put in but if it was to be effective we had to have a plan and a man to put the plan into effect. And the Premier went abroad to look for such a man. He found a man whom he thought at the time infinitely qualified to put the industrial development plan into effect. Here was a man who as a very young man had been a Finance Minister in a foreign country, a train-

ed industrialist, an economist, highly recommended by most responsible people in Canada. This young man was taken on by the Premier. As the Premier said, he was a forceful man, energetic, a man of high-capabilities. It seemed that this was just the man that we wanted. He seemed to be the answer to our prayer. The Premier was delighted and praised him extravagantly, perhaps too extravagantly. That is the situation. But what was the Opposition tactic then? Here was a man, as far as the world knew, most capable, a man eminently capable, but at this time the Tories had nothing good to say about him. He was a "Nazi," "Anti-Semitic" and above all he was a foreigner, a Latvian — nothing was too bad to say. As far as the man we and the world knew, he was nothing but an honest man of the highest capability.

Then the new denouncement came. Valdmanis became a crook, self-confessed. Then the Tory attitude — immediately this self-confessed crook became a martyr, the prisoner in the Cochrane Hotel, the society ladies all over St. John's weeping in their tea-cups about the doctor, and when a Tory doctor came along to prove Dr. Valdmanis would go mad if kept in the Cochrane Hotel — Now I know the Cochrane Hotel, I do not think it is the Waldorf Astoria, but I do not think it is quite as bad as that — We got a doctor from the Mental Hospital who pushed this sort of evidence away with the stroke of his hand. But the point is, Dr. Valdmanis became the Tory Martyr, the idol.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, that was never the attitude of the Opposition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Every Tory in St. John's.

MR. HOLLETT: I never had anything to say about the man, as I said this afternoon.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Every Tory in St. John's — the Darling of the Tories.

MR. HOLLETT: The Premier says so. He was not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order — might I remind the House the Solicitor General has the floor, attempting to speak.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, let us make no mistake about Valdmanis, the self-confessed crook, the best evidence in the word there, the proven, admitted crook, he admitted his guilt. There is no question of a jury. Some people could say a jury was picked, people could say a judge was wrong, but Valdmanis, so overwhelming was the case against him, Valdmanis is a self-confessed crook, and the documentation and proof is overwhelming, proof beyond any shadow of doubt. There is nothing whatsoever in it reflects on the Government and the evidence does nothing but give the highest credit to the Premier. If anything was ever established — Valdmanis took the money and the hands of the Government are clean.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what were the facts in the case? The Premier, as I have said, took Dr. Valdmanis to his bosom, praised him extravagantly, lavishly. Then all of a sudden the Premier learned that this man whom he had put so much trust in was a crook.

MR. HOLLETT: How did he learn it?

MR. MURRAY: Information was given him. What did he do? Consider for a moment the position of the Premier. He knew he had praised the

man. He said he would have to get out if Valdmanis did. He knew all that. He knew if he exposed Valdmanis, the Premier himself would be exposing himself to ridicule and scorn and jeers. Now that is a position few men would like, a position almost any man would recoil from — as Mark Twain said; "I can eat crow, but I don't hanker for it." That is the position the Premier was in. He knew, once he set the wheels of the law in motion inevitably he had to expose himself to ridicule and jeers and scorn. Now that is only half. I say it took a great deal of moral courage, in spite of that, knowing that position, to go ahead and do what was right. That was not all: He knew what kind of man Valdmanis was. He knew he was a resourceful man, a capable man. He thought he was a brave man. Now here is a man the Premier knew had gotten away with four hundred thousand dollars. Would it not be natural for the Premier to think that such a man would dispose of the money in such a way that it would never be heard of after? Was not that a natural assumption, knowing Valdmanis, capable and resourceful. Now picture the position the Premier is putting himself in. If the money were never found, never came to light, Valdmanis had the perfect answer: I took it and gave it to the Premier. That is the position the Premier was in. I say, Mr. Speaker, it took the highest moral courage, knowing that and appreciating that position, as the Premier did, to still go ahead regardless and put the wheels in motion.

MR. COURAGE: Hear! Hear!

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion. Valdmanis's trial and imprisonment are the principle reasons adduced by the Opposition in support of setting up a Royal Com-

mission. I say, if ever anything proved anything, the facts in the Valdmanis case clearly cleared the Government of anything wrong. The fact that the Premier could expose his best friend at the time, or a man whom he thought to be his best friend, the fact that the Premier could do that, exposing himself not alone to ridicule but the possibility of external condemnation, taking a chance on his own good name for ever in the country, if a man at the head of the Government is prepared to do that I don't see any reason for a Royal Commission.

MR. HOLLETT: What else could he do?

MR. MURRAY: He could have said nothing about it, and Valdmanis could be going around today. He knew the chance he was taking and he took it. He wanted to protect the resources of the country. If there had been robbery even though it was committed by a man whom the Premier thought was his best friend, yet the Premier pounced on it, and he brought it to light. Now if he would do that in the case of Valdmanis, what would happen to any of the rest, these fellows out at Koch Shoes and all the rest. I am as certain as I am standing here, if the Premier, as in the case of Valdmanis, finds out there is anything wrong, he will be the first man to put the law in motion. I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, for setting up this Royal Commission, and I am opposed to the amendment.

(Applause from the Government side).

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the last speaker a question? How do you propose to find out if the charges made about the misconduct of the Superior Rubber Company—

MR. SPEAKER: The question is out of order. The honourable member will resume his seat.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate, as it is now virtually 6:00 o'clock. I think it would be rather profitless if I proceeded to speak at this moment. I ask Your Honour to call it 6:00 o'clock, so that at 8:00 I may make my speech.

On motion debate adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 o'clock I will now leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock.

NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind the House that you have ruled, that the amendment proposed yesterday by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West constitutes a vote of lack of confidence in the Government. This amendment if carried would mean that this House has no confidence in the Government. If this amendment carries, I have to go tonight to the Lieutenant-Governor and hand in my resignation as Premier. When I do so, whether my colleagues like it or not, whether they do anything about it or not, automatically the Government goes out of office—the Government falls — that is the end of the Liberal Government — the Smallwood Administration. That is what is meant by this amendment which asks this House to agree to the proposition that a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into the new industries.

The amendment itself and the arguments of the two honourable gentlemen who have spoken to it from the other side of the House are based very largely, if not entirely, upon the fact of a man "Alfred Valdmanis"—upon the fact that there was such a man — the fact that he was the Director General of Economic Development for this Government — the fact that he was arrested at my instance — the fact that he is now in jail, a self-confessed criminal — the facts of Valdmanis. The superficial facts about him constitute the principal reason given in this amendment and the principal arguments of my two honourable friends.

I think, therefore, it would be sound if I were to say something about the Valdmanis case: My honourable colleague, the Solicitor General, told us here before the recess that he knew more about the Valdmanis case than did anyone else in this House, and probably more than anyone else in Newfoundland. I think that is true. As Solicitor General he handled the case. But I happened to be the person who created the case—I happened to be the one who ordered the arrest of Alfred Valdmanis, and I know more than any other man why I ordered his arrest. I said at the time that it was the hardest thing I had ever had to do (or something of that nature) the hardest, the most difficult task I had ever been called upon to perform (or some such remark as that). That was a miserly under-statement because in ordering the arrest of my friend, my close friend and collaborator, Dr. Alfred Valdmanis, in ordering the arrest of a man who had been closer to me than any other man — I took my political life in my hands.

Now the story is this: Dr. Valdmanis came to Newfoundland at my

invitation. I met him first in the city of Ottawa. It was in my room in the Chateau Laurier in Ottawa, the hotel there, and with me in my room at the first moment I laid eyes on Alfred Valdmanis was my honourable colleague, the Minister of Education, the member for Harbour Grace. It was on a Sunday. I invited him to my room, and I had lunch sent up to my room. The three of us, my colleague, the present Minister of Education, Dr. Valdmanis and I, had lunch together. For several hours at my request Valdmanis told us the story of his life. It took several hours to tell. My colleague and I agreed that it was truly a remarkable story and that his life was truly a remarkable one. I remember the tears that came in his eyes and streamed over his cheeks as he told us of his suffering at the hands of the Russians in gaol in Riga, the capital city of Latvia. He said then; "One day I will show you my body and you will see the marks of Communist torture." My honourable colleague the present Minister of Education, agreed that he was a very remarkable man with a remarkable career behind him. Now here in Newfoundland he repeated that story to a number of persons. I know that he repeated it to Mr. Perlin. I know that he repeated it to Mr. C. E. A. Jeffery, M.B.E. because I was present on each occasion when he did so. He told the story of his life many times, and I listened most carefully each time, and never once did I detect a contradiction between one of his accounts and another of them, always his statements jibed precisely, which was quite impressive.

Here was a man who at that time was 42 years of age, when I met him. He was highly recommended, very highly recommended, and he worked

at that moment for the Department of Trade and Commerce of the Government of Canada, and he worked at that same moment for the Department of Immigration of the Department of the Government of Canada. He was working for two Departments of State at that time, drawing a salary from each one of them. He was at the same time a lecturer, professor or associate or assistant-professor of Economics at Carlton College. He was altogether drawing a salary of nine or ten thousand dollars a year, so he said. I saw no reason to doubt it. The recommendation that was given to me was extremely high. He was then 42. He had been in Canada for three years, I think. He had at that time worked for the Government of Nova Scotia on loan from Ottawa. He had worked for the Nova Scotia Research Foundation. He had made an economic study of the possibilities of a cement mill in Nova Scotia to investigate the cost of blast furnace slag from the steel mills in Sydney as the main raw material of slag cement. He had made an economic study of the possibility of a gypsum plasterboard and plaster lathe mill in Nova Scotia. Accompanied by Dr. Rowland, the Chairman of the Nova Scotia Research Foundation, and others, he had gone to Germany from Nova Scotia to investigate the cost of getting a gypsum plasterboard and lathe plant built for Nova Scotia.

Three years he had been in Canada. Before that he had been in Geneva, or in Switzerland somewhere, I think Geneva, working for "RIO" (The International Refugee Organization of the Allied Nations). For two or three years before that he had been, so he said, a kind of prisoner of war of the German Government, because when he opposed the German occupation of Latvia, and when he became the leader

of the Latvia Underground, indeed the Baltic Underground Resistance to the Germans, the Germans had caught him and shipped him off to Berlin. In Berlin, so he said, he had done economic planning for the German Government. He had planned the construction of cement mills for the German Government during the war. Before he was brought to Germany he was in Latvia for about a year. He was in gaol as a prisoner of the Russians. Before that he had been head of the Latvia Hydro-Electric Commission, or chairman. Before that he had been a member of the Cabinet of Latvia, holding three portfolios, Minister of Finance, Minister of Trade and Minister of Industry. He was the youngest Cabinet Minister on the Continent of Europe — great civilized Europe. He had been the Leader of the Latvia Delegation to the League of Nations. It was at the League of Nations he had made the acquaintance and had become a close personal friend of Dr. Hugh Keenlyside, whose name was so notable in Canada.

So, on that Sunday afternoon he came to us not only highly recommended but with what appeared to be, a distinguished career as an economist, as an industrialist, as a financier. He was still only 42 years of age. He was a man of enormous energy, enormous, mountainous energy, and he was a man of towering ability. He speaks English with a finer vocabulary than most of us to whom English is our native language. He speaks German fluently. He speaks Russian, and of course he speaks his own native Latvian. He was born and raised speaking Latvian. He had a smattering of French, was a very good Latin scholar. He was an economist, and had been sent out by his own Government to study as a student, as

a university student. Then after he had studied industry and economics in different countries and had studied under the great Dr. Schacht, one of the greatest economists who had lived in the world, the man whose genius as a financier made Hitlerism feasible, practically enabled Hitler to build vast military machinery. It was Dr. Schacht who made all that possible. And Valdmanis had worked under him, as a courtesy of the German Government as a number of students of other countries who worked in Germany under the great Dr. Schacht.

So we brought him here. The man worked like a dog. He set new records. He could even outwork me. When I thought I was putting in an honest day's work, with sixteen and seventeen hours a day, Mr. Valdmanis was working even longer hours. We made a team. I have six brothers and I have seven sisters. I never loved one of them as I loved that man. So we went for several years as a team. I admired him intensely. He had great gifts, great talents. He was a magnificent pianist, a magnificent athlete, a magnificent linguist, well-read, a man who could hold his own, as I saw him do on dozens of occasions in the great circle of bankers in New York, Montreal, London and all across the face of Europe, as I saw him do so many times and as my honourable colleague the Attorney General, saw him do, and as the Honourable Minister of Education saw him do and as others of us saw him do repeatedly, again and again — a man of mountainous ability — I was very fond of him, had great affection for him. He was a great worker and I like workers. And it had every appearance that the two of us working against time to build industries for Newfoundland — Now it was about

the month of December or it might have been November or it might have been October in the year before last, that is 1955—in the Fall of 1953, we began to drift apart — we began to drift apart. There was a rift between us. It was never put into words but I began to be very annoyed by the fact that he would not come and live here and bring his family. He said that he wanted to keep his family in Montreal. I did not like it, but I did not say too much to him about it. Then he would be absent for months on end, and come down here for maybe three days. There would be a mad rush for three or four days, night and day, and then he would be off again, off to Detroit and Cleveland and Boston and New York. He travelled all over the Continent of North America — That was when we were promoting NALCO.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I had a visit from General Wallis and Mr. Ronald Turta in my office, in January or February last year. I think it was somewhere in the winter time. Months do not mean anything to me. I don't know what month I am in now. But it was sometime in the winter of last year, when I had a visit from General Wallis and Mr. Ronald Turta. They came to my office by appointment to bring to my attention certain facts that they alleged concerning Dr. Valdmanis and his work as president (or was it chairman?) of NALCO. I was astonished. But Dr. Valdmanis was due to arrive in a few days from Montreal. So I said to these two gentlemen: "Will you leave it to me, let me handle it? They said: "We came to you because you represent the owners of NALCO. I said: "All right then, leave it with me." This they did.

Two or three days later Dr. Valdmanis arrived in St. John's and he went to work as usual up in his office.

That night of the day of his arrival—or he possibly got in the night and next day he worked, and about 11:00 o'clock that night he telephoned me from his office in NALCO up here to my office in Canada House. He said; "Mr. Premier, I have been dictating reports for you all day and they will be typed in a few minutes. Would you be too tired for me to send them down to you?" I said: "Not at all, but instead of sending them down bring them down." He said: "Would you mind if I came down?" I said: "No, I would rather that you bring them down yourself."

Now the Honourable Minister of Finance, my colleague, at the moment happened to be in my office. Now he did not know anything. Nobody knew anything. I had not said a single sound to a soul — or I think I did to my honourable colleague, the Attorney General. At all events we went into the office in my house and we locked the front door so that he could not just walk in the door. The bell rang at about a quarter to twelve. I went out myself. We have no maid. I went out myself. He came in. I did not see his hand as he put it out for me to shake hands with him — I happened not to see it. I turned around. He walked in behind me. He went to shake hands with the Minister of Finance and he happened not to see his hand either.

I said; "Sit down." He sat down. First he handed me the reports. I said, "thank you very much!" and laid them on one side.

He sat down and I named five items one after the other. I said; "Now I don't know, maybe I should have you arrested, but I won't. You will make immediate restitution, and you will

hand me your written resignation tomorrow."

He sat there stunned, of course. Naturally, as you would expect, he could not speak. After a while he said very weakly: "All right, Mr. Premier, whatever you say."

We sat there for twenty minutes without a syllable being spoken by anyone, the three of us, for twenty minutes. It was a very bitter twenty minutes for me. Finally I said: "Why did you do it? You had a good salary, a lovely family, a lovely home, honour and prestige. Why did you do it?" He said nothing. So there was a long silence. Then he got up and left. As he walked out of the room he said: "Would you give me until tomorrow night so that I can clean up my desk?" I said, "All right." He said: "Can I bring in my resignation from NALCO, from North Star Cement, from the Gypsum Plant?" (Whatever he was connected with, which he had to resign from). I said: "Yes bring them to me tomorrow night."

He came in the next night with his resignation. And he walked out of my office happier, relatively speaking, than he had been for a long time, because he walked out of my office that night knowing that I knew nothing except what I had mentioned, these matters affecting NALCO. That is all I knew. He walked out on air, that night, out of my office—he walked out on air.

That was sometime in February, I think. My honourable friends will remember the occasion of his leaving. It was noted in the press that there was not a soul to see him off. He drove out to Torbay and went off alone. A few of his compatriots turned up to wish him good bye, but nobody from the Government, least of all myself.

Then to everyone's surprise he came back a few weeks later. The reason for that was that he had failed to resign as a director of NALCO. He had resigned as chairman, but, by an oversight on his part, which he did not notice either, he had neglected to resign as a director of NALCO. We thought we saw a show-down coming at that next meeting of NALCO and we needed his vote. So we asked him to come back and attend the NALCO meeting, to throw his vote in with ours, as he was still a director.

When the meeting ended he resigned, and then he left. That time his leaving was final until he was brought back by the police.

Now after he left Newfoundland — He was gone a few weeks when I had a visit from someone who came to me and asked several questions — a personal friend of mine it was — he asked me several questions. I paid no particular attention to these questions. He went after I answered the questions. About three or four weeks later this man came back to me again.

He said: "Remember my being in to you?"

I said, I did.

He said: "Remember the questions I asked you?"

I said: "Yes, I do. Why?"

Then he told me the story. The story was this:

"When Dr. Valdimanis was negotiating on behalf of the Government with the German firm of Benno Schilde, negotiating with that firm for the building of our present gypsum plant at Humbermouth, when he was negotiating with them — he was a hard negotiator. He screwed them down,

and he got a good price for the mill. Then these negotiations collapsed a couple of times. There was one man who was in the syndicate with whom Dr. Valdmánis was negotiating, Claudius Peters of Hamburg. Claudius Peters got fed up because the price was being screwed down too tight. He threw in his hand and went back to Germany, and withdrew from the syndicate. Finally they agreed on a price. Then when the price was agreed on, Valdmánis said:

"Now add on that ten per cent. This is for the Premier. This ten per cent is for the Premier, and I am acting for the Premier. You are to pay the ten per cent over to me, Valdmánis, and I will tell you where to put the money."

It was not to come to Newfoundland. It was to go to New York. It was to be paid into an account that he had already opened in the American Express Company.

"Ten per cent you are to pay to the Premier. But you are to pay it to me, through me and you are to follow my instructions. Furthermore you are to keep this very dark because, of course, if it got out it would be very bad for the Premier."

He was correct enough in that statement. He was one hundred per cent accurate there. It would be very bad for the Premier indeed if it got out.

Now the firm in question paid the money. They paid it into that account in New York City, the American Express Company — not in one lump sum but in a series of payments. In fact, according as the Government paid Benno Schilde, as they did from time to time while the plant was being built — I think it was so much down

— I don't know how it went. I don't remember the details, but according to the contract there were progress payments paid from the Newfoundland Government in United States dollars from time to time as the plant was being built. And as it got nearer and nearer to completion, over about a period of a year, or however long it took to build the plant—and each time that the Government Treasury up here with Canadian dollars bought an American dollar bank order from the Guaranteed Trust Company or whoever they were there in New York, and sent it on to Germany to Benno Schilde, each time they did so Benno Schilde remitted to that account of Dr. Valdmánis's in New York the ten per cent of that payment."

That is the story that was told me by this visitor, on his second visit to me.

I said: "Look, this all sounds like a fairy tale to me. Frankly I don't believe it."

He said: "It is true."

I said: "I don't believe it. Whatever Valdmánis is he is not a crook. Frankly, I don't believe it." And I did not believe it.

Now I did not tell anyone. I did not tell my honourable friend, the Attorney General. I did not tell my honourable friend the Minister of Finance — both of whom were very, very close to me politically and socially, very intimate and friendly. I did not mention it to a soul, not a living soul.

Then I said to this man: "Have you got any evidence at all?"

"Yes," he said, "I have not, but there is someone who has."

This someone was Dr. Hertz, a director of Benno Schilde. Dr. Hertz was the man who visited back and forth between Germany and Humbermouth supervising the erection of the plant. In other words, carrying out the Benno Schilde contract. He was the man, and what happened was this:

He said what happened was this:

"They had paid regularly and on the dot, but in December, 1953, the Minister of Labour and I went over to Germany to see a certain great firm. We went to Cologne. While we were in Cologne Dr. Hertz came down to the hotel to see me. And while the Minister of Labour and I sat there in the lobby of the hotel smoking and chatting, Dr. Hertz and Dr. Valdmanis — the four of us sat around chatting after tea — In the night they got up and walked up and down the lobby of the hotel, in sight of us, chatting away in German. I did not speak German. I did not know what Dr. Valdmanis was telling Dr. Hertz in my very presence — That the Premier was in a bad position. I had to have some money and had to have it quickly.

He said to Dr. Valdmanis: "I kept our bargain and gave what we agreed to give."

"It is no use to talk about that now. He must have money," Dr. Valdmanis told him.

And he got ten thousand dollars from him there.

"Well", I said, "I remember the occasion. Yes, I do remember them walking up and down in the hotel."

Here is what else happened:—

When Benno Schilde had the plant completed, when they completed their

contract they came to us, to the Government, and came into the Cabinet, and they said they were out-of-pocket. They had lost money on the contract. After they had made the contract prices had gone up, labour had gone up, I think three times. In Humbermouth, I think, wages had gone up three times when they were building that gypsum plant. Steel went up and cement went up and other raw materials went up above the prices that prevailed when they had made the contract. So they came back to us when the building was erected and the machinery installed and said: "We have lost money on the contract. Would you consider giving us a 'compassionate' allowance (was the word)" — an ex gratia payment in equity, which I understand is pretty commonplace with governments all around the world.

Now we had made an ex gratia payment to the firm of MIAG. They had completed the building of the cement plant before the gypsum plant was completed. On completion of that contract the Firm of MIAG had come to us and had put up their claim, which was the same type of claim— everything had gone up — and it had. When we checked that there was not any doubt about it. And they could give us, and we knew, every week the complete week to week cost of that plant. We had all the figures, the weekly reports and we knew precisely to the dollar what was being paid for labour. We had that weekly. We knew that the wages went up three times. And we could compute within twenty cents how much additional money they had been forced to pay out in labour etc. So we allowed them the ex gratia payment.

But what I was sore about — and when Benno Schilde asked I said; "Go

to hell! No." These were my words. "Go to hell! — No — Not at all!"

Valdmanis said: "Now Mr. Premier, you have got to be fair. They are out of money."

Now I am a little ahead of my story, Mr. Speaker:

I had been pleading with Benno Schilde to come to Newfoundland. I wanted them to establish here a plant of their own because they are a good firm, an excellent firm, one of the best in Europe. The place they were to establish in was Bay Roberts. They kept hanging back and hanging back on it. They would not agree to come. So that finally when they came to me asking for the ex gratia payment I told them "Go to hell". Dr Valdmanis then came to me and said; "Now look, Mr. Premier, you know you want to get Benno Schilde."

"Well," I said, "If they take the ex-gratia payment we give them and spend it on a plant in Newfoundland, all right I will agree". Then in came Dr. Hertz and the resident engineer, who erected the plant, two of them came in to the Cabinet and for two or three hours we hammered out exactly what they were to make in that plant in Bay Roberts. We agreed we would give them the ex-gratia payment, not what they had asked for, several hundred thousand dollars. But we agreed to give them a hundred and fifty thousand, half what they asked for. We agreed to give them one hundred and fifty thousand dollars on condition they would use it to build a plant of their own, a small branch plant, which was announced shortly afterwards. The House may remember my description of it. They were to work with sheet metal, sheet tin, sheet galvanized steel, copper, lead, but it was to be sheet metal.

They were to weld it and they were to bolt it and they were to rivet it, but it was to be that type of medium in which they were to work. That is what they do in Germany. I announced it. They were to incorporate themselves, which they did as "Eastern Machinery" and something; I forget the full name.

They went over to Bay Roberts. Mr. Pushie went with them. They selected the site for the plant, and we paid them the one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. We paid it into their account here in St. John's. Now they came back to us a week or two or three or more later. I don't remember exactly. They came back and said;

"Look, we want to open an office in Montreal. Our plan is this: In this Montreal office that we will open we will station an engineer-salesman, that is a man who was an engineer but who would go to the different firms and sell them, get orders from them. He had to know the business yet be an engineer but he had to be a salesman. They would also have a couple of clerks and stenographers. We will open the office. The big stuff we will send to Germany and the smaller stuff to Bay Roberts. Whatever Bay Roberts makes we will send to Bay Roberts but some stuff we send to Germany and have it come back to Bay Roberts to have it completed and delivered. Would you be agreeable to have some of this money to open an account in Montreal and have forty thousand dollars of it deposited to this account to cover our Montreal operations?"

Well, we talked it over in Cabinet and it seemed like a sensible scheme. It seemed sensible. This firm would go to the Canadian plants and get to know them and book orders, and what

was practical to do in Bay Roberts they would send to the little plant in Bay Roberts and it would otherwise go to Germany. We agreed. That left forty thousand dollars in their account in Montreal — remember that — forty thousand dollars.

When Dr. Valdmanis got this ten thousand dollars from Benno Schilde in Germany, in December 1953, it made Benno Schilde a little disgusted, a little angry. They felt they had lived up their bargain and paid the Premier his ten per cent through Dr. Valdmanis. They thought, now the Premier must be getting greedy and wanted another ten thousand dollars. Well, they gave it to him, but they did not think too well of the Premier.

In January, the very next month, the telephone rang one day in the office of Benno Schilde in Bathurst in Germany saying: "This is Dr. Valdmanis from Montreal — All hell is popping loose (or words to that effect) "the bottom is dropping out of everything. The Liberal Government of Newfoundland is practically gone, hanging by the ropes."

I was down in Jamaica, in the sunshine of Jamaica and was not aware of any crisis. I did not know the Government was hanging by the ropes nor of any crisis. I knew nothing whatsoever about it.

He said: "The Government are in an awful stew. We have to have money. We have got to have forty thousand dollars" (It is quite a coincidence that that was precisely the amount they had on deposit in Montreal). "We got to have forty thousand dollars immediately." Then he mentioned the name of a certain gentleman who is reputed to be a prominent Liberal and who is reputed to be a man who has assisted the Liberal

Party financially in various elections — (say Tom Johnson) — He mentioned his name to this Dr. Hertz in Germany, on the Trans-Atlantic telephone and said: "Tom Johnson is about ready to hang himself if he does not get the money quickly. "So," he said: "you must come right over."

He said: "Well look Dr. Valdmanis, I am terribly tied up and am due to leave now on a business trip to Turkey—I got to have time to think this over — I will call you tomorrow."

In the meantime he called his friend here in Newfoundland (that is the friend who tipped me off) — he called this friend and said: "I had a call from Dr. Valdmanis in Montreal. Dr. Valdmanis is demanding another forty thousand dollars and he says I have to go to Montreal and join him there. This friend of his who is also a friend of mine said: "That is nonsense the Premier is in Jamaica on a holiday. There is no sense in coming across the Atlantic now. You will not see the Premier if you come over here."

So he sent a telegram then to Dr. Valdmanis saying — "I understand the Premier is in Jamaica. Don't see any sense in my coming. Intend to wait until the Premier returns."

Valdmanis took up the phone and called him again and said: "Look, I know the Premier is in Jamaica. I am in touch with him hour by hour. Get over here quickly if you want to prevent a terrible blow."

Dr. Hertz said: "All right, I will come over."

He went to Montreal. Dr. Valdmanis demanded the forty thousand dollars. He said he did not have authority to give it. But he ended up by giving the forty thousand dollars, and

Dr. Valdmanis gave his note for forty thousand dollars; signed his own note for the forty thousand dollars.

When subsequently we began not to like the feel of things—When I came back I dismissed him from NALCO he got a little apprehensive and he paid back the forty thousand dollars to Benno Schilde and had his note returned to him. Meantime they had photostated the whole thing.

Now this is the story this friend of mine told me.

"Well," I said, "All right, what evidence have you besides what you tell me of? You have nothing in writing."

"Yes, we have the address of the banking account in New York. We have this in Dr. Valdmanis's own writing. He gave it to Dr. Hertz. He wrote it out and handed it to Dr. Hertz, and he still has it. So we know the name of the account."

"That is fine. That is okay," I said. "Will Dr. Hertz come here?"

"Yes, he will come."

I said: "Cable him and get him here quickly."

He came two days later, as fast as he could get here from Germany. That night he and our mutual friend went out in the car. I drove and drove around for miles, outside the city, anywhere, just to be private, and he told us the whole story in great detail.

I said: "Are you prepared to put it in writing?"

He said: "I am prepared to put it in writing."

I said: "How long will it take you?"

He said: "Give me tomorrow and I will have it for you tomorrow night."

I said: "Fine."

The next night it so happened, not by any arrangement, my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Finance, dropped in to see me as he frequently does, in to my office.

I said: "Greg, I want you to hang on and you will see and hear something interesting."

Now I had not told anyone up to this minute. About eleven o'clock in the night Dr. Hertz and our mutual friend walked in to my office. He had his statement typed out and signed and witnessed. He handed it to me, I read it and then read it aloud. That is the first time that anyone in the world had any knowledge of it, that is the Minister of Finance. I took the telephone down and called the Superintendent of Police of the RCMP. He had just gone to bed. I said: "Never mind, get up and dress and get down here quickly, if you please, it is extremely important."

Superintendent McKinnon arrived about half past midnight in my office. I introduced him to Dr. Hertz and to the other gentleman who was there (He already knew the Minister of Finance). Then the other two men left (Dr. Hertz and this other gentleman) left the office and went to the hotel.

I handed it to Superintendent McKinnon and said: "Read that first, Superintendent."

He took it and very carefully read it through — very carefully.

"Yes," he said, "that is really something."

I said: "It really is something."

Now in the meantime — I don't know if I am permitted to say this — but Dr. Hertz told me that when he returned to Germany after he had

signed the contract in the first place for Benno Schilde he went to the German Foreign Currency Control Authorities of the German Government and he said to the Authority: "Our firm has just signed a contract with the Government of Newfoundland to build a gypsum plant, but we are required to pay ten per cent of it back. It is to go to the Leader of the Party. That seems to be a practice over there in North America, what about it?"

The German Foreign Currency Control Authority said: "Oh, that is all right. We had a case like that already. We had the firm of MIAG in here who also requested permission to remit the ten per cent to New York."

Now that gave me the idea that it ran somewhere around half a million dollars, and I pointed out to Superintendent McKinnon that if he had collected ten per cent from Benno Schilde and another ten per cent from MIAG and then ten thousand dollars besides and then forty thousand dollars, which he had to pay back, then it came to over half a million dollars cash—hard cash.

I said: "I should think, Superintendent, this is one of the biggest cases the RCMP ever had to handle, don't you?"

He said: "Yes, it is undoubtedly."

I said: "I will tell you what I want you to do, and I am speaking as Premier of Newfoundland, I want you to throw the full resources of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police into this case. "Furthermore," I said: "I don't ask you to commit yourself, but I understand the FBI are very close to the RCMP and that possibly other secret police forces or police or secret service associations in North America are very close to the RCMP and that there is a

working agreement between you and various other police agencies?"

He did not say yes and he did not say no.

I said: "I want you to get all the help you can get from all the police forces that are available to you. "But," I said, "I want to get the goods, get the evidence, on Dr. Valdmanis."

He said: "I will take the plane tomorrow and I will fly straight to Ottawa myself, and I will see the Chief Commissioner."

I went down the following morning. He left my office about 2:00 o'clock in the morning. I went down at 10:00 o'clock that same forenoon and I dictated everything I could think of, everything I know, all the details I could think of, filling in the background. I suppose it took me four hours to dictate all. I volunteered to do this, to enrich the RCMP's information, to help them in their case. But I did insist I would not do it for an ordinary stenographer. It had to be a uniformed member of the RCMP. I did not want any leak. I did not want anything to leak out. The Attorney General did not know but only the Minister of Finance and I had pledged him not to utter a syllable to any soul on the earth, I was deathly afraid, I was never so afraid in my life. What I was afraid of was that Dr. Valdmanis would suspect, get a breath or whisper of it and skip out to South America or somewhere. So it had to be a deathly secret.

That afternoon the Superintendent went and the last words I said to him: "Superintendent will you do me a personal favour?"

He said: "What is it, Mr. Premier?"

I said: "Try and get the evidence on Dr. Valdmanis. In throwing the full weight of the police into this case will you remember to try to find the money. Will you try to trace the money he got, because if you don't I am a goner." Those were my words. "If you don't find the money, Dr. Valdmanis's money, then I am a goner." These were my words to Superintendent McKinnon.

He laughed. He did not see the implications. I saw them.

Now there was nothing at that point, when I knew, or thought I knew, that Dr. Valdmanis had robbed half a million dollars from the Newfoundland Government by getting these two contractors to charge half a million dollars extra and pay it over to him. When I knew that, or thought I knew it, I also thought that naturally as any member of the House would naturally suppose, anyone here would naturally suppose what I supposed, that is, that he had the money stacked away. Naturally if he was having five hundred thousand dollars in cash paid over to him in a period of two years, was it not then natural that he would have some of it, no doubt, in Canada, some of it in the United States, some of it in Mexico, some of it in other South American countries, and some of it might even be in his own name, some might be in his wife's name, some might be in any name, some might be in bonds, some might be in bank notes, some might be stacked away in gold, some might be in this bank, some might be in the other bank, some might be in this vault and some in another vault, but that never would be found. That was obvious. That was natural, the man was not a fool. We would never get it. If we did not get it or if we could not trace it, if we could not find out exactly

where it went, I was a goner. Smallwood was a goner. He was finished for all time. Time would not wash it out. Millions, oceans of words would not wash the guilt off me, never. I would live and die and after me my children would live under the name of "Smallwood" — "The grafter, Smallwood!" "Smallwood the robber." Smallwood who was given a chance by the Newfoundland people and all he did was get rich and fill his own pocket. That is what I faced. I knew it: It was obvious. It was apparent. There was nothing more apparent than that. Valdmanis had the money hidden away and stacked away — So I said to the Superintendent: "Will you do me a favour? Will you find the money? Will you trace that money?"

Now I am not permitted, at least I do not think I am permitted, and if I am permitted I don't think I will use my permission to tell the entire police working because the RCMP and FBI and other police authorities might have other cases not connected with Newfoundland, but other cases, and if I were now to tell what I know of the way they operate I might be helping some criminal to escape. But Superintendent McKinnon was gone between a week and ten days. Nobody knew it. The Attorney General did not know it then. Only the Minister of Finance knew it. And I did not dare, I did not dare let a whisper get out.

In the meantime Dr. Valdmanis was under twenty four hour surveillance. Superintendent McKinnon came back. He phoned me as soon as he got here.

I said: "That is good — you are back — is it all right?"

He said: "Oh yes, I think so, Mr. Premier."

I said: "Come up."

He came up with a suitcase and opened it and took out dozens and dozens upon dozens of photostats that had been taken of everything, every single letter that Dr. Valdmanis wrote, every order he had given, every cheque he had issued, every deposit that had been made in his account. That is when I called in the Attorney General. First of all there was the opening of the account in the name of Katrina Mattis, his sister-in-law. She is a lady who is domiciled in the State of New Jersey, and whose husband, I believe, is a United States Government Customs Officer or clerk, a rather ironic angle. If don't think personally the lady knew anything about it except that her name was being used by her distinguished brother-in-law, Valdmanis, a great man up there in Canada, with a big salary, a famous man. So he goes to the American Express Company to open an account in the name of Katrina Mattis who passes her power of attorney to him, so that the account from that very moment that he opened the account was under his sole and exclusive control, just as though it was in his own name. But it was not. It was in his sister-in-law's name, Katrina Mattis. And every single transaction up to a couple of days before, that from the beginning up to a couple of days before every single transaction was photostated. He dumped them out on my desk.

I said: "Look, have you added it up? Does it square? Can you account for it?"

"Yes," he said: "it is all there."

I said: "Thank God! Joe does not go to gaol. Joe does not have to resign. The Tories stay out another twenty years."

So then I called in the Attorney General officially, and he and I went to the office of the Superintendent, and we went through the documents. These later were produced against Valdmanis, and they formed part of the record.

At the same time they raided Dr. Valdmanis's home in Montreal, and they got all his letters written from St. John's to his wife. They got letters which said to his wife, ". . . now dear, I am sending you this parcel." At one time he sent \$25,000 in bank notes to her, and insured it for \$50, sent it parcel post through the mail from St. John's to Montreal — \$50,000 — or sent it by express and insured it for \$50. ". . . and dear, don't forget this money is for you. This is your money. If anything happens to me this is your money. If anything happens to me don't let Katrina (that is Katrina her sister) don't let Katrina claim it. Don't forget, if anything happens to me this is your money." They found all these letters, the police did. They also found a letter that Valdmanis wrote down here in gaol here in St. John's, that he wrote to a man in Germany asking him to commit perjury, to go around and see various people and ask them to swear falsely. We got that letter. We know how it got out of the gaol here. We know who took it out. We know the name of the person to whom the answer was to be sent from Germany. At the moment I will forbear to mention the name. I won't mention the name.

But the evidence that was collected, as I noted in one of our local papers the other day, I was most interested to notice a piece in the "Daily News" copied from a Latvian newspaper published in Toronto, a Latvian newspaper published in the Latvian language. Dr. Valdmanis owned it. He

bought it with the same money. A fine article praising him up — the same paper which he owned. We own it now, the Newfoundland Government owns that paper now. That newspaper published this article praising Dr. Valdmanis making him practically a martyr, with big quotation marks, a big question mark "Is he innocent or is he guilty?" That is not a new tradition. People say that about Hitler — "Was he really innocent or was he guilty?" The police gathered the evidence and piled it up item by item by item, dozens of items, in hundreds of items, and if ever anything was proven, as the Solicitor General said this afternoon, never in his experience did he see a case better documented. That is what he said. He handled the case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you one other thing that throws a new light on the whole picture: When this man came to me and told me that story originally I had only to say to him — "This is all right — just forget it. That is okay — don't worry about it." Because, I ought to have explained this, Benno Schilde, when Valdmanis took them for that ten thousand dollars in Cologne, were angry. But when he hooked them for forty thousand dollars in Montreal it made them highly suspicious, and Dr. Hertz had no sooner passed the forty thousand dollars over to Dr. Valdmanis in Montreal and gone back to Germany than he gets a letter from me — that was not produced here today — I came back from my holiday in Jamaica and went to my office. Gordon Pushie began to brief me and bring me up-to-date on anything that happened when I was gone. He happened to mention Dr. Hertz. I said: "That is right — what has happened to them — I am getting fed up and

frowned off with them. They promised to build a factory in Bay Roberts. I had to take all kinds of nonsense and so did the member for the district, all kinds of abuse through their failure to build the plant. We are not going to let them off any more."

I sat down and wrote a stiff letter demanding to know what they meant and why they did not start the plant. Told them to get the plant started at once or pay this money back to the Government. Two months after they had paid Valdmanis ten thousand dollars, almost in my presence, not actually, but it had been demanded in my presence and in the presence of the Minister of Labour, and he had gotten the ten thousand. Then six weeks after that he got forty thousand. Then two weeks later he gets a letter from me, a stiff letter, arrogant and intolerant — Start this plant at Bay Roberts or pay back the money immediately. His suspicions were confirmed. He said: "This money has not been going to the Premier at all. I don't believe it has."

Now, all I had to say was: "Forget it!" That is all I had to say. There would never have been a Valdmanis case if I had been willing, and I could have done it, and I don't say I was not tempted to do it — I am not a saint — I don't say I was not tempted to take the easy way, to hush it up. I could have hushed it up, and was strongly tempted to do it. Because, you know a lie can get half way around the earth while the truth is putting on its boots to chase it. Half truths — whole lies — innuendo — hints are hard to answer.

Well, that is the story of Valdmanis on the Benno Schilde incident.

Now I know the evidence, because

the witnesses were brought here and all swore to their evidence one after the other in the MIAG case. But the MIAG case is still subjudice and I cannot discuss it, not properly. I can discuss it of course but not with propriety, Mr. Speaker, so I shall not do it — let it go.

I have never gloated over Valdmanis's downfall. I am to be blamed for trusting him, I am to be blamed for that. I trusted him too much. I was too fond of him. But, Sir, if it had been my own brother or my father, if it had been any member of this Cabinet I would have done precisely what I did. I might have been tempted not to do it, but I would have done it. I do not hate Valdmanis tonight in gaol. I had a letter from his wife, after he pleaded guilty and went to gaol. She wrote me a letter apologizing for Alfred. I have been in their home. They have lovely children. She is a lovely woman. She wrote me to apologize for Alfred. It was a nice letter. She said: "You know I can explain what happened — He went through so much in Europe that he swore, if he ever got the chance to make a lot of money he would make it." That is her explanation. It might be right, I don't know.

I will always be glad I took the right course. It looked very black when I went in and told the Cabinet. It was quite a shock. My honourable friend, the Minister of Welfare, screwed up his face at that, and my honourable friend, the Minister of Health and all my friends in the Cabinet. It was a great shock. I was over the shock. I had taken it — one by one and alone — I had taken the shocks one by one.

Now, says the Opposition, because the Premier ordered Valdmanis ar-

rested; because Valdmanis was arrested at 2:00 o'clock in the morning, and for the next four hours impounded like an animal in gaol, poor devil — let us have a Royal Commission. That is on a par with what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said when Valdmanis was arrested. He then came out with a statement — **What** was his statement I took note of his statement — The statement of the Leader of the Opposition on the Valdmanis affairs — "If Valdmanis is proved guilty the Government should resign" — That is the reward for honesty.

MR. HOLLETT: For carelessness.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a reward for honesty — "If Valdmanis is proven guilty the Government should resign" — No word of praise for us, no word of praise, not a word, not a syllable, not a word of congratulations to us for having caught him, for having prosecuted him, for having put him in gaol, not a word of thanks for that. But this is the reason they give for a Royal Commission.

If I would send Valdmanis to gaol, God help anyone, any honourable gentleman opposite, because I was very fond of him. If I ever catch anyone doing anything and I have any control over it, he would not stand very long.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable and learned gentleman who moved the amendment told us here yesterday that the Government have spent twelve and a half million dollars of the people's money on the gypsum plant, the cement plant and the birch plant together, the three of them together, twelve and a half million dollars. Yes, that is true. That is correct. The Government has done that. But, Sir, to the end of December past, that

is two months ago, up to two months ago, or January, February and March, three months—take three months—these same industries had paid out to the Newfoundland people here in Newfoundland, (well not all of it some of it was paid out to some Germans and Lativians. In the cement plant, I think, there are ten or twelve Germans, and in the gypsum plant there are some ten, twelve or fifteen Lativians and, I think, one or two Germans. In the birch plant, the new production manager is a little Yugoslavian and I think there are one or two others. Altogether this would be thirty or forty foreigners in these three plants) up to the end of December had paid out to Newfoundlanders or, I will say, Newfoundlanders and some thirty or forty non-Newfoundlanders, not Newfoundlanders by birth but only Newfoundlanders by adoption — so let us drop the distinction and say — up to the end of December these three industries had paid out eleven million nine hundred and twenty-nine thousand dollars and if you want the odd dollars eleven million, nine hundred and twenty-nine thousand, five hundred and thirty-six dollars, call it twelve million, just a few dollars under twelve million, they had paid out to these people up to the end of December past. In this year 1955 the same three industries will pay out to our people, the gypsum plant, six hundred thousand dollars, the cement plant, one million, three hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars and the birch plant one million, five hundred thousand dollars, that is a total of three and a half million dollars. Now that is in wages and salaries and the purchase of things here in Newfoundland. By the end of December in this very year these same three industries will have paid out in New-

foundland, fifteen and a half million dollars — fifteen and half millions. They will not have paid back to the Treasury — No they will not have paid that to the Government of Newfoundland, but they will have paid it to the Newfoundland people in one form or another. That is to say that because and for no other reason than that the Government has spent twelve and a half millions of the public money to build these three plants by the end of this present year they will have paid out to the Newfoundland people fifteen and a half million dollars, a gain of three million dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question about that — By that time will they have spent more money on the birch plant than the gypsum plant?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think we will have spent possibly another quarter of a million dollars. We will spend none on the cement plant, a little on the gypsum plant and a little on the birch plant. The net gain to Newfoundland by the end of this year is — Now add to that, next year, another three and a half million or more and a year after still another three and a half million dollars and every year add on to that three and a half million dollars or four million dollars — or add to that twelve and a half million dollars a quarter or a half a million a year so that instead of the people being three or four millions better off each year because this Government built these plants, instead of that they are better off — a little less than three and a half million dollars — What is wrong with that? Is it not good for the Treasury? We would like to see in addition to the money paid out to the people, the Treasury also getting interest and fin-

ally the principal, as we believe some day we will.

While I am at it I will give you the story of all of them, in a lump sum:

This Government has paid out, spent, we built these three and then in addition to these three we built wholly and solely with Government money, we have also assisted certain German industrialists, businessmen, to come to Newfoundland to erect certain plants. We have lent them certain moneys to do it. And we put it all together, what we spent on the three plants that we built ourselves and what we lent to these industrialists, put it all together and it comes to twenty-three millions or twenty-four millions, I don't remember the exact figure.

MR. HOLLETT: Twenty-two millions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think my honourable friend is a little under, it will probably be more than twenty-three millions.

MR. HOLLETT: A year ago it was twenty-two millions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Add another million to it — twenty-three millions.

Now they have started production, all of them except one, and that one starts on Monday next, in Brigus. But even those that have started have not all of them started full blast. The rubber plant at Holyrood is not running more than, say 20% yet, not more than 20% of its capacity. The Tannery at Carbonar is not running more than 25% of its capacity. Koch Shoes are not running more than 20%, but the cement mill is running full capacity, the plasterboard is running at 60% or 70% capacity. The birch plant

is running so far right now under the new management at about 50% capacity. It will pay out this year one and a half million dollars in wages, one million dollars in wages and five hundred thousand dollars in local purchases, one and a half million dollars, and they are running at about 60% capacity.

But let us assume for the sake of argument that each of them will never be any better than it is now, that each one has now reached the maximum — Now that is not right, it is not fair, but let us assume that — twenty-three millions —

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if I may ask a question, Mr. Speaker? Would the Premier deal with the charge that the material produced at the rubber plant at Holyrood is worthless?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will deal with it — but I won't refer to it at the moment.

Atlantic Films and Electronics, Atlantic Gloves, Atlantic Gypsum, Atlantic Hardboards Industries, Limited, CMEC, Eckhart Mills, Gold Sill Leather Goods, Hanning Electric, Koch Shoes, Newfoundland Hardwoods, Newfoundland Tanneries Garment Plant, North Star Cement, Superior Rubber, Terra Nova Textiles, United Cotton Mills— twenty-three millions. To the end of December past these paid out to our Newfoundland people and a few Germans, say two hundred Germans all together, out of two thousand, 10% twenty million dollars, to be exact, \$19,974,679.82.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may ask the Premier if he would table a break-down of these figures so that we could have them on record and available?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I could but I would not. Twenty million dollars in round figures.

MR. HOLLETT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker — The Premier is quoting from a document. Is it not a fact we should have that tabled?

MR. SMALLWOOD: These are my own notes I am using. I do not have to table my own notes. These are my own notes to refresh my memory. I do not carry these figures in my mind. The honourable gentleman ought to get up earlier and not bowl me over like that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, we are not trying to bowl him over — The public would like to know.

MR. HOLLETT: He is trying to bowl us over.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is hardly worth the effort, the public did that three years ago.

MR. HOLLETT: No they did not — we are here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but where are you?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, it is not important that we are bowled over. The important thing is whether the public will get the truth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the burning desire of the honourable gentlemen on the other side, that the people get the truth, the full truth and nothing but the truth, all propaganda excluded, all insinuations left out, just the simple, pure truth. That is very high-minded.

No, this year the same industries, that is to the end of December 1955, will pay out another seven and a half million, in this current year, so that

is twenty-seven and a half million dollars. So that so far up to the end of this current year these industries which have a net gain of four and a half millions have paid off to the people twenty-seven and a half million dollars. So that so far, up to the end of this current year, these industries which have cost the people twenty-three millions have paid already to the people twenty-seven and a half millions, with some of them working at half capacity, only one working at full capacity and one of them not even started yet, and others only working on one cylinder. At the end of this year the Newfoundland people will have a net gain of four and a half million dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Honourable the Premier permit me I don't think the Honourable the Premier included in that the figure accruing to the Treasury, the interest on the twenty-three and a half million dollars?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not included anything — We have taken the people's money, twenty-three millions of it. We have spent it. But the public who gave twenty-three million dollars of their money have received back twenty-seven and a half million dollars, that is four and a half millions they gained — that is at the end of this year — Now next year there will be another seven and a half millions, if not more and the year after another seven and a half millions, in fact a 50% gain — Let us put it this way: The Government have taken the people's money and invested it, lent it out at interest, but are not getting the interest and may not get it for some time to come. But they have lent it out, twenty-three million dollars and the public are getting seven and a half million dollars a year on

that in the form of employment and orders and work.

There was some reference here to-day from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the great salaries given Koch and his wife. They have no children, by the way, and Mrs. Koch works in the office. I think that is the actual situation. She is there in the office anyway — they have no children — I think they get eighteen hundred dollars a month, nearly twenty thousand dollars a year. Mr Koch owns the plant you know. It is his. He is not the manager. He owns Koch Shoes.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, has not the Government an investment of nearly a million dollars in it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is true, yes.

MR. BROWNE: Then it is not Mr. Koch's plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course it is his plant.

MR. BROWNE: It is true that in comparison with the Government's million dollars Mr. Koch put one hundred and thirty thousand dollars in to the plant? I submit it is true.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman submits so many things we lost track of them.

MR. BROWNE: Don't lose track of that one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We shall not — This year, working at 60% capacity, Koch Shoes will pay out four hundred thousand dollars.

MR. BROWNE: How much will the Government pay for that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh the Government have paid a million dollars,

and we may still have to pay some. But I do suggest that on expenditure of \$400,000 a year, working so far at only 60% capacity, so that if they were at full capacity that \$400,000 would become \$600,000 or \$700,000 at 100% capacity, and the managing director gets nearly \$20,000 a year. Now that can be made to sound like a pretty terrible thing. Indeed with the proper tone of voice and the proper ring of righteousness and indignation that could be made to sound like: "My God! what are we coming to? A man is drawing a salary of nearly twenty thousand dollars a year, how can the plant ever succeed?"

MR. BROWNE: \$22,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right \$22,000 — How can it ever succeed? They pay out three quarters of a million a year in wages and salaries and local expenditures, and the owner, the head of the plant, and his wife draw in salaries for the management of that and also the management of another, \$22,000 a year.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the Premier allow me? That three quarters of a million a year is for this year for wages and salaries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend is trying to lay a trap for fools — he is not trying to lay a trap for me, is he? As I have already said, in this current year to the end of December they will have paid out \$400,000. If their capacity is 60% I said when it was working 100% it will be \$700,000. Now what are you going to do about that? Can that be made to sound mysterious?

It has been suggested to me that we have a recess for ten minutes, Mr. Speaker.

On motion the House then recessed for ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in his speech this afternoon the Honourable Leader of the Opposition made reference to some rusty machinery in Superior Rubber Company. He was generous enough to say that he understood that even now machinery could get rusty, but that this particular rusty machinery, he thought, was not that kind of machinery, new machinery that got accidently rusty. He thought that was very old machinery. Now he is perfectly right, it is quite old. The machinery in question, not all of it, not all the machinery of the plant, but this rusty machinery is really quite old. My honourable friend said he thought, or that someone thought, that that particular machinery dated from the first World War. I would not be surprised that it pre-dates the First World War. If any honourable member of the House went in to the rubber plant at Holyrood and saw for himself the machinery in question he would not be surprised by the fact that it was old or that it had been rusty.

Rubber comes in large sheets of very coarse raw sheets. It is in great piles, sheets of it, something similar in size and thickness to a pulp that you will see piled in a pulp and paper mill a sort of semi-dry pulp. The rubber comes like that. It has then to go through a number of processes before it is fine and soft and pliable and workable. When it comes in it is stiff and hard and rather brittle. The first thing that has to be done with it is to knead it, almost as you would knead dough.

MR. BROWNE: You need dough.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes — It is not "need" but "knead."

This stuff is fed into massive cylinders, ten, perhaps twelve feet long (from memory) and in diameter each of these rolls is, (again from memory) as I visualize them, about 23" or 24" in diameter; great rolls which revolve. And you take these great slab of rubber, raw rubber, and just enter it into where two rolls are going around in opposite directions and it pulls it in and it comes around on the roll and keeps going around and then goes up into the next roll and keeps getting thinner. Then you slash it with a knife. Then it re-enters and goes in the opposite way, and it is slashed with a knife again, and is kept kneading through these great rollers. Now these rollers are heavy, tons and tons and tons, and immensely strong. They could well be, well, fifty years old and fifty years from now will still be kneading rubber on exactly similar machines. Now the first of these rollers are a sort of rough steel, not very smooth, and are shiny and like nickel or silver, silver, but just a sort of drill steel, and are not very smooth. They don't need to be smooth, but rather rough in fact. But when the rubber has gone through these rollers the next ones are not quite as wide and higher and are shiny and like nickel or silver, and the next ones are even finer again. So that when the rubber finally goes over these you can do anything with it. It is workable, pliable. Now the old and rusty machinery is, I believe, the first and second of these rollers.

In all of these plants, the list of which I have read, Mr. Speaker, there are some 2,400 machines and pieces of mechanical equipment, and of these between 80 and 100 were not new. They were second-hand. And of that number 80 to 100 of the 2,400 some were rusty, for example, the tannery at Carbonara. William Don was a

Sudeten-German. His people for, I think it was, seven generations have been tanners, in a straight, unbroken line. (Not many people in Newfoundland can trace their ancestry back in a straight line for seven generations. Most of us would be a little scared to go back that far) For about four of these generations the family, who were Germans, lived in Czechoslovakia in Sudetenland. They were tanners. William Dorn moved his tannery from Czechoslovakia into Germany, when the trouble began, and Hitler was demanding the right to protect the rights of Germans all over Europe particularly the Sudeten Germans. The House will remember he marched into Sudetenland. Around that time William Dorn moved his plant to a place near Hamburg. A refugee, the Government of Germany had no right to stop him if he tried to leave. He left Germany bringing his plant with him.

Now if the honourable gentlemen have been in tanneries they knew tanneries are always wet and full of acids and liquids and steam. I would say it would be physically impossible to keep the machinery in a tannery from becoming rusty. It was rusty when it came. It is still rusty. If it were to move to some other country it would arrive there rusty. They are rusty and continue to be rusty. Tannery equipment is almost bound to be rusty, it cannot be managed any other way. It was second-hand machinery in the first place. I said that here in the House at the time, that it was second hand machinery. There are a few pieces of second-hand machinery in the Superior Rubber Company; but overwhelmingly the machinery that has come to these plants is not only new but it is as new as new can be. For instance in the whole world today — I would not say today — but in the

whole world two years ago, there was not a plant of its kind with machinery more modern than in the CMiC. It did not exist on the earth anywhere. Now, two years later, there is not any doubt whatsoever that there are still newer designs, new machines, because in that type of article vast improvements are being made very rapidly. It is still a very very new plant however.

Now the shoe plant in Harbour Grace is a thing of joy. It is so new, so modern, so beautiful, (and machinery can be beautiful; it would do your heart good to go into the plant. My honourable friends ought to do so — Go over to Koch Shoes — Never mind stolen documents or anything like that go over and ask him, Mr. Koch, say to him: "We are members of the House of Assembly. You know there has been public money lent to you. Would you mind showing us your plant?" Go over there and see a modern shoe plant, beautiful, stream-lined. See the beautiful shoes. They are making beautiful shoes. They are making beautiful products. Don't listen to a bunch of malcontents and soreheads.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier tell us what proportion of money was invested by Mr. Koch in comparison to the investment of the Government in that plant?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Koch's Shoe Company was, I think (I speak subject to correction when I say this) the first concern for whom we broke our original formula. The original formula was fifty-fifty, half and half. In the case of Koch Shoes they were either the first or one of the first for whom we broke that formula, and did not require anything like half. I believe we agreed to put up two-thirds or three-quarters of the total investment. That information is available.

to the honourable gentleman right now in the legislation. Yes, it is in the legislation. I think he will find it is in the contract, the statutory contract, in the Statutes of last year or the year before.

Anyway I was talking about machinery. I was addressing myself to this question of rusty machinery, rusty, old machinery. Go in to CMIC, into Hanning Electric where, by the way, they are making the best batteries in all Canada today — the best — not as good as any others but the best — that is something to be able to say four years after launching a move for industrial development, economic development — that Newfoundland is producing the finest wet batteries, storage batteries, now being made anywhere in Canada — Hanning Electric — Ask any of the thousands of Newfoundlanders who are using their batteries and they will tell you. Ask any of the dozens of dealers who are handling their batteries. Ask Irving Oils, with thousands of retail outlets, who has agreed to take the entire output of Hanning Electric. Yes, I was instrumental in bringing Mr. Irving and Company to Newfoundland. It was at my invitation that he came here. Their plant in there is thoroughly new, absolutely new, spick-and-span new, every last, single individual item in the plant.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have here the agreement with Koch.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not want to discuss Koch Shoes now. I want to discuss machinery now.

MR. BROWNE: He made that statement — I challenge him to show it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The honourable member is out of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Go in to Atlantic Hardboards Industries who are making fibre-ply. In Canada today that has become quite an important industry. She is getting to have some quite interesting industries. In all Canada today no concern is turning out a product of such high quality in a product of its kind to equal that of the product of this Newfoundland Hardboards Limited. No concern in the United States is turning out a product as good in quality. No concern in all the Continent of Europe is turning out a product of such high quality as this company in St. John's today is doing.

MR. BROWNE: How much do they owe to the Government now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will come to that in my time, but it will be in my own time when I do. The product that they are turning out is superb. It is a superb article, a beautiful article. Not knowing I would be speaking about it here tonight, I did intend to bring in some of these products to this very Chamber, including some sheets of fibre board, full size, so that if honourable members won't go out and look at the products I will bring them here for them to see. They are not only turning out a magnificent product but that same product, moved down across the track into Newfoundland Hardwoods and is being there veneered with mahogany and with walnut and with oak and with birch plywood. Then, Mr. Speaker, you are getting panels a quarter of an inch thick or 7/8 from a quarter of an inch thick veneered with mahogany, so that you may get a table top of most superlatively beautiful mahogany, made in Newfoundland, not excelled in quality in North America, not in all North America. That is being done in the Hardwoods Plant. Go in and see it.

Any Newfoundlander, if he has a spark of love for Newfoundland, of pride in Newfoundland, will glow with pride to see Newfoundlanders — true they are helped by a Yugoslav head man and by a few other technicians who have been brought in — make these beautiful products for furniture that can make Newfoundlanders proud. Go in to the office of the Newfoundland Hardwoods — Go into the office — I would say it would be safe even for my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West to go in there now — go into the office of the hardwoods company and see the most beautiful offices in Newfoundland, the most beautiful suites of offices — the floor all Newfoundland hardwoods birch floors — walled with fibreboard veneer all made across the track — mahogany veneer, the whole wall, beautiful, magnificent, the next one walnut and the next birch, completely the product of Newfoundland except that the mahogany is made out of logs grown in Africa and brought here by ship. Another big shipload arrived the other day, and there will be another in a few days time. In other words this plant in there now is doing what plants do in the United States. I don't know if it is generally known to honourable members that mahogany is not grown in the United States and in Canada. They have to buy the mahogany from British Honduras or the Caribbean or Africa. This comes from Africa, the Ivory Coast.

Now Newfoundland Hardboard Limited, the operators of the plant here, these two concerns, one across the track from the other, will pay out this year one and a half millions by Newfoundland Hardboards Limited and Hardboards Industries will pay out half a million. That is two million dollars which will be paid out this

year by these two concerns there, with in a stones-throw from each other and who are now working in the closest possible collaboration, and every last nail, every last screw, every last bolt, every last machine, every last, every single bit of mechanical equipment in that plant is not only new but the latest and newest in the world. Indeed it is so new that already they have thrown out two chipping machines and brought in later ones. The process is to take the logs, the sticks of wood and run them through a machine which reduces them to chips, short chips, and they are then sucked by air, blown through the machine into a knife mill, something like a hammer mill, but a knife mill and chopped to exactly the right width and length. They have already been ground to the right thickness, then they are sucked down through into the next building in the main mill into a great dryer and on through as the main raw material and merged with chemicals, etc. These machines which were brought here and put into operation a year and a half ago were the latest in the world, but then something far better came out so they condemned them and brought in four of these great new machines. It is worth going in to see them. That is the secret of it all, the right chips in the first place but then there are certain other secrets to it afterwards, but the rest will fail if they do not have the right chips in the first instance. They have there the latest machinery in the world — yet all this talk of rusty machinery rusty machinery —

So it goes in the cement mill. I remember — it is now the fashion of the Opposition to speak of the cement mill as a fine mill — Now, there it is, a fine mill — but it was not always so. Does not the House remember the

mill that was collapsing, the mill that was falling down? Does not the House remember the mill that was crumbling? Does not the House remember the old rusty machinery? That was only two years ago. That is the cement mill. It is like Valdmanis: Two years ago the Opposition attacked him, sneered at him, they could not find words to express the hatred and contempt they had for him.

MR. HOLLETT: We were right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But now what happens? Valdmanis falls from grace and immediately he is taken up by every Tory in St. John's. Yes he was — he was indeed — by every Tory in St. John's, taken up, commiserated, the propaganda ran rampant through this town. He was being prosecuted — the prosecution of poor Valdmanis — Then what happened? Mr. Gordon Higgins defends him, of course, obviously he was just a lawyer defending a client without any thought of politics. And I understand that my honourable and learned friend, the member for St. John's West tried to get in on the act, and he wanted to defend Valdmanis, of course.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I deny that, and I demand that the Premier withdraw it. He had no foundation for making such a statement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have foundation all right.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I must require that the Premier withdraw that statement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: It is a personal attack, yes.

MR. BROWNE: I say it is not true, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because he denied it I withdraw, but only because the honourable gentleman denies, and I must accept his word, and I do — But a lot of people tried to get in on the act. Col. George Drew, the honourable Colonel, the Honourable George Drew, the big Leader of the big pow-wow of the Tories, he tried to get in on the act. He sent down Mr. J. Sedgewick, a great criminal lawyer, and a great and prominent Tory. He sent him down to see how he could help him. He came to St. John's, the first of a procession of prominent Tories who hustled down here — thought they had me — thought they had Smallwood — so the Tory Party of Canada naturally took up the case of Valdmanis, the victim, Valdmanis the martyr, Valdmanis, the man hounded by the Government and prosecuted. The Tory Party took him up. A prominent Tory in Montreal adopted him. Another prominent Tory adopted the children and sent them off to summer camp. Another Tory, prominent Tory in Montreal, very prominently identified, started a collection, good God, for a man with half a million dollars! He started a collection to pay for his defence.

MR. HIGGINS: Would Bloomfield be a Tory? He was the man who was handling Valdmanis's case?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know that and many other things besides. I am talking not about Mr. Bloomfield, not about the man who had the technical and official care of the defence of Valdmanis, but I am talking about the super-special and extra-curricular efforts of the Tory Party of Canada to horn in on this Valdmanis case. I say now, Mr. Speaker, that the Tory Party of Canada jumped into the Valdmanis case, tried to seize control of it, sent emissaries to St. John's, tried to take

possession of the Valdmanis case, instigated by Mr. George Drew, and I will tell him so to his own face — Mr. George Drew.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct the Honourable the Premier — I don't know what the Tory Party of Canada did. I do know the Tory Party in Newfoundland had nothing whatsoever to do with Dr. Valdmanis, and we have stuck to our guns as to what we thought of the man from the first. The Premier is not trying to tack anything like that on us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would regard Mr. Gordon Higgins as a Tory, a member of the Tory Party. Gordon Higgins has played politics in the Valdmanis case from the beginning up to the end, to this very moment he has played politics in the Valdmanis case — that is all it ever was to him —

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, may I — my position is rather a delicate one — but I think the Premier fails to draw the distinction or refuses to draw the distinction between Mr. Gordon Higgins the lawyer and Mr. Gordon Higgins as a political opponent. It is a distinction I am sure the Honourable the Attorney General and the Honourable the Solicitor General can draw. I don't want to get into a fight about a gentleman who is not a member of this House, but I do think that common justice requires the distinction to be recognized. A man who acts as a counsel for anybody is entitled to be regarded as acting as counsel and should not of necessity have improper motives attributed to him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the Valdmanis case I recognize no distinction between Gordon Higgins the lawyer,

and when he brings his own mother in as bondswoman.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order — Whatever the Premier may be entitled to say — I do submit that common decency —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Forbade him to bring her in.

MR. HIGGINS: I think, Mr. Speaker, there is no need for the Premier to drag in an innocent person's name into his debates or disputes nor any member of that person's family. I, for one, Sir, will not stay in this House if the Premier persists in that type of talk. I don't think it is fair.

MR. SPEAKER: While the Chair cannot protect nor have cognizance of any political party, and cannot protect a member not a member of this House, yet I think the Honourable the Premier should recognize the delicate situation a certain member finds himself in in this particular instance, and that the honourable member's request be deferred in.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will indeed, because I have nothing but the sincerest sympathy in the matter, and the honourable member was placed in an extremely difficult position — But I say, in this Valdmanis case I do not recognize any difference because I don't believe there is any difference or distinction to be drawn between Gordon Higgins the politician and Gordon Higgins the lawyer — In the Valdmanis case — the minute he was in the case — from the minute he entered it he made it a political issue. Every statement he issued was a political statement. That is notorious, it is well-known.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, in all this talk of broken-down machinery of

broken-down mills of broken-down industries, it is as empty, as without foundation as possible, because these same industries are paying this very year seven and a half million dollars out to our Newfoundland people. That does not sound like broken-down industries.

MR. BROWNE: What is the Superior Rubber Company paying?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me deal for a moment with Superior Rubber Company: I will not deal with it in any great detail, and certainly not exhaustively, but with but one aspect. If a diesel mechanic working for Mr. Arthur Monroe, and he must have many diesel mechanics because the Government has lent him three million six hundred thousand dollars for his various plants, public money, three million six hundred thousand dollars, and if one of the diesel mechanics or say one of the ordinary mechanics or say one of the engineers in one of his plants operating the cold storage or some other mechanic in that company went down to a lawyer or a newspaper man and on the hoof makes out an affidavit — I suppose an affidavit is on the hoof — Anyway he makes out an affidavit in which he says: "I am not aware that Mr. Monroe has invested any money in this company. The products of this company are terrible — no good — the machinery is old. One of them came in from Germany and came originally from the United States. The management is terrible." Would the Opposition pay him much attention? Would the Opposition pay much attention to it? Suppose a linotype operator in the Daily News Office came to the Opposition and on oath made a statement that the management of the Daily News is terrible — Suppose a mechanic of the Bonavista Cold Storage came,

or of any concern to whom the Government have lent money, some such mechanic came with an affidavit, would the Opposition pay him much attention?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if the Premier would allow — The country has no money invested in the Daily News or the other plants I believe you mentioned — Therefore we are not interested — but we are interested in the money the Government invested in Superior Rubber Company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right, leave out the Daily News — Well take Alberto Fisheries, Limited or Arctic Fishery Products or Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils or Burgeo Fish Industries Limited or Fortune Bay Products Limited or Gaultois Fisheries Limited or Northeastern Fisheries Limited or John Penny & Sons Limited, take an engineer or a mechanic on one of their boats or a mechanic in one of their plants who comes and makes an affidavit on oath and says the management of this company stinks, the executive management of it is terrible, the machinery is old the product is no good; would they take it seriously? I do not want to put an unfair question. I know if they want to lambaste the Government they will take it seriously, but apart from lambasting the Government would they take it seriously — the opinion of a mechanic?

Now that mechanic was a man who came into this plant some time back. He was brought into this plant from Montreal, and if bad blood developed between him and the man who brought him in, and if it appeared he was out to get him; to "get" him — (we will put quotation marks around the word "get") and then came with an affidavit would he still take him seriously?

MR. HOLLETT: Does the Premier want an answer?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is a rhetorical question.

MR. BROWNE: I can answer that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I dare say the honourable gentleman can answer it. The honourable gentleman spent a couple of hours yesterday answering it.

Before I leave Superior Rubber may I say that the Government, thanks to our care, have for some considerable time been giving very careful thought and consideration to the rubber plant in Holyrood, which is not operating as successfully as we would like it to operate. In fact it is considerably short of what we would like to have, considerably short. But we are not ignorant of that. We do not need to wait for a newspaper article to tell us so. Still less do we need to wait for the Opposition to tell us so. Certainly we do not need an affidavit from a disgruntled employee, a man who might be quite sincere, but who, in my opinion, is a little mentally unbalanced. We knew this. We have taken all necessary steps, all necessary steps, and all good steps too, and we hope — we hope — we won't guarantee but we hope to have some news to announce — we hope so, and that it will be good news for Newfoundland — we hope so — we are trying to do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, take Koch Shoes: He goes over to Germany on a visit to his father and breaks his leg while over there. He has to have it in a cast, he is still in a cast. He hobbled back, still in plaster cast — And while he is over in Germany with his leg broken some serpents went to work, reptiles, rats went to work. They were right in the office — right in the office of the

company. They went to Mr. Gordon Higgins the other day and they swore to certain statements. Mr. Koch called in the RCMP to have them search their premises or homes or offices or something, to have them search for certain documents he accused them of having stolen out of the office while he was away in Germany with his leg broken. So they found some of the documents — yes, Schafers turned in some of them — Willard said: "I am not going to talk to you. You got to talk to me lawyer." Me lawyer was Gordon Higgins. The mechanic who had been brought in from Montreal said the same thing. He had been talking to his lawyer, Gordon Higgins, and by another coincidence Mr. Gordon Higgins was the lawyer to Mr. Schafers too. He would not talk except before his lawyer. So they all talked before their lawyer. This lawyer, Mr. Speaker, was present and they talked. The documents that were found in their possession or that were not found in their possession but which they had handed to their lawyer, these documents they said they did not steal. They had not stolen the documents. They swore to that. The documents were mailed to them. Came to them in the mail. They swore to that — the documents came to them through the mail. They were in and out of the office. Schwartz worked in the office of Koch Shoes. He said he did not steal these documents out of the file — "These documents were mailed to me." — They came out of the file. They came out of the office. They came out of Koch's possession. "But I did not steal them," said Schwartz, "they were mailed to me." I believe they were in a brown paper parcel.

Mr. Schafers said: "Oh, I was in and out of the office, of course, all the time. These documents, I know, be-

long to Mr. Koch and I know they were stolen, at least removed from the office, but I did not do it. They were mailed to me." He swore to that — "They were mailed to me."

When I was in Offenbach, in Germany, a few years ago I was accompanied by the Minister of Finance and the Attorney General and the Minister of Public Works. We found that Mr. Schafers, the old gentleman, the father, was quite a leather-goods man, quite a manufacturer. He had a company there of his own. He had a factory of his own, one of the eleven hundred factories in the town of Offenbach, and he engaged in the leather-goods business. Offenbach is the centre of the leather-goods industry of the whole world. Mr. Schafers, senior, was very prominent in that. I have always had a keen personal interest in two products, wood and leather, and I wanted this leather-goods factory, leather-goods industry for Newfoundland. I wanted it. Old man Schafers came out here and incorporated a company — but was never able — he went back to Germany. Incidentally he flew here, and gave an interview to the newspapers saying he was moving to Newfoundland. The Government of Germany said: "You are not," and he did not. That ended that. So we never got him. When the shoe plant was starting I remarked, there is one beautiful industry I would like to get for Newfoundland, it is a natural. That is the leather-goods industry. It is a natural. You know, we had a deal with Schafers in Offenbach but he could not fulfil it, so it collapsed. It fell through. He never went ahead with it. He asked if we would like to have a leather-goods industry. I said: "It certainly would." He said: "Would you like me to try? If you like when I go back to

Germany I will go and see Mr. Schafers. I will go and make a deal with him."

He made a deal, and the deal was this: Mr. Schafers would provide machinery for Koch — He had no money, could not put anything into it at all. To this minute he has not put a single cent into it, not one red copper, not a dollar, nothing.

MR. BROWNE: Who is Koch?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am talking about Mr. Schafers: Not a single dollar did he put into it, nor did he agree to put it in. But he would sell the machinery for Koch. Now, incidentally, some of the eighty to one hundred pieces of old and rusty machinery that has come in is in the Schafers machinery. Some of it is right there. It is put away useless. They cannot use it — a piece of junk. That is all it is. But Mr. Schafers sold it for Koch, to Mr. Koch.

MR. BROWNE: For Koch?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Koch, yes — Koch's money, spondulicks.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask the Premier if it was sold in Germany or sold here?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not too sure of that.

MR. BROWNE: According to the agreement in the Registry of Deeds the sale took place here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The final sale was made here. There were a couple before that. The final sale was made here for Koch and Mr. Schafers Sr., but it was Mr. Schafers Jr., who came out to run Canadian Leather Goods, which was renamed "Gold Sail". So they set up right there beside Koch

Shoes. They remodelled a building that was already there. I might say they did a very fine job of remodelling it. They set up a factory and started manufacturing an absolutely beautiful product. I would say that in all Canada there is no better leather-goods made than there has been manufactured and they are manufacturing as only they can manufacture. They are good, yes.

But almost from the beginning there was some kind of incompatibility between Schafers and Mr. Koch. There was a complete incompatibility between them.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Premier a question relative to what he is saying now? Mr. Schafers told me he never got paid for that machinery. He was supposed to have gotten 25% of the company, but has not received it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The shares were not for the machinery. For the machinery he was paid cash. He was to get 25% of the shares of the company. That was for his skill and his know-how. As I say, right from the beginning, or soon after, bad-blood developed between Koch and Schafers. Now I may say that I was very impatient over that, when I heard it. Gordon Pushie came in and reported. I said go and read the Riot Act. They have public money. If they fall out it is the public of Newfoundland that will be hurt. Read them the Riot Act. If you don't, tell them I will be over to them. So he read them the Riot Act. I was very impatient with it all. My sympathies were with Schafers, completely, because, not because I like Schafers more than I liked Koch, but I was personally interested in the beautiful product they were making in that plant — absolu-

tely beautiful. Mr. Joseph Goldstone told me he imported from all over the United States and Canada and he cannot get goods as good as these — beautiful goods, beautiful products. You can see them exhibited in the Newfoundland Hotel. They have orders to ship goods right in to the United States. So that my sympathies were with Schafers. But Mr. Pushie kept a sharp eye on what was going on, going over frequently and dropping in unexpectedly. He came back to me and said finally: "Look, the man at the bottom of it all is Schafers. To begin with he was going around boozing, night after night. He was boozing with his own employees. Now that is not good for discipline — and apropos of liquor I may or may not say something about certain activities connected with liquor, with Harbour Grace and with Argentia — It is quite a story — quite a story.

In the absence of Mr. Koch, Mr. Schafers and Mr. Schwartz and other masters had the run of the office. Suddenly the Canadian Customs pounced. They marched in as a result, no doubt of being tipped off. Certain documents disappeared. These were documents that went through the mail, so they swore. Then other documents were not handed to the Canadian Customs but were kept in the custody in the possession, of these gentlemen. Mr. Schafers, in a public place in Harbour Grace, took out certain documents and waved them, and in the presence of a number of witnesses said: "I have here stuff which the Opposition offers to buy from me." He then also said: "I have stuff here the newspapers are willing to buy from me; and I am going to get Mr. Koch."

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I think I ought to say a word: If the Honourable the Premier will allow

me—to be quite frank with the House. One night a man telephoned me and told me he had some information about Koch Shoes, and was quite sure I would like to have it. I said: "Why phone me?" He said: "Well, I thought you might be interested." I said "Look, are you a Newfoundlander or what are you?" He said: "I am a Newfoundlander, but the man who has the information is not, and incidentally he wants some money for it." I said: "In that case, Sir, you can tell the man to keep his paper. We have sufficient information relative to Koch Shoes and all the other companies. We don't have to buy it." That was the only time that he called me. That must be the story the Honourable the Premier has heard. Certainly we have no connection whatsoever with that particular man at that end of it. Certainly we did not offer to buy it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman must not flatter himself that the honourable gentlemen opposite are the only opposition members around St. John's. There are several other opponents of this Government around St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER: I must correct the honourable member there—The term "Opposition" can only be applied to the occupants of the seats.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't withdraw that. Mr. Schafers said he had documents, waving them, which the Opposition would be glad to buy from him. That is what he said. I do know that fact. He mentioned the figure of \$1,000. That is Schafers, Mr. Speaker.

From the beginning of the launching of this great programme of economic development in Newfoundland, from the beginning of it, the birch

plant, the cement plant, the gypsum mill and all the others, the founding of NALCO, the founding of BRINGO and all other aspects of economic development, from the beginning of it, the Opposition have been opposed. They voted against virtually all of them, virtually all they voted against in the first place. Since then I have scarcely heard them utter one kind word, scarcely one. The most extraordinary fact is that they have carefully collected every scrap of rumour, or every bit of gossip, every stray fragment of suspicion, every vague and indistinct accusation, every anonymous charge that they could find. Straw on straw they have built them up into what they hope will be an indictment of our economic development programme. In every one of these German plants, and plants that are not German, in Newfoundland today, every malcontent knows that we can go to Gordon Higgins and/or to the Opposition—every malcontent, every spy, every reptile, every rat. There is a ready market in Mr. Gordon Higgins. He is becoming almost a fence—he is becoming almost a fence—for stolen goods provided they are stolen from the industries—Gordon Higgins—And in this House honourable gentlemen opposite are issuing to us any of that material that they can use. That is brutal talk but it is the brutal truth.

MR. BROWNE: It is not the whole truth.

MR. HOLLETT: Why don't you give use the truth now—tell us the truth?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the brutal truth that there is a standing market in St. John's today for anyone who will spy, anyone who will rat on any of the new industries.

There is a standing open market. It is well-known — Gordon Higgins — "I will tell the Opposition if you don't do this—if I don't get a raise." That is it. "You dare not fire me. I will go to the Evening Telegram to Harold Horwood." It is a sort of blackmail based on the silly notion that the Government are scared of something. We were not scared to put Valdmanis in gaol, not a bit, not even the slightest bit.

MR. HOLLETT: You left him out too long.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now I serve notice on every employee in all the industries that have been started with public money, I serve notice on them tonight, that anyone who threatens blackmail will be given the bum's rush, and if German, deported out of Newfoundland and never allowed to set foot in any port in Canada again. Schafers thinks he is going to go back to Germany and come back and settle on the Mainland of Canada. His shirt is out.

MR. BROWNE: Who is doing the blackmailing now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Schafers did the blackmailing, and the reward is, he is going to get the bum's rush.

MR. BROWNE: Tell us about Koch Shoes and where he got the agreement. I have the figures here, and what you said. I will tell the honourable gentleman what he did say.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.—The honourable gentleman is out of order.

MR. BROWNE: I have as much right to stand up as anyone else here —Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman said—

MR. SPEAKER: Ask the permission of the honourable gentleman who has the floor.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Premier said the Government put in two-thirds on three-quarters—he broke the agreement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said no such thing.

MR. BROWNE: I wrote it down as you said it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman should learn to write. I will tell you what I said. I said Koch Shoes was the first, but maybe they were not the first, and if they were not the first they were one of the first in whose case we varied our formula.

MR. BROWNE: You broke the agreement, you said.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the honourable gentleman apologize to me humbly?

MR. BROWNE: No, I will never apologize to you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If you are wrong?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, if I am wrong.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The record will have it.

MR. BROWNE: I don't care what the stenotypist says. I took it down myself. I have got it here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say anything about —

MR. BROWNE: You did so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say anything indicating or hinting that we changed the agreement. I said

Koch Shoes were the first, and if they were not the first they were certainly one of the first for whom we varied the formula—the formula of fifty-fifty or dollar for dollar. The whole House knows I said that.

MR. BROWNE: The whole House knows—I took it down—you said two-thirds or — I ask you on what authority.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And you said we broke the agreement.

MR. BROWNE: Here is the agreement. Show me where it authorizes it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentlemen are completely ignoring the Chair. I might say this whole thing is extremely ridiculous, almost ludicrous. May I suggest that honourable members stop arguing across the House—"I did"—"I didn't"—across the House. It is hard to believe how silly it seems. To interrupt, the honourable member should ask permission of the speaking member who either yields or does not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At least, Mr. Speaker, in that little incident we got a quick glimpse of the fondness of the honourable gentleman for me. He has great affection for me, that becomes very evident.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have affection for telling the truth. And I am not going to allow the Premier to say I am not telling the truth. I ask him about the agreement now—let us forget personalities—Where is his authority to vary the agreement made by the Government—it is not in the wording?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nobody said anything about varying the agreement. The words were "varying the formula" from the beginning, I said.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall see 11:00 o'clock if this does not cease. Let us behave like grown men if not like members of parliament. After all, Hansard has it—If the honourable member refuses to recognize Hansard or not the House does and must. Do we halt the debate until this very minor point is settled? I suggest the honourable member move on with the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is just a little annoying to be told you said a certain thing when in fact you did not say it.

MR. BROWNE: And it is certainly a little annoying to write down something someone said and be told he did not say it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said, Sir, that from the beginning (I am speaking now of the Opposition in the House of Assembly) the Opposition of the Government had been opposed to the whole, sweeping programme of economic development. These plants we built, these plants we helped finance, the founding of NALCO the founding of BRINCO, they have sneered at them and jeered at them, and they have scarcely ever said a kind word for any of them. It is a most notable fact, an extraordinary fact to have to express concerning a party over six years. But, on the contrary, they have gathered every little wisp of suspicion, blown it up, magnified it, gloated over it, chuckled over it, until tonight they bring in an amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, calling for the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate these industries, basing it principally on the arrest of Alfred Valdmanis. Does that suggest we were wrong? Is there a suggestion we were wrong in arrest-

ing him, wrong in jailing him? Is that grounds for a Royal Commission, or it is not, as my honourable friend, the Solicitor General said, excellent evidence, if we are able to tackle Valdmanis and jail him.

MR. HOLLETT: It cost a lot to tackle him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It cost a lot but we tackled him. He is in gaol tonight. If we did that with Valdmanis we are to be trusted, I suggest, to my honourable friends here, if my honourable friends won't accept it, I suggest here that the Government are to be trusted to watch all these industries and to watch everybody connected with them, and if things are wrong to rectify them, if there is dishonesty to ferret it out, if there is mismanagement to eliminate it — the Government can be trusted to do that. That is our programme. If there is anyone who wants it to succeed it is we who are the ones who wish this programme to succeed. We are the ones who wish these factories to prosper because we created them.

MR. HOLLETT: Every Newfoundlanders does.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not every Newfoundlanders—no. I cannot agree with that—Not every Newfoundlanders wants their success, some want their failure, and want it most desperately, more than they ever wanted anything in their lives. Of course the greatest of all would be that I should drop dead or something. But apart from my dropping dead they would like to get some graft or something on me. They would like to do that.

I am now finished on that whole topic. I have one other topic I should like to cover, in a matter, I think, of relatively a few minutes. I

could go on tomorrow, but if I could have ten minutes I could cover it.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member ask for an extension of time? That would be at the discretion of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can complete it in ten minutes and then be through with the matter.

There have been various remarks in this House about a certain farm on Roaches Line. There have even been faint suggestions of graft, of dishonesty on my part in connection with that farm. Mr. Speaker, the situation is this, the fact is this: Four years ago, on May 9, coming, it will be four years, my son-in-law and my daughter went over to Roaches Line. My son-in-law, Edward Russell, had just gotten married to my daughter. Unlike a lot of young men who married the Premier's daughter (the Premiers are big men, big-shots, big-time politicians) — Unlike some young men, Edward Russell, long before I ever heard of him, was fascinated by farms. During the war he went off to Ontario and got a job on a farm to learn farming. He came back and went to Argentina, and worked like a dog earning money. He saved every dollar and bought a tractor and horses and pigs and went farming in here in Freshwater Valley. He became a very well known sight in Freshwater Valley because his tractor had headlights on it, and besides doing his own work he did customs work. He was a familiar sight around parts of Conception Bay and parts of St. John's East and Bell Island as he did customs plowing for people until midnight, and sometimes all through the night until daylight the next day. The man was fascinated by farming, tremendously interested in farming, in an idealistic kind of way, and yet a

very practical kind of way too. So that four years ago he and my daughter went in with a pick-up and a trailer towed by the pick-up, a trailer that my son-in-law had built with his own hands — they went in on that farm to start a farm on Roaches Line. He had no money, or very little. Until three months ago my daughter slept in that trailer. It is 5' wide by 12' long. You could hardly swing a cat in it. There are men in this Chamber who have been in it. It cost \$200, \$300 or \$500 to build. He built it with his own hands and lived in it until three months ago. Three months ago they moved to a Quonset Hut for the next four or five years until he can afford to build a house. (It is extremely funny, is it?)

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry if I appeared to be laughing at anything the Premier said. I was no doing that this time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: About a year after they started, my son-in-law was just about at the end of his financial resources. He had worked like a dog. I think he set new records, new standards of work for Newfoundland. I don't think it has ever been equalled in Newfoundland the work he did in that year and in the years since then, night and day, Sunday and Monday, 365 days and nights a year, with the headlights on his tractor, phenomenal, almost miraculous that a man could endure such physical effort for four years, as he has done. But he had no money. I have earned ten thousand dollars a year for the last six years. That is sixty thousand dollars. That is what I have earned. I get seven thousand dollars for being Premier and three thousand dollars for being a member of the House, ten thousand dollars. My family is grown-up and I have not got an awful big expense,

with no children now to raise. After they were there a year I began helping them financially, helping my son-in-law, really helping my daughter, but really helping my son-in-law too, because I have immeasurable admiration for him, immense admiration for him. He is a good man — a good farmer. I have immense admiration for him. So I began to help them, and I found that in that first year I helped them to the extent of several thousand dollars, two or three thousand dollars out of my pay. He used to say to me: "Skipper you can't do this. You have to think of your own future." So finally I suggested to him that as he was now showing Newfoundland, all Newfoundland something, he was proving something to all Newfoundland—in the meantime the Department of Agriculture got enormously interested in him. He established entirely new techniques in farming in Newfoundland, never tried before, in land clearing, entirely new techniques. He will have two hundred and fifty acres cultivated this year, in four years — the hard way — But I insisted and then finally I knew I had to keep doing it, so instead of buying an annuity — I have no money — but instead of using my salary or all I could scrape out of it to buy an annuity for myself for when I get too old to work or too old to earn, I proposed to my son-in-law that we become partners, and we did. We have been partners ever since. And every single dollar I earn goes into that farm. I have my cheque here. It is two thousand dollars. We all got them here on opening day. We are going to get another thousand before we close. Every dollar goes into Ruswood Ranch ("Rns" for Russell and "Wood" for Smallwood).

Now I am just a little tired of hearing these smooth remarks about beauti-

ful estates. One newspaper columnist wrote of a palatial home the Premier is building on Roaches Line. They lived until they bought this Quonset Hut, which cost fifty dollars to buy, in a trailer, and I lived in a bale box. Every time I went to that farm I lived in a bale box. That is the palatial home. It cost \$75. Furniture came in to an American serviceman in it. I bought the big box, a furniture bale box. That is where I slept in the last three years on that farm, in this palatial home. They have not got a home yet. They have not got it yet.

Where is the credit to Edward Russell, if it is going to be referred to in the newspapers as the Premier's Estate? If a newspaper talks of the Premier's palatial home up there, if a newspaper columnist speaks of paving the road — I went over the road on Sunday and was to the axles in mud — a paved road into the farm — If it is to be referred to as a beautiful estate, what is that doing to Edward Russell. Because he happens to be the Premier's son-in-law is he to be dragged into politics, is he to be dragged into politics, is he to be cheated out of the credit that is due as a young man for work the like of which no man has ever done in Newfoundland? It has never happened before. I don't care who he is. I think of the Rubys and the Hallidays and all the great farmers in Newfoundland. None of them ever did the work Edward Russell has done in the last four years. It is gigantic, everybody knows it. It is a miracle of human effort which that man has performed. Yet the idea is to cheat him out of his credit that is due him, so as to get a crack at me. Now I ask the newspapers and radios and the honourable gentlemen opposite to desist referring to my farm, desist referring to my estate. It is a very

rough place. Some day we hope to make it a great farm, and if so, when I go out of politics I will have somewhere to live, enough to eat, and I will be happy.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand that His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor will come to the House tomorrow, at 3:30 of the clock, to give assent to certain Bills.

Now I am about to adjourn the House, under Standing Order 8, unless there is any announcement to be made to the House, the House is adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 30, at 3:00 of the clock.

WEDNESDAY, March 30th, 1955

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

Presenting Petitions

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 522 residents of the Town of Harbour Grace, 80 residents of Shearstown and 292 residents of Spaniard's Bay and 72 residents of Riverhead, Harbour Grace and 62 residents of Harbour Grace South, 72 residents of Upper Island Cove and 59 residents of Bishop's Cove; requesting that I present on their behalf a petition to this House expressing their grievance in respect to the increase of the electricity rates in the District of Harbour Grace, the increase averaging anywhere from fifteen per cent to two hundred per cent.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member would defer his presen-

tation of his petition—His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor took the Chair.

HIS HONOUR: Pray be seated.

MR. SPEAKER: Your Honour, it is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects Her grateful commoners in Newfoundland to present to Your Honour a Bill for the appropriation of interim supply granted in this present session.

A Bill "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of The Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-First Day of March One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-six and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service.

HIS HONOUR: In the name of Her Majesty I thank her loyal subjects, I accept their benevolence, and assent to this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of this Province has at its present session passed certain Bills to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly I respectfully request Your Honour's assent:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act."

HIS HONOUR: In the name of Her Majesty I assent to this Bill.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor left the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Harbour Grace:

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, continuing my support of the petition from 1,361 residents of the District of Harbour Grace, they advise me that in their opinion this said company has an exclusive franchise in this area and because the use of electrical appliances have doubled and trebled in the last ten years they are automatically assured of a terrific increase in the use of power in that area, and they see no reason why such a terrific increase in the cost to the users of this power should be implemented. They request the Government to check with the Public Utilities Board to have them check and see if there is any possibility of having these new rates decreased within the near future.

I ask leave, Sir, to have this petition placed on the Table and referred to the proper department.

On motion petition tabled for reference to the department concerned.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—we have not disposed of the other petition.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word in support of the petition so ably presented by the Honourable Minister on behalf of the people in his district. The same condition applies in the district which I represent and the people are paying on the Blackhead Road practically double what the people are paying on the opposite, the Southside Road in the city. It is quite a hardship to these citizens. They have already sent a petition to the Public Utilities Board, but so far no action,

I understand, has been taken, except that we heard the Attorney General state he had given certain orders. I am very happy to support the petition.

MR. BROWNE: I too support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and hope that there will be a re-hearing announced soon, and that these people concerned will give evidence in their own communities.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House a petition from the District of Carbonar-Bay de Verde, which is in effect a mass petition representing numerous settlements in that district which object to the increase in the rates of electricity recently applied.

The petition was spearheaded in the first instance by the Town Council of Carbonear, and by the Kiwanis Club of Carbonar. One of the main objections of the petitioners is that they see in this increase a device of the company to raise funds in that district to subsidize their operations elsewhere. For a district, I may say, where the supply of electricity ought to be cheap, the proportionate increase for householders, they feel, is quite out of proportion.

The petition is supported by 1,552 signatures from the Town of Carbonear and the communities of Flatrock, Freshwater, Victoria, Perry's Cove, Broad Cove, Western Bay, Riverhead, Western Bay South, Northern Bay, Burnt Point, Lower Island Cove, Caplin Cove, Bay de Verde, Redhead Cove, Old Pelican, Gull Island and Grate's Cove.

I am quite aware, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General, in a public statement, has undertaken to see that a review of these rates will be undertaken,

but in order to advance as far as possible the interests of the people concerned I present, with my support, this petition to the House, and ask that it be referred to the department concerned.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, as with the previous petition, I support also this petition for the same reason.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out one thing, that as there has already been a hearing and a finding and these rates were set by the Board of Public Utilities. Now this petition for a rehearsing has been considered by the Government and the hearing held according to the terms of the Act was held recently, when the Commission of Public Utilities went around and took information from the people. In order to legalize a proper re-hearing it should be advertised so that people who have anything to say could be there.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I wish to support this petition. The position is this: In order to re-open the hearing the board must, I think, receive an application from at least five citizens. Well I figure that there are enough signatures to that petition to keep re-opening for the next three years. However, I am glad to see these petitions being presented to the House because they justify the request made to the Board to re-open the hearing. Before, actually I was basing my instructions to the members of the board on the fact that there had been petitions to them direct.

MR. BROWNE: They have already done that.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

MR. BUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Winterton, Heart's Delight, Islington, Cavendish and Hearts Content also in connection with the recent increase in electrical rates. In view of the fact that the Honorable the Attorney General has already made a public statement concerning the matter in question, I will await further developments. Again the honourable member for Carbonear Bay de Verde and the honourable member for Harbour Grace have outlined the facts which are in the same category as relate to the petition which I am presenting. Therefore, I support this petition on behalf of the people of Trinity South which I represent, and I beg leave, Sir, to lay it on the table of the House and have it referred to the department concerned.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, because I knew that the honourable member was to be the third to bring forth such a petition as this I deliberately refrained from speaking in support of the two earlier petitions, not that I did not support them, but that I felt one speech sufficient to express my support of the petition which the honourable member for Trinity South has just tabled, and if it is not too much out of order, to express my hearty support of the two petitions tabled earlier.

I may say that there are many questions in my mind just at this moment as to what are the Government's rights in the matter or what are the rights of the Legislature in this matter. The Public Utilities Commission is there in its office, functioning. To what extent can the Attorney General interfere with them as regarding instructions and directions? At least one member of the Board of Public Utilities Commission feels very strongly that there has been

political interference with the Board. Captain Frank Gosse has tendered his resignation to the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Grant Jack, on the grounds, in writing, that he resented political interference. I wonder to what extent the Attorney General, or the Premier, or the Government, or the House of Assembly can interfere with the Public Utilities Board? If we are confronted by a widely expressed public clamour for a readjustment of the rates, are we in the position where we can only sit tight and hope that the Board will take up the matter, or is it a bad thing for the Government, through the Attorney General, the responsible Minister of the Crown to direct or instruct or request or invite the Board to re-open the matter and take steps to ascertain whether an injustice has been done the general public in raising the rates as they were raised?

I regret sincerely the fact that Captain Gosse has felt it necessary to resign. I regret that. He is an excellent man, an exemplary citizen, and I can say only that I regret that he has felt it to be necessary to hand in his resignation.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would tell us when Mr. Gosse resigned?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I believe, I am not sure, I have his letter of resignation addressed by him and delivered by him to the Chairman of the Board, which I found on my desk this forenoon, I did not notice the date, probably today or yesterday, but within the last few hours he has handed in his resignation.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the petition of the honourable member for Trinity South

I too regret that a member of the Board has found it necessary to resign on account of what is termed political interference. It is a most regrettable fact, if there was any political pressure placed on either of the parties. I do hope that Captain Gosse will reconsider his decision to resign. As for us on this side of the House we can assure you there was no political interference with anybody. We did present a petition to the Commission from Blackhead Road, of course, like the petitions coming in today, and I agree with the Premier that it is most regrettable for anybody to even attempt to use political influence one way or the other in connection with this company. But the thing, I consider, the people I represent on the Blackhead Road are paying nearly double the amount they paid prior to the increase in rates. These petitions are coming from all around Conception Bay and other areas from the people. Whether or not anybody interferes does not count. The point is, are the rates justified?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is my feeling, and I think that is bigger even than Captain Gosse, fine man, fine citizen as he is.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't even know him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is a very fine citizen. He has rendered a great service — a military man.

On motion petition received for presentation to the department concerned.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Hodges Cove, Hillview, St. Joes Within, begging that a gap or road between Hillview and Hodges Cove should be made

passable for motor traffic. This is something for which the petitioners have been crying for the last five or six years. Some repairs to the road have been made in order to make it a passable trail, but it is not yet fit for vehicle traffic.

I support the prayer of the petition, and beg leave to table it and have it referred to the department concerned.

MR. DROVER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by the Honourable Minister from the people of Hillview, Hodges Cove and vicinity. That is the area in which I grew up. I know that the people of that part of the South East Arm, Trinity Bay, are cut off from the railway and I do think that a road would be very convenient for them in getting sick persons to hospital and getting communications with the Trans-Canada Highway. I have much pleasure, Sir, in supporting the petition of the Honourable Minister.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, almost two years ago the people of Newfoundland accepted an offer from the Wild Life Institute to undertake a survey of wild life resources here in Newfoundland. The report of the survey undertaken previously by the head of the Fish and Wild Life Services of the United States of America was presented to the Government in December last, and because of its public importance the Government decided to publicize the report. This is the first opportunity we have had to table it in the House, Mr. Speaker, and I therefore ask permission to have this report of the wild life survey tabled in the House at this time.

On motion report tabled.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I should like on behalf of this House to say how deeply grateful the Government and the House and the people are to Dr. Gabrielson and to the Government of the United States that released him to undertake that great survey in Newfoundland. Dr. Gabrielson served absolutely without pay. He refused to take a single dollar in payment for his great work, all that he was prepared to accept was simply his bare expenses in visiting Newfoundland and in carrying out his mission. He is a most distinguished world figure in his particular field, and Newfoundland was indeed fortunate that we could get so great a man to undertake this important work.

I think the whole House would want that statement to go on record, a statement of our gratitude to Dr. Gabrielson and to his country and his Government.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the relevant statute I now wish to lay on the table of the House the latest published report of the Department of Health. Whilst I am on my feet, if I may, I would like to take this occasion to distribute to members of the House a list of patients presently at the St. John's Sanatorium, according to electoral districts.

MR. HIGGINS: Might I ask, Mr. Speaker, did not the Honourable Minister already send around similar reports?

DR. POTTLE: We make them up by the month, Mr. Speaker.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I

beg leave to report the Select Committee on Legislation met this morning and considered certain Bills to it referred. The Committee is now in a position, Sir, to make what might be called an interim report as regards Bill No. 9 "An Act to Amend the Wills Act" — The Committee has no recommendation to make. We recommend the Bill as printed.

MR. SPEAKER: I am puzzled about the words "Interim Report."

MR. CURTIS: It is really final, Mr. Speaker, with regard to that Bill.

MR. BROWNE: I think the Minister meant that the Committee had not finished its work on all the Bills, but has on this particular one.

On motion report adopted.

Giving Notice of Motion

None.

Giving Notice of Questions

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

- (a) A statement showing the travelling expenses of the present Director General of Economic Development with dates and length and cost of each trip since his appointment.
- (b) Who were the parties who recommended Dr. Valdmánis to the Minister? Were these recommendations in writing or any of them? Table a copy of each recommendation which was in writing.
- (c) Name the industries which were initiated or established as a result of recommendations by Dr. Valdmánis. When did Dr. Valdmánis cease to take an active interest in the work of the Department?

- (d) During the absence of Dr. Valdemaris from Newfoundland as Chairman of NALCO was there any correspondence between him and the Minister? Table a copy of the same, if any.

Answers to Questions

Question No. 19:

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, to the first part of that question the answer is "No." May I explain it by saying that provisions for the various institutions are bought on a weekly or monthly basis and are bought according to the price lists which we receive regularly from the wholesale houses. Since they vary in quantity and prices fluctuate from week to week and month to month it is possible to deal with them. But in each and every instance the lowest prices are used, unless some other position occurs like, for instance, we are unable to get delivery. I might say also, dealing with No. 2 for which I have a written answer — again where possible local production is used as widely as it is possible for all of our institutions. For the out-lying institutions, the cottage hospitals the arrangement there for supply is done locally on the spot, and their supply is a determining factor, and that is checked regularly by the Department of Health officials. In Question 2 — Fish again is a product which depends upon several factors. We buy here, there and elsewhere wherever we can get an adequate quantity at the lowest prices subject to quality. In part of the second question, a part I have not here is a section dealing with drugs and dressings over the past years. That, Mr. Speaker, involves considerable work. If at all possible I will get it before the House closes. I trust the honourable member may be satisfied with that in-

formation. Again I might tell him price is the determining factor except in such cases as emergencies where we have to get it wherever we can.

MR. HOLLETT: If I may, Mr. Speaker, in connection with that question: A somewhat similar question was asked last year, and as I remember, I received a detailed answer with regard to it. I don't know whether the Minister would be aware of the fact, as I don't think he was Minister at that time — I had a detailed reply. Apparently this year he cannot get it.

MR. HEFFERTON: I will give a detailed reply on Section 2, apart from the drugs.

Questions No. 22, 23 and 24 in course of preparation.

Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I may direct a question to the Acting Minister of Health. I notice this is a report for 1953. When, may I ask, will the report for 1954 be out? This is so far behind it is not very much value at the present time.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, I may say, it is being given very serious consideration by the Department of Health at the present time.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would be able to give me an answer tomorrow or at a later date?

DR. POTTLE: I shall undertake so to do, Sir.

First Reading:

Honourable the Premier asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act."

On motion read a first time.

MR. SPEAKER: With the consent of the House I suggest it would now be read a second time.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, read a second time?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not read, but I make the motion, and the motion be put.

MR. BROWNE: It has just been read the first time now. I wonder if the Minister could tell us if there is much difference between the Bill and the one introduced last year?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House give leave?

Motion is that this Bill be now read a second time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of this Bill. I assume that the Bill is available for distribution to the House. I propose today to have the Bill distributed and to distribute maps to all members illustrating the changes that are to be made in this Legislation, and to explain the redistribution that the Legislation provides for.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it will be seriously denied that the membership of this House ought to be increased. Away back half a century or more ago when Newfoundland had a population of two hundred thousand or less, the membership of the House of Assembly was 36. It continued to be 36 for a great many years. In the election, I believe of 1900, and in the year of 1904 and the year 1907 (that was the year of the tie election when there were exactly eighteen elected on each side) and in the election of 1909 (the one that broke that deadlock) and the elections of 1913, 1919, 1923 and 1924, 36 mem-

bers were elected each time because that was the membership of the people's House. But the Monroe Government, elected in 1924, raised the number from 36 to 40. I believe it was the Monroe Government that did that (I am speaking from memory).

MR. BROWNE: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And in the election of 1928, 40 members were elected to this House. The population of Newfoundland then was less than three hundred thousand people, well under three hundred thousand people. In 1923 twenty-seven members were elected because the Squires Government, elected in 1923, brought in an amendment to the Legislation cutting the number from forty back not to thirty-six as it had always been, or at least as it had been for so many years, but to twenty-seven. That was at a time of great stringency. It was in the hard times. It was in the depression. It was then felt that twenty-seven would be enough for Newfoundland in those days, in those times and under those conditions.

When the Terms of Union between Newfoundland and Canada were being negotiated it was provided that the Constitution should be restored as it was before the suspension of Responsible Government, the Constitution of the House of Assembly, with two exceptions only (1) that there should not be a second Chamber, the Upper House, the Legislative Council, as it was called, was abolished, and (2) the membership of this House was increased from twenty-seven to twenty-eight so that Labrador might for the first time in history be given representation in the House of Assembly, that addition of Labrador bringing the number therefore to twenty-eight. That resulted from the fact that Lab-

rador had been represented in the National Convention, and had voted in the National Referendum.

So, Sir, the general election was held in Newfoundland after Confederation and was one that elected twenty-eight members to this House, Labrador having been added. Then in the next general election which was held the same number was elected. Well now, because another general election, the third one, is due to take place within the next two and a half years, we have thought it proper to bring before the House this present legislation calling for a further redistribution. Now there are two or three outstanding facts about this piece of legislation (1) that the number of members is increased from twenty-eight to thirty-three. On that point I doubt very much that there can be very serious disagreement.

Our population in Newfoundland now is over four hundred thousand, and it is growing very rapidly. We will see half a million people in Newfoundland in the next few years. A House of thirty-three members representing a population of something between four hundred thousand and half a million people is a very reasonable number, at least it is not an excessive number when you remember that a population of two hundred thousand and less than that were represented by a House of thirty-six members, or three more than we propose in this present legislation. So that I don't think that anyone will argue seriously that thirty-three is too many. Another feature of the Bill is that dual constituencies are abolished. That is to say; constituencies electing more than one member are abolished. We have three of them in Newfoundland at the moment, Harbour Main-Bell Island constituency elected two members; St. John's West constituency elected two members

and St. John's East constituency elected two members. This will be abolished if this legislation is carried. They will cease to exist and will be replaced by one-man constituencies, each of them electing one member only to the House of Assembly. A third feature of this legislation is that some existing constituencies are being sub-divided, or should I say are being divided, into two, they are Labrador which presently is one constituency and will become two different constituencies, each electing one member to the House; and Humber District, which is presently one constituency, will be divided into two, each of the two electing one member to the House; and Grand Falls constituency, which will be divided into two, each of the two electing one member to the House. Bell Island-Harbour Main will be divided with no increase in the number of representatives. It is at present a two-man district, which will be sub-divided, but each of the two will still elect one member so that there will be no net increase. In Placentia-St. Mary's District the district is also being divided into two distinct districts, the District of St. Mary's which will elect one member and the District of Placentia East which will elect another.

These are the only changes until we come to the constituency of St. John's, the City and Suburbs of St. John's. At the moment St. John's consists of two districts, St. John's East and St. John's West, each of them electing two members making a total of four. What we propose is that St. John's, that these two constituencies, be abolished, and St. John's suburbs be divided into five individual or single constituencies, five. These will be the District of St. John's East and St. John's West, St. John's North and St. John's South and St. John's Centre, five. So that

the representation of the City and Suburbs of St. John's will be five members in the House of Assembly. Now the most it ever had, when the House consisted of thirty-six members, was six, St. John's West three and St. John's East three, but St. John's East included Bell Island, which will still have a member. St. John's will be divided into five districts, give and one are six, so that the representation in that area which then had six representatives in the House will have six now. They had six out of thirty-six. They will now have six out of thirty-three.

There is one thing I omitted to mention the change in Conception Bay: There are to be two changes. I mentioned one. The second one is that in Conception Bay at the present time the representation in this House from Conception Bay is as follows: Carbonear-Bay de Verde one member; Harbour Grace two members, or one member, that makes two; Port de Grave one member, that makes three; Bell Island-Harbour Main two members, that makes five. We are reducing the number to four. The constituencies will be Carbonear-Bay de Verde, no change; Harbour Grace-Port de Grave one district with one member; Harbour Main one member; Bell Island one member, a total of four members.

Now if these maps can be brought and distributed to the members they will see at a glance how the constituencies shape up physically. I am reminded (I have been speaking without notes) we have divided also the district of St. Georges-Port au Port which now elects one member into two separate districts electing one member each, St. George's one district electing one man and Port au Port another district electing another man.

MR. SPEAKER: May I interrupt — I don't see how the honourable member can make a speech if members keep rattling papers. I suggest, since the Opposition are few, they may look at their maps but why not other members wait until after the speech when they will have ample opportunity to study them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Actually, Mr. Speaker, there is very little necessity for it beyond the necessity of curiosity. I think the Solicitor General can get more noise out of a piece of paper than any man I have ever met.

MR. SPEAKER: I discovered that earlier, that paper makes noise — the honourable member seems to have learned it for the first time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now we have taken three great principles into account in this redistribution, which I think must be adopted in this Province. The first one is a traditional one of representation according to the great broad divisions of our people, not ideologically but denominationally. From time immemorial it has been the practice of political parties without exception, since the beginning of Responsible Government it has been the undeviating policy of all political parties to give each of the three divisions of our people the same percentage of representation in the House as they constitute of the whole population.

Now it so happens in Newfoundland that our people fall broadly into almost precisely three identical numbers, one third, one third and one third. So the first principle is that the districts are so drawn, the boundaries are so drawn as to result, should each political party follow the traditional practice, in a House that will

always be one third, one third and one third. Now that is the first principle we have adopted. The second principle we have adopted is that of making into a district electing one member an area that is roughly, as nearly as possible, like minded, that is to say homogeneous to make a homogeneous area and constitute each of them a separate district. For example Bonavista Bay is one area but is too big to make into one district. We cut it in two and make two districts of it, the north side of a district and the south side of a district; Fogo District all approximately one area, so we make it one district. We don't put one part—when you go around Cape Freels you leave Bonavista North and enter Fogo. We do not put part of it, on the other side of Cape Freels, into Bonavista Bay because it does not belong in Bonavista Bay. That is the second principle, geographically speaking we have tried to make, as all our predecessors have tried to do, to constitute the district as homogeneous areas of Newfoundland.

The third principle is one which we in this House, all of us, I am sure, must be in complete agreement, that is, to give rural areas more representation than we have given urban areas. Now that principle is carried out throughout the world in every local House virtually in the world today — it takes far more voters to elect a member from an urban area, it takes far more population than it does in a rural area. I will give the House some very good examples of that: Take Nova Scotia: In the rural districts of Nova Scotia, what we would call here in Newfoundland the outports, the outport districts, in the outports or rural districts of Nova Scotia it takes 7,459 voters to elect one member and 13,000 people to elect one

member in an urban area. If you take all the constituencies of Nova Scotia, electing 21 of the 27 members, that is the rural areas that elect 21 out of all the thirty-seven they have altogether. In that province these 21 members are elected in districts that have a total of 195,000 souls, that is an average of 7,500 persons per member. But in the urban parts of Nova Scotia it is 13,000 people who are required to elect one member. Now in New Brunswick, in the rural, the outport parts of New Brunswick, it takes 4,700 population to elect one member to the House of Assembly, but in the urban parts, the cities and towns of New Brunswick it is 6,500 or 7,000 population to elect one member.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Honourable the Premier a question now on New Brunswick? They have there a different system altogether, they elect them in groups of five.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is an interesting observation, and I don't see it has anything to do with the point I am making. New Brunswick, I repeat, in the rural areas 4,700 people to elect one member to the House, but in the urban areas 6,500. Now in Quebec, in the rural areas every 14,000 people elect a member to the House of Assembly but in the urban parts of Quebec it takes 32,500 people to elect one member. Now we go on to Ontario: In Ontario, in the outports of Ontario, the farming district, the rural areas, it takes 17,600 people to elect one member, but in the urban parts of Ontario it takes 33,700 to elect one member. They are allowed to elect one member for every 33,700 people in the towns, but when you get outside the towns they are allowed to elect one

member for every 17,600. Now in the Province of Manitoba, in the out-ports they can elect a member for every 5,400 people. When you leave the country and go into the cities and towns it takes 23,000 that is four to one in Manitoba. In Saskatchewan—

MR. HOLLETT: I am afraid I cannot get four to one? Four and a half to one?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now Saskatchewan, in their House of Assembly, the rural areas can elect a member for every 8,460, but in the urban areas for every 19,780. Alberta the rural areas — listen to this — in the rural areas of Alberta there is a member elected to the House of Assembly for every 6,800 people and in the urban areas it takes 47,000 to elect one member. That is seven to one. British Columbia, the rural areas, 8,350 to elect one member and in the urban areas it takes 26,500. Now the ratio is this: Nova Scotia 5 to 3; New Brunswick 4 to 3; Quebec 2 to 1; Ontario 2 to 1; Manitoba 4 to 1; Saskatchewan 2 to 1 and Alberta 7 to 1 and British Columbia 3 to 1. Now here in Newfoundland — (Now these are averages. It does not mean that in Alberta they have passed a law that says, every 6,829 people shall elect one member. They have not done that. Nor that a constituency shall consist of a geographical area in which is domiciled exactly 6,829.) — due to the peculiar shape of the island in the first place and due to the peculiar fact that our people live on the coastline and not in the hinterland, and due to the fact that parts of our coastline are very thickly congested and other parts very sparsely populated, for instance take this great stretch of coast, the south-west coast from the entrance to Bay D'Espoir to Port-aux-Basques, on that

great stretch of coastline there are fewer people than there are in a couple or three or four dozen city blocks of the City of St. John's yet it takes a couple of days to steam up the coast. It is a vast geographical area. The distances are very great. Take the great St. Barbe District which goes all the way almost from Bay of Islands down to Labrador to the greater district, geographically speaking, of White Bay which covers from the Straits of Belle Isle right down through to the Head of White Bay and out the great peninsula to Cape St. John, an enormous area geographically, with hundreds of miles to travel, yet the whole area has thirteen thousand people. So it is therefore impossible for us to take into account the great traditional principle that we always try to follow in Newfoundland, if you are going to carry that out you cannot divide the coastline up into districts that would have a pretty similar number of population. We cannot do it because if we do where it should have been a district of a certain type it will become one of another type, and the House knows what I mean when I say "type".

Now the populations are as follows: St. Barbe District 8,375; White Bay 13,037; Green Bay 9,860; Gander 8,192; Grand Falls 20,046; Twillingate 9,931; Fogo 10,658; Bonavista North 12,704; Bonavista South 11,976; Trinity North 12,309; Trinity South 10,782; Carbon-ear—Bay de Verde 11,907; Harbour Grace—Port de Grave 15,157; Harbour Main 9,876; Bell Island 10,291; St. John's North 14,000; St. John's South 15,000; St. Johns East 15,000 —

MR. HIGGINS: These are approximate?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. MURRAY: The others are exact.

MR. SMALLWOOD: St. John's West 17,000 St. John's Centre 17,000; Ferryland 6,237; St. Mary's 5,912; Placentia East 5,410; (I think that is the smallest) Placentia West 9,954; Burin 10,867; Fortune Bay—Hermitage 12,045; Burgco-LaPoile, 10,070; St. Georges 8,027; Port au Port 7,809; Humber West 14,432; Labrador North 4,670; Labrador South 3,216; (that is the smallest—

On motion House recessed for ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that in this Bill we have tried, as far as the geographical characteristics of the island and the coastline would allow, to follow out the principle that it should require more people in an urban area to elect a member to the House than it requires in a rural or an outport area. We see that Newfoundland falls rather naturally into three broad divisions in that regard (1) the actual City of St. John's, the very city itself; that is the districts of St. John's West and Centre and the very City of St. John's itself. That is a highly urbanized area and then (2) there are urbanized areas but not so intensely urbanized, these are St. John's North, St. John's South and St. John's East.

MR. BROWNE: The only urbanized district you have is St. John's Centre.

MR. SMALLWOOD: St. John's West is fairly urbanized. Perhaps it would serve my argument best if I came towards St. John's from away off there — Humber District and Grand Falls District; Bell Island District, the suburban districts of St.

John's, all these are urban, but not so intensely urban as the actual heart of the City itself and (3) the ordinary run of outport or rural districts we have in Newfoundland. These are the three broad divisions geographically speaking, the intensely urbanized City of St. John's the urbanized but not so intensely urbanized districts of Humber East and West, Grand Falls and Bell Island, for St. John's East and then St. John's North and St. John's South, and finally the general run of districts. Now when you compare the populations of these districts and stack them up against this principle I have stated; that it ought to take more people in an urbanized area to elect a member than it does in one not so urbanized and that it ought to take more people in an intensely or highly concentrated urbanized area than in one less highly concentrated, the House will see that it works out very, very well indeed. In the two intensely or highly urbanized areas, that is St. John's Centre and St. John's West the population is 17,000 each, and it takes 17,000 to elect a member to the House. Now when you go to the next class, urbanized but not so heavily urbanized you will find St. John's East 15,000, St. John's South 15,000 and St. John's North 14,000 Humber East 12,000 and Humber West 14,500, Bell Island is 10,000 (I believe, from memory, but that is an island and we have taken all those on the island. Unless we are able to pick up some people and move them in there we shall just have to take the island as it is, and the population is around 10,000 or 12,000. We cannot help it. That is not our fault.

Now the one case in which we have not been able to follow this principle as precisely as we would like to do,

is the division of the District of Grand Falls into Grand Falls East and West. We wondered whether we should call it Gander or call it Grand Falls East, with the name Gander District, but we did not, we called it Grand Falls East.

MR. HOLLETT: It is Gander here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes it is, but we wondered about it and we decided to call it Gander. Now divide that district by running a vertical line north and south — if honourable members would take the District of Grand Falls as it exists now at the moment, before any change is made, and study the population for the whole district, by places, if honourable members did that and then studied the nature of the population and subdivide the population into various categories, it will be seen that unless we were prepared to drive a line through the centre of the Town of Grand Falls and say the Town of Windsor, unless we were prepared to do that, and we were not, because we thought it would be doing violence to the principle of homogeneity. We felt that we had to put Grand Falls and Windsor in one or in the other, and the line had to be drawn north and south. It could not be drawn east and west. It had to be north and south because of the location of different settlements and populations. So we had to put Grand Falls in one or the other unless we were willing to draw the line in the centre, which we were not. If you put Grand Falls into Gander District then the population of Gander District would be what is now the population of Grand Falls District and the population of Grand Falls District would be not what is now but what Gander is now. In other words, that is one case where we could not get roughly equal numbers in each of the two districts.

For the rest of the districts, the House has seen they vary in number from 12,700 in Bonavista North, 12,500 in Trinity North, 15,000 Harbour Grace — Port de Grave down to as few as 5,400 in Placentia East, and 3,200 in Labrador South.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before summarizing I should like to say to my friends in the District of Harbour Grace and my friends in the District of Port de Grave, I should like to say to my many friends in these two districts, Harbour Grace and Port de Grave, two great and historic districts, that in their history they have had many changes in their boundaries and they have another now. Neither district disappears. Harbour Grace District goes right on and Port de Grave District goes right on, both districts continue, they do not disappear, but they are united as they have been united before. We would not have united them if it had not been necessary. It was absolutely necessary to do it or else it would not have been done. Someone, the present member for Harbour Grace or the present member for Port de Grave, one of these, one honourable gentleman will now be running in the single district, and the honourable gentleman who does not run in the new district of Harbour Grace-Port de Grave will probably be running in some other district.

Now to summarize and conclude, Mr. Speaker: We think that the number 33, is not too great. It used to be 36 and it used to be 40. Thirty-three is not too great. We think that we have, as far as is practical to do, indeed insofar as it is possible to do it, kept theoretically (we could take up large bodies of people and move from one part of course to another part and in that way equalize the population but that is not practical

nor possible) we think the boundaries we have drawn up are good indeed. We have followed the traditional principle perfectly — it is eleven, eleven and eleven, unmistakably so. There is not any narrow margin anywhere, unmistakably and undeniably it is what it is. There is not any border-line case. Finally we have followed the principle that we should, in a congested city, an urbanized area, take more people to elect a member to the Legislature than it does in a sparsely populated area.

Now, sir, I have not any doubt but that complaints will be raised. I have no doubt there will be complaints that Labrador with a population of eight thousand and which is given the right to elect two members in the House — Well, I have two things to say about that (1) the population is far more than that, several thousand more than eight thousand, but I don't base the argument on population at all in the case of Labrador. I say that it is a sheer physical impossibility for any one man to represent it. It cannot be done. No man can represent a hundred and ten thousand square miles, twice as big as Newfoundland itself. How can any one man represent Newfoundland in a House of Assembly? Even in the House of Commons Newfoundland is represented by eight members, Newfoundland and Labrador. Labrador is just too big to be represented by one man. I went down there last summer with my honourable colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources, and we travelled for eight or ten days by boat, and the distance we covered were enormous, just enormous distances, yet we looked at only part of the Coast of Labrador. Look at the map of Labrador and see where we actually did go. We hardly even

began to cover the Coast of Labrador. It is just ridiculous to think that any one man can represent so huge an area. Now, sir, if the population of Labrador were only half what it is I would still say it should be represented by two men. It should be divided into different constituencies, each entitled to elect one man. I would say even if there were only two thousand people in all Labrador that we should divide Labrador into two constituencies and have each of them elect one member. Either give them no representation at all or give them genuine representation. One man attempting to represent that huge sub-continent is just ridiculous and cannot be done — We are prepared to stand or fall on that.

Mr. Speaker, the understanding, I believe, is that my honourable friends opposite will take all the time they need within reason, two or three days and maybe longer if they need it, to study this legislation, to study the maps, and if necessary any information which we can give them, if it is in our possession, they have only to ask and we will pass it on. If they want the breakdown of the population by districts, if they want the traditional breakdown we have got that except for the City of St. John's. There is a rather peculiar situation in the City of St. John's, if you take the city itself and the three suburban districts of the five districts you will find the traditional balance drawn is about fifty-fifty, but slightly more than fifty and slightly less than fifty, but roughly speaking about fifty-fifty, but we have made it three and two. That is the only way that we know of whereby — we don't know of any other way — we have created a small district in St. Marys Bay and a small district in Port au Port, and having

done that, there is nowhere else we can turn to get that eleven except in the City of St. John's so we have done what we have done.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: In view of the fact that the House is not ready to proceed with the debate the Honourable the Premier ought to move the adjournment.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, not debating the motion at all, the Premier said he had some information which he could give us. I wonder if he could give it to us now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, before we go into more business that everyone get rid of these maps.

Committee of the Whole on various Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Protection of Justices and Other Public Authorities".

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. In this Act.

(a) "Judge" means a judge of the Supreme Court, a judge of a District Court and includes a Stipendiary Magistrate; and

(b) "justice" includes a judge of the Family Court, a judge of a Juvenile Court, a Stipendiary Magistrate and a Justice of the Peace.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, it does not apply, I take it to judges of the Family Court, but what about the Judge of the Family Court?

MR. CURTIS: That is under (b).

MR. BROWNE: Is there any consideration being given to giving him the same protection?

MR. CURTIS: Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I did not notice it until now. There must be some reason. Perhaps we could let that stand.

Clause 2 stand.

Clauses 3, 4 and 5 read and carried.

Clause 6 read:

6. Where a conviction or order has been made by a justice and a warrant of distress or a commitment has been issued thereon by some other justice, bona fide and without collusion, no action shall be brought against the justice who issued the warrant by reason of any defect in the conviction or order, or of any way of jurisdiction in the justice who made it, but the action, if any is brought shall be against the justice who made the conviction or order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask at this stage, to what extent do justices hear cases in this country and make convictions and orders and carry them out? It seems to me it must be a very small number of cases.

MR. CURTIS: They never do, Mr. Chairman, it is just really a short term for describing the people mentioned.

MR. HIGGINS: I remember Eli Basha sitting once, and bought up the whole issue of the "Advertiser" to send to his friends.

Carried.

Clauses 7, 8 and 9 carried.

Clause 10 read:

10. Where a justice refuses to do

any act relating to the duties of his office as a justice, the person requiring the act to be done may, upon affidavit stating the facts, and upon six days notice to him, and also the party to be affected by the act, apply to a judge of the Supreme Court, or to the judge of the District Court for the judicial district in which the justice resides, for an order directing the act to be done.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, on that, I was just wondering whether the Attorney General might inform me — There are certain cases I know in districts exclusively in the districts outside the City of St. John's where a magistrate may be out of town and a man may be arrested for any of a variety of charges. He usually can be brought before a JP and remanded and provided bail. But if the JP refuses to come up, has the man to wait for five or six days before anything can be done?

MR. CURTIS: I believe in such cases the police do not execute the warrant.

MR. HIGGINS: But when a man is actually in custody?

MR. CURTIS: I think sometimes they just don't arrest them, that is all. We have great difficulty with magistrates on circuit. It is sometimes very hard to get things done like that. Where possible the police don't make any arrests but proceed by way of summons when the magistrate gets back.

MR. HIGGINS: Would that apply in a case where John Jones goes driving his car on Saturday night and the police pick him up as he is obviously drunk while in charge of a car — The magistrate is on a holiday and the JP says: "No, I am not going up". Does

he have to stay there, having been arrested, mind you the police must arrest him.

MR. CURTIS: In a case like that we would send up a magistrate from a neighbouring place. The difficulty is in a place like Goose Bay when a magistrate has to go out to some other part of the district, then we find it very hard to supply the courts —

MR. BROWNE: The only point seems to me is this notice of six days. It means the person applying for the order has to wait six days before he can take it out. If some proceeding is to be taken it should be taken right away. There should not be any limit.

MR. CURTIS: That is Section 5 of the English Act, but I have no objection.

MR. BROWNE: Shorten it to two days then.

MR. CURTIS: I agree to that.

Clause amended by deleting the word "six" and substituting the word "two".

Clause as amended carried.

Section 11 carried.

Section 12 read:

12. Where a discretionary power is given to a justice by any statute of Canada or of Newfoundland an action shall not be brought against the justice for or by reason of the manner in which he has exercised his discretion in the execution of any such power.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Solicitor General or the Attorney General is in a position to explain what that means? It is certainly very wide coverage there—the discretion of the magistrate —

MR. CURTIS: It is the section we always had, Section 6. It was always there, before 1949.

MR. BROWNE: It is the same one as was there before?

MR. CURTIS: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: All right. It was not there before 1949 because we did not have the Statutes of Canada.

MR. CURTIS: It is just revised to suit the situation, but it is a section of the old English Act.

MR. BROWNE: But it is the Statutes of Canada.

Clause 12 carried.

Clause 13 read:

13.—(1) A defect in an information taken before or in a warrant issued by a justice shall not prevent him from claiming the benefit and protection of this Act if the judge or the court trying the matter is of the opinion that he acted in good faith, and that the informant or complainant intended, by the facts stated to the justice, to charge the commission of an offence which, if it had been set forth in proper form in the information or warrant, would have been one within the jurisdiction of the justice.

(2) An action shall not be brought against a person who has in good faith laid an information before a justice by reason of the information not containing a proper description of the offence, or being otherwise defective.

MR. BROWNE: That seems to me to be a little inconsistent with Section 5. It seems to contradict Section 5.

MR. CURTIS: Section 5 is where he would not have any conceivable

jurisdiction. I would take it that in Section 13 he conceivably had jurisdiction, but in Section 5 he was definitely outside his jurisdiction.

MR. BROWNE: Well he either had the jurisdiction or he did not. Under Section 5 he is liable to action but under 13, if he did not, but thought he did, he is not liable for action. That is contradictory and should be examined.

MR. CURTIS: We might let it stand for the moment.

On motion Clause 13 stand.

MR. HIGGINS: If the injured party has a conviction set aside and recovers cost the Court may decide that is enough for him?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for St. John's East suggested that it might be covered by costs. The Court may order that costs be given — I may point out that does not help the man's feelings. The lawyer gets the costs. It only pays for the costs of the case — no man goes to law and makes money if he just gets a judgment saying he is wrongly treated. If he only gets costs he is still out of pocket. There seems to me to be something inconsistent between these two sections 4 and 14.

MR. CURTIS: I think there is a connection, Mr. Chairman, between 14 and 9.

MR. BROWNE: I suggest that section should stand too and we should get more information on it.

On motion Clause 14 stand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't you think Mr. Chairman, it is now about time to abolish the Legal Committee.

MR. BROWNE: This has not been referred to it. I think it should have been because, Mr. Chairman, actually what they have done is to combine the two Acts, the English and the Ontario Act. While I think we will find it all right when we analyze it, just at first sight it does not seem right.

Clause 15 read:

15. Where a plaintiff is entitled to recover, and if he proves the levying or payment of any penalty or sum of money under any conviction or order as part of the damages he seeks to recover, or if he proves that he was imprisoned under the conviction or order and seeks to recover damages for the imprisonment, he shall not be entitled to recover the amount of the penalty or sum so levied or paid, or any sum beyond the sum of five cents as damages for the imprisonment, or any costs of suit, if it is proved that he was actually guilty of the offence of which he was convicted, or that he was liable by law to pay the sum he was ordered to pay, and, with respect to the imprisonment, that he has undergone no greater punishment than that assigned by law for the offence of which he was convicted, or for non-payment of the sum he was so ordered to pay.

MR. BROWNE: Could the Attorney General tell us the precedent for that?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, Section 15 is Section 13 of the English Act.

MR. BROWNE: Exactly the same? It seems to me to sound a little different.

MR. CURTIS: Of course, Mr. Chairman, in the English Act we have split up many of the sections into

sub-sections, for instance, two or three of these sections represent one section of the English Act. We have just split up the Act and made several sections of it. Perhaps when the Committee rises, Mr. Chairman, we could just report progress, and the Legal Committee could just have a look at this before we call it again — When you are finished reading it.

MR. BROWNE: Let the clause stand and pass what we can.

On motion Clause 15 stand.

Clause 16 read:

16. An Action shall not be brought against a justice or any other person for anything done by him under the supposed authority of a statute of Canada or of Newfoundland which was beyond the legislative jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada or of the Legislature as the case may be, if the action would not lie against him had the statute been within the legislative jurisdiction of Parliament or of the Legislature which assumed to enact it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand that — In other words the judge is not liable for doing something he has no power to do but if he had the power to do it he would be liable for action.

MR. CURTIS: No, Mr. Chairman. Surely my honourable friend can understand that section. It says: "An action shall not be brought against a justice or any other person for anything done by him under the supposed authority of a statute of Canada or of Newfoundland which was beyond the legislative jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada or of the Legislature as the case may be, if the action would not lie against him had the statute been within the legislative

jurisdiction of Parliament or of the Legislature which assumed to enact it." It is crystal clear. In other words if there is a statute passed by the Parliament of Canada and the Parliament of Canada had the authority to pass it, I suppose if it dealt with something which was exclusively in a provincial jurisdiction, and they passed it and he acts under that then he is not liable. That is all, it is just crystal clear.

MR. HIGGINS: If I may, I believe this sort of thing harks back to the situation which the Honourable the Attorney General remembers back in 1931 when this House amended the Newfoundland Highway Traffic Act, and a man for drunken driving could be sent to jail, and a man was in fact convicted before the magistrate of Bell Island under the Provincial Statute and sentenced to seven days. I think the matter went to the Supreme Court and it was found the Newfoundland Statute was out of order. Conceivably that man would have an action against the magistrate.

MR. CURTIS: This protects the magistrate. Incidentally the Supreme Court was wrong. It was criticized in the Canadian Journal.

Clause 16 carried.

Clause 17 read:

17.—(1) An Action shall not be brought against the Sherriff of Newfoundland, any of his deputies, a constable, bailiff or other officer, or against any person acting by his orders and in his aid, for anything done in obedience to a warrant issued by a justice until demand has been made or left at his usual place of abode by the person intending to bring such action, or by his solicitor or agent in writing, signed by the person demand-

ing the same, for the perusal and copy of the warrant and the same has been refused and neglected for six days after such demand.

(2) If, after such demand and compliance therewith, by showing the warrant to and permitting a copy thereof to be taken by the person demanding it, an action is brought against such sherriff, deputy sherriff, constable, bailiff, or officer or such person so acting, for any cause without making the justice who issued the warrant a defendant, on the production and proof of the warrant at the trial of the action judgment shall be given for the defendant notwithstanding any defect of jurisdiction in the justice.

(3) If the action is brought jointly against such justice and such sherriff, constable or bailiff or other officer or person so acting, on proof of such warrant, judgement shall be given for the sherriff, deputy sherriff, constable or bailiff or other officer or for the person so acting notwithstanding the defect in jurisdiction.

(4) An Action shall not be maintained against any person for or by reason of anything done in obedience to a mandamus or a mandatory order.

MR. BROWNE: This is a new section, what is your precedent for that?

MR. CURTIS: It is new because it was not in the English Act, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 18 carried.

Clause 19 read:

19. An Action shall not be brought against a justice or any other person for an act done in discharge or intended discharge of any statutory or

other public duty or authority, or in respect of any alleged neglect or default in the discharge of any such duty or authority until

- (a) a notice in writing of the intended action clearly and explicitly stating the cause of action and the court in which the action is intended to be brought, and containing the name and address of the party intending to sue and the name and address of his solicitor, if any, had been delivered to the justice or other person or left for him at his usual place of abode by the person intending to commence the action, or by his solicitor or agent; and until
- (b) the expiration of at least thirty clear days from the date of the service or notice; and unless
- (c) the action is commenced within six months next after the act, neglect or default complained of, or in case of continuance of injury or damage, within six months after the ceasing thereof.

MR. BROWNE: Why thirty days there?

MR. CURTIS: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, some magistrates are quite a distance away from St. John's and they probably have to get in touch with the Justice Department and get an opinion on these things — it takes time.

MR. BROWNE: What is your precedent?

MR. CURTIS: Ontario Section 11. I would not be surprised if we extended the days. Some parts of Newfoundland are more inaccessible, but I will check that.

MR. BROWNE: It seems to be a very long time.

Clause 19 carried.

Clause 20 carried.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, just what sections are outstanding?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clauses 2, 13, 14, 15 —

MR. CURTIS: Does the honourable member still think Clause 2 ought to be held up?

MR. BROWNE: It does not make any difference.

Moved and carried that the Committee report progress on this Bill.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Fire Prevention Act",

Clauses 1 and 2 carried.

Clause 3 read:

3. Section 20 of the said Act is amended by repealing sub-section (5) and substituting therefor the following:

"(5) Any report required to be made under this section shall be mailed or delivered to the Fire Commissioner within ten days after the occurrence of the fire or within such longer period as the Fire Commissioner may prescribe."

MR. BROWNE: I think this is a case where a further period could be put in here.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, the position is, it either must be delivered in ten days or made in ten days. I don't think there is any consistency there. It should be one or the other.

MR. HIGGINS: Otherwise a man in some remote section has a fire and as long as the report is made in ten days he is safe from any prosecution.

MR. BROWNE: Here he must deliver it or mail it within ten days.

Clause 3 carried.

Clause 4 read:

4. Section 21 of the said Act is amended by repealing sub-section (1) and substituting therefor the following:

"(1) Subject to the approval of the Ministers, the Fire Commissioner, or any other person designated by the Minister, may hold an inquiry into the cause, origin, extent and circumstances of any fire, and the approval of the Minister required by this subsection may be given generally in respect of all fires occurring in a prescribed area or particularly in respect of a specified fire."

MR. BROWNE: We just passed the section there, but may I bring to the attention of the Attorney General: supposing the insurance company insures property which is burned, and the insurance company is not here doing business, is it conceivable a company outside of Newfoundland which has no office here might not get their reports within ten days, then I suppose this other part of the section would apply.

MR. CURTIS: Yes. There are several cases — The AND Company and Bowler's are, I think insured in Montreal.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I notice that expression there "Any other person." That does not mean the Attorney General could just appoint a person who had no training or anything of that kind?

MR. CURTIS: Don't you think that means "magistrate"? Don't you

think it is very likely the magistrate should be appointed in that case?

MR. BROWNE: It means you need not do it, or your successor could appoint a friend of his, if he wanted to do so. Would it not be better to substitute "a justice or a magistrate" or something like that?

MR. CURTIS: No. It might be a member of the Fire Department. I think we had better leave it open. It might be an officer of the Fire Department.

Clause 4 carried.

MR. BROWNE: I don't imagine it would be the intention to have just a fireman hold an inquiry?

MR. CURTIS: No, the fire officer would really just make an inquiry and report his findings to a court or to a magistrate.

MR. BROWNE: Under this Act there is a difference between holding an inquiry and conducting an investigation?

MR. CURTIS: However, this is presumed to cover the case should there be a Deputy Fire Commissioner. There is provision in the Act for one. We have not appointed one, and are not likely to do so. I don't think there should be any real objection to the section.

Clause 4 carried.

Clause 5 read and carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Disabled Persons Act, 1954."

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. There shall be inserted in The Disabled Persons Act, 1954, the Act No. 74 of 1954, immediately after Section 11 the following as Sections 11A, 11B, 11C and 11D:

"11A. Where by reason of misrepresentation or fraud an allowance is paid under this Act to a recipient, the amount so paid is from the date of the payment thereof, a debt due by the recipient, or by his estate if he is dead, to Her Majesty in right of Newfoundland.

11B.—(1) Where any officer of the Board knows or suspects that any person is or is about to become indebted to a recipient or his estate indebted under Section 11A or that the recipient or his estate is or is about to become entitled to any property, the officer may by registered letter demand that the person indebted or about to become indebted or who had the custody or control of the property pay over to transfer the money or property to the Board on account of any debt due by the recipient or his estate under Section 11A.

(2) The Board's receipt is a good and sufficient discharge of the liability of any person to whom subsection (1) applies to the recipient or his estate to the extent of the amount stated in the receipt.

(3) Any person who discharges any liability to a recipient or his estate after receipt of the registered letter referred to in subsection (1) is personally liable to Her Majesty in right of Newfoundland as for a debt due to Her Majesty in that right to the extent of the liability discharged as between him and the recipient or his estate or to the extent of the debt due by the recipient or his estate under Section 11A whichever is the lesser amount.

11C. Where a debt is due under Section 11A by the estate of a deceased recipient who dies with or without a will and no letters of probate or of administration have been granted, the Supreme Court shall, on the application of the Minister and without fee or sureties, grant administration of the estate to the Minister or his nominee, limited to the amount of the debt.

11D. Any debt due under Section 11A or 11B may be recovered by the Board with interest thereon at the rate of five per centum per annum and every action or other proceeding for the recovery of the debt may be instituted in the name of the Board."

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, on second reading I asked the Minister if he would be good enough to explain to me what appears to be a contradiction between Clause 2 (b) and Clause 2 (d): Clause 2 (d) provides for the recovery of any debt due under Section 2 (a) or (b) in the ordinary way, by action, but (b) seems to provide a means whereby the Board or any officer of the Board can attach property belonging to a debtor without apparently going through any process of law. I think that is misleading. I think when I asked at the time the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare did promise to give some explanation of it. The side note certainly seems to be misleading and Clause 2 (b) (1) and 2 (d) seems to provide for two separate procedures.

DR. POTILE: I speak in these matters as a layman. The principle for this kind of a Bill is always contained in Act No. 13 and Act No. 16 of 1953, which cover amendments to the Blind Persons Act and the Old Age Assistance Act respectively, side notes and all. But I would agree that

the side note attached to Clause 2 (b) is inconsistent, and I think without substance. I have this as a suggestion: To demand, pay over or transfer funds delivered to recipient: Although the Board does as a first step, without recourse to formality of law, demand that the transfer be made, as to whether the transfer is actually made the final enforcement of it depends on 11 (b).

MR. HIGGINS: The point is, Mr. Chairman, that word "attachment."

DR. POTTLE: My suggestion is "demand to pay over or transfer property deliverable to the recipient—Cross it out and substitute "demand."

MR. BROWNE: Is there a regularly constituted board?

DR. POTTLE: Yes.

MR. CURTIS: They are a body corporate. I think the Board might very well carry out any functions in the name of the Board but not in the name of the Chairman. I think when you go to the Supreme Court you should have the application made on the highest level.

Clause as amended, carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the Bill with some amendments.

On motion the Committee rose to report progress.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to it referred and have passed a Bill "An Act to Amend the Fire Prevention Act," without amendment.

Report received.

On motion Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to it referred and have made some progress on Bill "An Act to Provide for Protection of Justices and Other Public Authorities," and asks leave to sit again.

Report received.

On motion committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to it referred, and have passed the Bill "An Act to Amend the Disabled Persons Act, 1954," with some amendments.

Report received.

On motion report adopted and Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred. Might I ask Your Honour to see 6:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 o'clock, the House is adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 31, at 3:00 of the clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION

THURSDAY, March 31, 1955.

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

Presenting Petitions

None.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table in the House

the annual report of the Department of Mines and Resources for the year ending March 31, 1954.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the Table of the House gazetted copies of the Regulations for the Mothers' Allowance Act, gazetted date Aug. 17, 1954.

Giving Notice of Motion

None.

Giving Notice of Question

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

(a) A statement showing the name or names of the industry or industries in which the contributions made from public funds exceed 50%. Give the amounts contributed by the Government and promoter or promoters in each such industry.

(b) Has there been an investigation into the management of, or operation of, the Superior Rubber Co. Ltd.? If so, by whom was such investigation made? Table a copy of the findings of the person or persons making such investigation with recommendation, if any, made by such person or persons.

To ask the Honourable the Attorney General to lay upon the table of the House the following information:

How many pairs of shoes were purchased by his Department from Koch Shoes Ltd.? What was the cost of same? To whom were the said shoes distributed.

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Education to lay upon the table of the House the following information:

What was the amount paid for school desks built by the CMIC to Government order? How many were so built and how were they distributed?

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources to lay upon the table of the House the following information:

How many cords of pulpwood were exported from Newfoundland for each year since 1949? Give names of shippers and amounts shipped by each shipper. What proportion of the amount shipped in any year was from Crown Land?

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

(1) Who are the contractors who are building the Buchans' road and what amount of moneys have been spent on this road to date? What has been the cost per mile (average cost), and give number of miles built to date, with the number of miles of this road that remain to be built? Is this road being built under firm contract, or on a cost plus arrangement? Were tenders called?

(2) Who built the Concrete Highroads Shed at Grand Falls and what was the total cost of same?

(3) Give an itemized list showing all Highroads machines or vehicles or property of whatsoever nature which has been sold, hired or loaned in the Grand Falls area by the Highroads Department. Give types of machines, the original cost, the price received and the name of the person or companies to whom sold. Also what were the terms of hiring or loaning in any such case?

(4) Table a copy of all contracts let to J. Goodyear & Sons since the 1st of January 1952. State the amount of money paid out to date under each contract or agreement, showing what work has been performed to date under each said contract.

Answers to Questions

Question No. 25:

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): The answer is in course of preparation, Mr. Speaker. I have here the remainder of a reply to a question directed to me by, I think, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, asking for the IBEC Report. I tabled already one section of the report, the one dealing with the fisheries and prepared by IBEC for IBEC on our behalf by Mr. Richardson. I table now the other two sections of the report, one being a study of the economic possibility for a paper mill at Bay D'Espoir in Newfoundland and the other being a study of the economic possibility for a paper mill at Goose Bay, Labrador.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, excuse me, is there another section?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, that is all.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to Question No. 22 directed to me by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West, the basis of remuneration for the honourable member for Harbour Main-Bell Island who is the Chairman of the Royal Commission on the Terms of Union? The rate is \$10,000 a year. The rate of pay for Mr. Carl Goldenberg and his associates, Mr. Goldenberg being the Combines Investigator whose findings were issued the other day on his investigation into some alleged combines, industrial combines. Mr. Gold-

enberg incidentally was retained by the Government to prepare for the revision of their terms for the forthcoming provincial conference for the economy of all Canada, and he has quite an organization. He was retained by the Royal Commission to make certain economic studies to present to the coming Royal Commission. Mr. Goldenberg \$200 per day. P. S. Kierstead \$50 per day. Mr. E. Armstrong \$25 per day. Muriel Armstrong \$20 per day. Peat, Marwick & Mitchell & Co. Limited, the senior partner \$200 per day and the other partner \$150 per day, senior assistant \$50 per day, junior assistant \$25 per day. Report Department \$25 per day.

I may say that the senior partner and the other partners of the firm of Peat, Marwick & Mitchell are engaged in the work rarely. The work is done primarily by the assistant, not the partners and then the partners and sometimes the senior partner, that is Mr. Thompson, is brought in for a day or two to correlate the work of the assistants which might have been going on for weeks and even for months.

Mr. Thompson is the gentleman who advised the delegates that negotiated and signed the terms of Confederation. He has been the special financial advisor of the Government from the beginning of Confederation to this moment. It was Mr. Thompson who set up our whole financial system and central accounting system, Mr. James C. Thompson.

MR. BROWNE: Would the Premier table that reply so we could get it accurately?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have only one copy, in the form of a personal note — I must be careful not to table

that because I had one tabled here. If the honourable gentleman wants the figures repeated I will run them down pretty quickly:

Now, Question No. 4, asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. (1) The total cost of these visits: Honourable the Premier, \$1,897.04; Hon. Minister of Finance, \$1,957.92; Mr. Pushie, \$1,745.00 I may say the difference in the amounts between the two of us would be accounted for by the fact that at a hotel at one meal perhaps one of us would sign the bill and it would be charged to that one and on another occasion the other one would sign the bill and it would be charged to him so that you would get this small, relatively small variation.

The visit on that occasion was to England and Wales, Scotland, Sweden, Denmark, Berlin, Southern Germany, Austria and Switzerland, and back to England then back to Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask the Honourable the Premier if he would table that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. I am giving the information, and reading it slowly enough for the honourable members to take it down.

Now on the recent visit to Jamaica the answer reads: "The only information we have at present —

MR. HOLLETT: What was the reason? Go on with the first one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the interest of Economic Development. In the interest of finding, if necessary, things or people to bring to Newfoundland for economic development in various fields, not only factories, I may say, but also Agriculture and Forestry and also connected with a possible third paper mill. It was straight Economic

Development we were on. Now in connection with the recent visit to Jamaica the Treasury says the only information we have at the present on the cost of this visit (there has scarcely been time yet for a complete accounting) Honourable the Premier \$675.60, of which \$350 is imprest to be accounted for. The balance is transportation. In other words all but \$350 of that was just made up by air transportation handed to me by the Department of Finance. They bought and handed me the tickets and gave me a cheque for \$350 for which I have not as yet accounted. In fact I still have the hotel bills etc. which I have not had time to pass back to the Treasury, nor to pay back anything I cannot account for. If I have spent more than \$350 and have the vouchers for it, I have to collect the difference.

The Minister of Co-operatives \$1,000, all of which was imprest. He bought his own ticket and paid his own expenses. He has to put in the bills and pay back to the Treasury what he did not spend.

4 (2) — The reasons were as I announced publicly on my return. It might perhaps have been more courteous to the House here if I had waited until the House opened to say here what I said in the press. However, the House was not open, and I said what I said to the press, and that was this: I had learned certain facts on my vacation in Jamaica with regard to the consumption of Newfoundland salt codfish, and I thought this information should become known to the trade here. I had two ways of doing it (1) just to tell them in writing or orally and (2) to take several reputable and responsible fish merchants down there and introduce them to certain people so that they might hear this information and gather this knowledge with

their own cars and their own eyes. I took that course.

Now there appears to be another question asking how much I have spent myself in the financial year just ended in travel. Here are the amounts:

The total amount is \$5,301.69, excluding this last visit to Jamaica.

In May — to Ottawa \$521.50.

June — Labrador — I don't know if that was all charged to me — That was the charter of the boat. No it was half and half. Half to my office and half to the Honourable Minister's office I had better withdraw that and find out the exact figure. My honourable colleague says this is not correct. I knew I flew back and that cost nothing, as I came back free, but I paid half the charter of the boat going down.

In August — to the Mainland and the United States, \$452.27. I was in Boston and New York on that occasion.

Again in September, to Halifax \$149.25.

Then in October to England, Sweden, Denmark — the trip I just described — \$1,879.04.

In November an amount of \$25.50 — I don't know what that was. The Treasury has a question mark after November 17 — 19 — 4 days: That probably means a hotel because I was the guest of the hotel and was merely charged incidental expenses wherever I am; a non-paying guest at Grand Falls or Corner Brook or certain hotels on the Mainland of Canada, wherever I am, if they do not charge me I do not charge the Government. I never bill the Government for free board which I frequently get. Certain hotels seem to think they should not charge

the Premier anything for his room. I always accept. It is a courtesy to the Government and not to me. I could of course collect from the Government for my board, but I do not do it. I have never done it. So I imagine this amount is to represent incidental expenses.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): That was in Corner Brook.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is the time the Honourable Minister of Labour went with me to Corner Brook, and cost nothing but the meals on the train and the sleeper out and back and any taxis we might have had.

In February, to Montreal and Ottawa \$379.90 — That was four days. And the Jamaica trip which I just described.

That is the years travelling, very small. In the past year it has fallen off very considerably. But that is because, when I table the answer in regard to Mr. Pushie and his expenses it will be found he did most of the travelling. I have availed myself increasingly in the past year of Mr. Pushie's services as I did the same in regard to Mr. Vardy's services in other years. Where I would have gone myself I sent Mr. Vardy in past years or Mr. Pushie, so that their expenses are up and mine are down.

Question No. 8:

There are only four copies of the answer — the titles of the films made by Atlantic Films and the cost of them to the Government. "Education in Progress," "Old City with a Young Heart," "Northeast Coast" a long version and a short version. I may say that picture was made for presentation to the Canadian Cabinet when we were making a strong effort to convince the Government of Canada of the need for special action on the

Northeast Coast for the fisheries. We made a motion picture of that coast showing what the coast was like. We could not get the whole Canadian Cabinet to come and visit so we took the Northeast Coast to the Cabinet by means of making a movie of it and taking it to them. Now we felt we might not be able to get them to look at a long version so we made a second edition of it, a shorter edition, so that if they would not look at the long one they would look at the short one. That was a lot cheaper than bringing the whole Cabinet down on the Northeast Coast, if we had been able to bring them, which we were not. "Danish Seining" progress report No. 4 "Need is my Neighbour," "Five Years of Confederation." Incidentally, that is a misleading title. That is the one they are making now embracing all the Departments of Government and all the economic and social and educational activities of the first five years of Newfoundland as a Province of Canada. That is going to be a full length picture, a full length, feature, which we hope to have shown all across Canada, and we hope it will be of great benefit to us and great value when the Royal Commission on the Terms of Union sits and when after that the Parliament of Canada considers the recommendations of that Royal Commission.

"Bridge Building in Newfoundland" and "LaScie the Community." We are making a complete record of the building up of LaScie; what it was like before and what it is like from stage to stage and finally as it will be — a complete document of a great fishing community. "Agriculture in Newfoundland," "You are Welcome." That is the tourist picture that is circulating all across Canada and in the United States, that is the one with John Fisher,

I hope my honourable friends have seen it. "Health is Wealth" and finally one on "Local Government."

I may say, Mr. Speaker, these films circulate in some six hundred different places in Newfoundland, places that have movie projectors and movie theatres. Over half the population of the Island are now in a position to see movies. This we find is the best possible medium we have yet discovered to carry to the people an account of their Government and the Departments and activities of Government. They are not political. Any honourable gentleman who has seen these pictures will know there is nothing partisan nor political in their character whatsoever. They are straight factual documentary films.

Question No. 5 :

DR. ROWE : Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 5 asked by the honourable member for St. John's West on the Order Paper of March 25 and have one or two comments to make on it. First I should perhaps explain that the question was concerned with several Departments of Government including the Department of Economic Development and the Department of Fisheries. Rather than come back and refer the honourable gentleman to the other Departments, I instructed the officers of my Department to endeavour to obtain the information and make one complete comprehensive answer of it. One or two of the answers may not appear satisfactory. Section (c) I am sorry to say we do not have up-to-date for 1954 because the replies are not in from all the milk farmers. We do have them for 1953 and would be glad to make them available to the honourable gentleman. I would be glad to make them available to the honour-

able gentleman, but it would not be a very realistic picture because during the past year there has been a very substantial increase, however, I could let the honourable gentleman have that and it could well be that before the session closes we may have the 1954 figures. I could not give the figures now, as I have not received them all from the remote parts of the Province. These figures include all loans given to any mink farmers in Newfoundland, including loans made during the Commission of Government days. In section (c) we are asked to give the name of all the members of the Mink Breeders Association. We do not have the names of all the members. We do have the names of the officers.

There has been no agreement entered into whatsoever.

The following information is supplied by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources in reply to Question No. 24 (Mr. Brown) Order Paper of March 30th, 1955.

Question: What has been the cost of the Royal Commission on Forestry to date? Give particulars of all amounts paid by the way of remuneration with names of persons receiving same.

Answer: The total cost of the Royal Commission on Forestry to March 31st, 1955, was \$90,661.61.

Particulars of all amounts paid by way of remuneration:

Name	Position	Salary
Major General H. Kennedy	Chairman	\$7,847.05
D. Roy Cameron	Commissioner	13,071.43
Roland C. Goodyear	Commissioner	12,587.55
Roy Forward (Seconded)	Secretary	980.36
Mrs. H. Whitten	Stenographer	2,483.65
Mrs. M. A. Beach	Stenographer	150.00
J. F. Turnbull	Forestry Engineer	9,522.58
E. S. Davison	Forestry Engineer	6,932.26
William Knight	Draughtsman	600.00
G. K. Goundrey	Economist	2,124.19
Charles Smith	Recorder	1,100.00
J. A. Brodie	Forest Fire Research	993.66
H. J. Henry	Aerial Photograph Interpreter	858.88
		<hr/>
		\$59,251.61

(g) Part of that section was tabled yesterday by the Honourable Minister of Finance. I am not sure just how it happened, but he received that question as well as myself, and he tabled part of it. Actually it concerns his Department anyway. I table the answer to the remaining part of section (g).

Question No. 5: (g).

Total indebtedness of Arctic Fishery Products Ltd. at 28/3/55 is \$87,500. The company originally received a guaranteed bank loan of \$125,000. This was subsequently converted to a revolving credit with a limit of \$100,000 to be reduced by \$125,000 annually.

I also have the answer, Mr. Speaker to Question No. 24. The amounts are all listed here:

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, at yesterday's session of the House, following my presentation and tabling in the House the report of the Department of Health for the year 1953, the honourable member for St. John's West raised an oral question as to why the report was not more up-to-date. May I say that the report was for the calendar year 1953, that is to say, to the end of December of that year, which is only three months less business than is normally reported to the House. I may go on to say, Sir, the data which is contained in that report and in such reports from that Department are not gathered in as a rule until the end of January, and statistics which also properly belong to that report have to be completed and submitted to Ottawa before they are officially tied in as they refer to projects jointly covered by the two Governments. Furthermore after all data is included it takes about three months to assemble such things, and in addition the time for printing and proof reading — the actual printing itself occupies as much as six months from the time the report is presented until it is ready for final reading and publication. In order for the reports which comprise so much and so many operations of health services for the Provinces to be done expeditiously it would probably require a special editor in the department to see that it could be done in that way, as it has to be taken and studied. Now with our present facilities the best we can do is to have the report published by July of the following year. There is one statement I can make, however, which borders on hope, shall I say, and that is that when the next report is ready for publication it will be distributed at once to all members of the House of Assembly wherever they

are, and will not be delayed until May, or until they come here and receive the report for the first time in the House.

The House will appreciate, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I offer this explanation not as an apology but rather as a frank answer to the question which the honourable and learned member has raised, and I am sure this Honourable House would like to have.

Question No. 17:

HON. E. S. SPENCER: (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I have here the answer to Question No. 17.

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Public Works in reply to Question No. 17 (Mr. Hollett) — Order Paper of Monday, March 28th, 1955.

1. Question:

In connection with the operation of the Rail-Car Ferry service between Clareville and Gander what, if any, amounts were charged to the Government for said service by the Canadian National Railway?

Answer:
\$3,734.40.

2. Question:

Is it correct that the facilities of this service were denied the people of Port Blandford and Alexander Bay? If so, state reasons for such denial.

Answer:

Facilities such as sidings and loading ramps necessary for getting vehicles on and off the rail car were not available at these places. The Rail-Car Ferry was a temporary trial service designed to afford a connection from the east to the west.

3. Question :

Is it still the intention of the Government to continue work on a road from Port Blandford to Bunyan's Cove. If so, when is work on said construction likely to commence?

Answer :

Yes. It is not possible at this time to say when construction will commence.

4. Question :

Will any delay be caused to the construction of the Trans-Canada Highway between Alexander Bay and Port Blandford by the Government's decision to delay the granting of title to the Federal Government of that section for a National Park?

Answer :

It is not anticipated construction of the Trans-Canada Highway will be delayed.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Economic Development, to ask him if his attention has been called to a statement in the press by Mr. Doyle of Canadian Javelin, and whether that will affect the Wabush Iron Ore.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not seen any statement in the press by Mr. Doyle, I have, however, seen a letter sent by him to the shareholders of his company, and I know also of a conversation on the telephone between Mr. Doyle in New York and someone here in the city. According to Mr. Doyle's statement on the telephone the fact that the merger of Javelin was not consummated will not delay development on the Lake Wabush project. Mr. Doyle said, and I can only repeat what he said, that he is well advanced

in his plans for the building of the railway and operating the mine. More than that I do not know.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable the Attorney General, in a matter I have asked before, that is, when the judges of the district courts are going into action?

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): I can only reply, the rules committee is in session at this moment putting the finishing touches to the rules, and as far as the district courts are concerned they will be able to function immediately.

MR. BROWNE: Has there been a place selected in St. John's for the judges of the District Court here?

MR. CURTIS: There is a temporary courtroom, Mr. Speaker, engaged up in the Constabulary Building at Fort Townshend, which building was recently inspected by the Chief Justice who commented very favourably on it.

MR. HIGGINS: Except he has not to sit there.

MR. CURTIS: He sits in worse places in places where he goes on circuit.

Orders of the Day

Debate on the Address in Reply, the amendment thereto is before the House.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak at this time had it not been for the information which you conveyed to the House earlier today, but the opportunity is too important to let go by and miss my chance to say something.

I rise to support the amendment proposed by my colleague from St. John's West. In so doing I must of necessity direct Your Honour's attention to the rather significant fact that this year's Throne Speech omits, at least certainly to anything but the most minute scrutiny, any reference to the Economic Development Programme at all. The House will remember that for the first several years of this Government's life we had Economic Development in every Throne Speech, and with everything proceeding from the Speech, of the great things that were to come. Last year the emphasis shifted from Economic Development to Fishery Development. Now, this year, we move further on to Forestry Development.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of this amendment, as I see it, to bring the attention of the House back to the question of Economic Development, a question which the Government has apparently satisfied itself is no longer of great moment. Economic Development has outlived its attractiveness as a slogan. Fishery Development we had last year in all its phases. We are told in passing this year, that it is to be hoped that this year we will see practical implementations of the programme. But now the emphasis is on Forestry.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And Agriculture.

MR. HIGGINS: And on Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, the way the Government jiggles around these slogans and catch-cries, programmes, call them what you will, would make one think that the people of this country are a lot of collective donkeys before whom you have to continue to dangle new suggestions and newer and more attractive carrots to keep their interest

alive. Now that may be a rather biased opinion, but insofar as the Economic Development Programme is concerned and in particular insofar as the new industries are concerned, for several years past the members of the Opposition have been asking questions about the industries, the press has been raising the question of the industries, and all we got, all that anybody got, particularly the people on this side of the House who raised these questions was a positive and precise and persistent refusal on the part of the Government to discuss the new industries. We are told it is not proper to give you information about these industries. These are private companies. It is true the people, as it turned out, have substantially invested moneys in them. Indeed, it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that the people have more money in these new industries than the so-called owners of them have themselves. But the official position was; you must not be told. The people must not be told, because it would not be fair. Well, on Tuesday past in this House that long silence was broken. The Leader of the Government spoke for the whole session and indeed for a little longer than the period allotted to the regular session, for some three hours at least, and in a long, and if I may say without offence, discursive speech, answered the criticisms on all these projects. But Mr. Speaker, did he answer them? At first flush, yes, it might be said, sitting here watching and listening one might have said yes, that is the complete answer. The Premier has settled all our doubts, all our worries, all our questions. You would want to be deaf and blind and cross-grained, to hoot, if you were not prepared to accept that most persuasive, most reasonable explanation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the great danger that confronts anybody who listens to a speaker as persuasive, as able as the Premier. Fortunately, as in most of these things, there is a cooling period, and when one takes a second look at the Premier's remarks, when one sees them in cold print, when one can sit back and think of what has been said without having one's attention distracted by the Premier's kneading rubber or going over the machinery etc. certain doubts come back. Because, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Premier in his rebuttal, in his eulogy, in his explanation, call it what word you will, deliberately dealt with the new industries on a very broad and very sweeping scale. He used his artists brush, one might call it, and he painted in very bold colours. He did not descend to details. I can see him now sweepingly describing these machines, the great machines out at Holyrood that took this raw rubber, this ugly thing, and put it in a machine one going one way and another another way, and then it goes out another way and eventually comes down and swish, the knife slashes off a piece. Then he went on again and he described the beautiful products out at the birch plant with genuine enthusiasm. Then he goes on and goes over to Carbonear to Mr. Dorn's plant, and mentioned how poor old Mr. Dorn got some machinery over there which is rusty, and has to be rusty, because machinery in a tannery is always rusty. Then he rhapsodizes again on the modern machinery out at the OMIC Plant, and he said, and he said it sincerely, that most of these plants were turning out products better than anything in Canada, better than anything in Continental Europe in most cases.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Excuse me!

I did not say that. I mentioned two that were, I did not say most of them.

MR. HIGGINS: I accept the correction, Mr. Speaker. When one is commenting, Mr. Speaker, on the remarks of a speaker as fluent and as colourful and as expansive as the Premier one is very apt to fall into the same trap and become just, shall we say, as free in the use of superlatives. But I would not want to misquote the Premier.

As I have said — here were the plants — here was the explanation — And mind you, the plant was — What are the Opposition talking about — the plants that only cost 23 millions dollars, and by the end of this year they will have paid in wages and purchases and other accounts some 27 million dollars. There is your answer. What are you complaining about — four and a half millions profit coming in. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was the statement made by the Premier, saying that — I must of necessity accept it as being correct. But, Mr. Speaker, I am almost forced to say that I regret and indeed all of us regret, and I have no doubt a lot of people in this country regret that time was not taken to give us a break-down of how the figures were arrived at, to give us a break-down of each industry showing us the number of employees in each industry, the amount of purchases, the amount of salaries paid, the amount of goods sold, the receipts from the sales of these goods and all the details which would have given us the complete picture which I am afraid the public has been conditioned to expect.

Now I am as aware as is the Honourable the Premier that no man can be held responsible for what the press says, but the fact remains that we had

been told, I believe in the daily press and certainly if not the daily press through a certain popular weekly paper, that there was to be a major statement by the Premier on the new industries. Now if that was the major statement, Mr. Speaker, and one would have expected it to be coming when it did, then I say, say, Sir, that we were, to say the least, rather disappointed.

Now if these plants are in fact doing as well as we are told they are, we have not yet been given an adequate explanation as to why it has been necessary for the Government to continue to give them moneys, advances of working capital and to continue guarantees. I don't know if I am correctly informed but I have been told that as recently as January of this year or late December 1954 the Koch Shoe Plant received an additional cash advance or loan or working capital of the order of a hundred and ten or a hundred and twenty thousand dollars. We know that the birch plant is still being assisted. We don't know with any great accuracy just what assistance is still being given, and is still contemplated, to any of these industries, because, Mr. Speaker, it may well be that an economist can explain satisfactorily why it is necessary to continue to pump capital into these industries, but if they are paying off at the rate that we have been told, the question still persists; why has not any of these industries made any payment on account of either interest or principal? They have not.

Now to continue with the Honourable the Premier's rebuttal of the points raised in support of this amendment. When one examines his reply, what answers did he make to the specific charges that were made first with relation to Superior Rubber at Holy-

rood and secondly with respect to the Koch Shoes Company and the Gold Sail Leather Goods at Harbour Grace? His answer in brief insofar as the charges made by this man Mr. Pronold which was made in the form of an affidavit which detailed certain irregularities, and what Pronold said — "there is a very real possibility that Pronold may be mad, and certainly may be mentally unbalanced" — And with respect to the attacks on Koch Shoes and Gold Sail Leather it was to the effect that Schafers was a booser. Now, whether or not Mr. Pronold is sane, and we have no assurance other than the Premier's that he is not sane, there has not been any suggestion on the part of the Premier that Mr. Pronold has been examined by some reliable doctor such as examined Valdimanis, not a Tory doctor, but a good reliable doctor, who said that man is insane. No. And I know the Premier won't take offence when I say that Dr. Smallwood is not acceptable as an authority on mental diseases. So we have a man who for all practical purposes at the moment is sane. That man goes before a perfectly reputable barrister in this community, a gentleman who is not actively identified in politics, a gentleman whom I don't think it is quite fair to drag into this controversy by name, but a gentleman whose reputation in his profession is unblemished. That gentleman notarized the statement made by Mr. Pronold. Apart altogether from the allegations of incompetency I am prepared to go this far and say, maybe the fellow has got a grudge. But he made very specific charges. I submit, Mr. Speaker, the very serious charge that here in this plant at Holyrood was a piece of machinery which had been shipped to Germany from the United States of America under the "Marshall Scheme

for Rehabilitation of Europe" — he gave, Mr. Speaker, a precise description of this machinery. He described how somewhere on this machine there was this small place, or I do not know what it was, on which was printed an American flag and words to the effect that this machinery was donated by the United States for the rehabilitation of the people of Western Europe or Western Germany. Anyway it was quite definite that it was a piece of machinery sent to Europe under the Marshall Aid Plan.

He went further, he identified that piece of machinery by number and the thing was described in detail. Now, when he spoke the other evening, the Premier did not say that this piece of machinery was not there, he did not say that if it were there Government inquiry had established that it came there without any irregularity. Because, Mr. Speaker, and I am just as much concerned, we on this side of the House take second place in no one in our respect for the reputation of this country. If there is in fact in this plant machinery received improperly from Germany, that was never intended to be used in Newfoundland, the implication, insofar as this country is concerned, is very unpleasant, because, if this piece of machinery was shipped as Marshall Aid supplies, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the country of its origin, the United States Government, has a record of each item that was shipped, and whether this particular number is on it. If that machinery is so labeled, so numbered, was in fact shipped from the United States through Hamburg, and the American authorities or the American consulate here sees it, and he must have seen it, and reports it to the Government and there is an investigation made, we in this country

are going to be left in a rather unhappy position. Now I do not know what the Attorney General presumably can tell us—What is the position of a friendly Province such as ours lending itself, willingly or unwillingly, to some sort of under-hand business by a German national dealing with goods sent to Germany in that fashion? But it is not a very pleasant situation.

Secondly Mr. Pronold sets out that a lot of the products of the rubber factory were sent to Montreal, a shipment of approximately twenty thousand pairs of rubber boots, produced at a cost of about fifteen dollars a pair, were dumped in Montreal at \$1.25 a pair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable gentleman yield there? I did intend to mention that in my remarks and forgot entirely to mention that in my remarks and forgot entirely to do so. As the House knows, I spoke entirely without notes. These boots were made when breaking in new girls who had never worked at it. I told them they dared not put it on the Newfoundland market. I told them that. "Don't you dare do it, get rid of it anywhere."

MR. HIGGINS: And Mr. Speaker, accepting the Premier's correction—the Government is building up Newfoundland's reputation in the great Dominion—The rubbers were not good enough for Newfoundland, were made by apprentices so he said—"Get clear of them where you like." And they were all dumped in Montreal. Mr. Speaker, that is an outrageous situation. Mr. Speaker, how can we expect to make our cousins, our new brothers, respect our new industries if we are going to send them up second class goods that we would not let our own people wear? I can only assume the Premier is pulling my leg.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman only had a case to make what a speech he would make!

MR. HIGGINS: At the moment I am doing all right!

Mr. Speaker, I suggest, if that statement had been made and given the publicity that it deserves not only would Mr. Pronold's statement that "Superior Rubber" get a new name be received with more weight at the time, but it certainly would seem to give it an awful jolt in the Canadian Mainland market.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: We only sent them back some junk. They have sent us lots of junk from the Mainland in their time.

MR. HIGGINS: That is not the way, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to build up a new industry, by sending out products of which the Leader of the Government said; don't let our people see them, give them to the Canadians — It is a contradiction —

However, Mr. Speaker, I would refer again to that piece of machinery and the number which was given to that piece of machinery and the translation of it reads: "For the rehabilitation of Europe"—sent by the United States of America. Now I am not concerned with anything else that Pronold says. There is none of us who have not experienced at some time a fellow coming in to us and saying he was fired because he was a Roman Catholic and vice versa, and then a few weeks later meeting the same fellow and find he was fired again and ask "What is the trouble now?" "They got a new manager down there who is a 4th Degree Knight of Columbus." So that I do not pay any attention, and we don't on this side pay too much attention to just chronic crabs. I don't

suppose anybody has not met a man who does not at some time or other say: the boss is making a tangle of things—but here it is not a matter of just saying a man has a grudge, there are specific allegations, the truth of one of which has already been confirmed by the Premier. As the statement says, these rubber boots cost fifteen dollars a pair to produce and were dumped at \$1.25 a pair, on twenty thousand pairs that represents a loss of \$13.75, and if my calculations are correct, that represents a loss of \$275,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the figures are correct.

MR. HIGGINS: That is what I said.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How is a man in the factory to know if they are correct or incorrect?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HIGGINS: There is no difficulty in finding the answer. We have already chiseled out this afternoon the fact there was in truth twenty thousand pairs dumped on the market.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say the number. I don't know what the number was.

MR. HIGGINS: We have not, Mr. Speaker, as yet had any definite statement from the Premier that this piece of machinery is not there. The only answer, Mr. Speaker, was that Pronold; well, he is only a mechanic and possibly half-mad, possibly mentally unsound. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the answer, the type of reply that was given with respect to Koch Shoes and Gold Sail Leather Goods. "Schafers is a booser," says the Premier. He does not name his informer. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police have

not yet made any report in which they say that Schafers is a booser. The Canadian Customs have not said so. No. When we get to Koch Shoes and the Gold Sall Leather Goods the Premier's answer was, not to reason it out. No. He took off on a long and abusive harangue about Gordon Higgins. He said things about him which I defy him to say outside this House—a man who is known to do this and the other thing—a fence or very close to a fence—a man who is known to be in the open market to buy information—Mr. Speaker, I suggest that invective is a very poor substitute for argument. That does not answer the allegations made by these people, allegations repeated to any pressman in the city of St. John's who cared to meet them; allegations made to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

We hear talk about stolen documents. As yet the police have not arrested anybody. There has been no summons issued against anybody. Can the same be said with respect to the Customs investigation into the affairs of the Koch Shoes? The Premier either ignored at the time he was making his address, or else he did not know, that neither Mr. Schafers nor Mr. Willard consulted anybody except the member for Green Bay and the Director General of Economic Development, Mr. Pushie, until after the Customs had raided Koch Shoes. He made no reference to the fact that in February of this year this man, Willard, had submitted to Mr. Pushie, so I am told, at the suggestion of the Honourable Member for Green Bay who had some official connection with Koch Shoes and the Gold Sall Leather Goods, at his request, so I am told, Willard submitted to Mr. Pushie a report on the merchandizing prospects of Koch Shoes Limited. And in that report he

called attention to what appeared to him to be Mr. Koch's lack of business ability and the damage he was doing to the prospects of the company. Now, mind you, Mr. Speaker, neither of these men in the statements they have made to the press, and in the report which I am told they made to Mr. Pushie, made any allegations that Koch Shoes or Gold Sall Leather were not good companies, on the contrary they emphasized the fact that they were both good companies, both able to produce high-class goods, but that their prospects were being seriously hampered by Mr. Koch's attitude. Furthermore, we were, I cannot say told, I am not sure, but I am under the impression that at the time that Koch Shoes was first discussed in this House (perhaps the Premier may correct me if I am wrong) I was under the impression that Mr. Koch was described as being a man of some experience in the making of shoes. As I say that may be an incorrect impression because my information is to the effect that Mr. Koch knows nothing about shoes nor the making thereof, but that Mr. Koch, prior to coming to Newfoundland, had been in South America engaged in the ceramic, or whatever the trade is, but that as to shoe-making his knowledge was nil. That was the report that these people made to the Director of Economic Development. The Premier made no mention of the fact that both these men had complained to Mr. Pushie of Koch's ways of treating the employees, both German and Newfoundlanders, a situation which was causing dissatisfaction in the plant, a situation, Mr. Speaker, which cumulated in the petition addressed to the Government signed, so I am told, although I have not seen it, by both Newfoundland and German workmen, and was brought in by Mr. Willard

who offered it to Mr. Pushie. Mr. Pushie said he was not interested, and did not want to hear about it. That, Mr. Speaker, was all before the Canadian Customs had entered the picture at all.

On motion the House recessed for twenty minutes.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, at the time we took a recess I was referring to the fact that in connection with the operations of Koch Shoes and the Gold Sail Leather Goods, in speaking to the amendment on Tuesday evening, the Premier had referred in rather scathing terms to the gentleman who had, as he put it, given information, about these ridiculous, and improper and untrue statements to the press and to the Opposition, and in particular to the gentleman who was acting as solicitor for some of them. I made the statement then, and I repeat it now, that these gentlemen had not in fact, as one would gather from the remarks made by the honourable gentleman at that time, gone out looking for people to give information. Mr. Willard, at the request of the honourable member of this House for Green Bay, who had an official connection with both organizations, Willard had submitted to him about mid-February, I think about the 16th of February, a report on the merchandizing practices of the company, and in that report he had drawn attention to the fact that although they had a good product the prospects of the company were being jeopardized by the administration of its affairs by Mr. Koch; and that subsequently a petition signed by, I don't know how many of the workers or what percentage of the working force, but a petition signed by employees both Ger-

man or we will say European, and Newfoundland workmen, had been shown by Willard to Mr. Pushie, the Director General of Economic Development in his official position, and Mr. Pushie had intimated that he was not interested in that particular aspect of their complaint.

Then we had the attitude adopted by the Premier, that you cannot deal with trash like that—they have people stealing documents—is that the way you are going to get evidence, collect that kind of stuff together. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that nobody in this House is better qualified to pass an opinion on that than the Premier's colleague the Honourable the Attorney General and his colleague the Honourable the Solicitor General, both of whom know full well that as often as not the basis of any prosecution is founded on the evidence given by people who do not bear the best reputation. The mere fact that a person may or may not be a hooser, that he may or may not be the sort of person that you would like to be seen walking down the street with, is not necessarily sufficient to make his evidence unacceptable or indeed to make it advisable to reject it. Because I am quite sure, and I am speaking now as if it were an academic question, that part of it, I am quite sure any lawyer in the House, and there are five on the Government side of the House, will agree with me that any criminal prosecution does not worry about the source from which the information came, it looks first for and checks to see if the information is correct. But not so the Premier, he says: that crowd, I would not have anything to do with them, serpents and reptiles, and he said (and he laughs) this fellow Schafers even had the gall to tell the police that he got these photostats

in the mail—imagine he got them in the mail.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He swore to that.

MR. HIGGINS: Yes. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you the collector of customs of St. John's also got photostats in the mail, Mr. F. J. Mercer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that I believe.

MR. HIGGINS: And, Mr. Speaker, there is no suggestion Mr. F. J. Mercer is a snake and a reptile and unworthy of credence. While I cannot speak personally with any knowledge of the basis for the investigations by the Canadian Customs into the affairs of Koch Shoes, it is not an unreasonable assumption that this information coming to Mr. Mercer played some part in it. Now as yet, as far as this House knows, there have been no charges laid against Koch Shoes, so that I take it, Mr. Speaker, I am free to refer to that fact. But if the Canadian Customs are investigating Koch and send people down from the Mainland, whether from Montreal or Ottawa is immaterial, they sent down a team of investigators and there must be, I submit, Mr. Speaker, in that, sufficient to give the Government cause to inquire into whether or not there is any foundation to that story. That, of itself, Mr. Speaker, would be sufficient to not only justify, but indeed one would imagine almost compel, the honourable members of this House on either side to support this amendment. It is not a matter, Mr. Speaker, of politics at all. It is not a simple matter of saying, "Oh that crowd they would do anything to get at me. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker, I trust we can discuss this thing intelligently without, as I say,

necessarily having to resort to invectives—if these things are facts, and until the time they are contradicted by acceptable evidence they are facts, then, Mr. Speaker, they should be investigated.

Now we have been told that the programme of economic development has today arrived at the stage where, I think, eight hundred Newfoundlanders are employed. That is possibly an approximate figure. I think that is the figure mentioned by the Honourable the Premier the other night—As I remarked earlier, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House and indeed the people generally have been suffering from a dearth of information as to these new industries, and what little information we have had must of necessity be out of date. But it is rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, to refer back, if I am permitted to do so, to an address delivered in this House on the 31st of March 1952 by the Honourable the Premier. That speech was later reduced to print, and every member of this House, and possibly people outside it, were furnished with a copy of it. And it is rather interesting —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—I am very familiar with the speech in question, but I doubt seriously whether it has any bearing on this amendment.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, particularly for that reason I asked the question.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not able to decide. I do not know what the honourable member is about to quote from.

MR. HIGGINS: I propose to quote from a speech which was delivered in this House on the 31st of March three

years ago to the day, by the Honourable the Premier—It was headed: "Newfoundland is on the March." It dealt quite expansively, among other things, with economic development and the new industries. I had proposed, if it were in order, to merely quote one or two statements made at that time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would these be statements to substantiate the contention that there should be a Royal Commission?

MR. HIGGINS: Not necessarily so, no.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is not that what the honourable gentleman is supposed to address himself to?

MR. HIGGINS: It is merely, Mr. Speaker, to show how the Premier's own predictions are borne out by events. It would seem to impeach his ability to properly estimate the value of these industries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that material for a Royal Commission? Is that a reason for a Royal Commission? Whether my estimate is wrong or correct?

MR. BROWNE: Certainly, sure.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, it would impeach the value of the Premier's summations and defence.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is out of order.

MR. BROWNE: I suggest it is in order.

MR. HIGGINS: — Mr. Speaker —

MR. SPEAKER: I am placed in the position of ruling on something I have not heard.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honour-

able gentleman now proposes to quote from a speech delivered two or three years ago which gave an estimate of how many people would be employed in these industries and again by quoting my speech of the night before last in which I said how many, remind us of what is said then, and go on to quote what was said three years ago — I ask, is that an argument for a Royal Commission? Is that an argument for the amendment calling for a Royal Commission to investigate irregularities? Is it irregular that I now say eighteen hundred are employed and that I then said more than that? Is that an irregularity calling for a Royal Commission?

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker if I may, the Honourable the Premier seems to suggest that any reference not of itself a complete and completely relevant argument is inadmissible. I submit it is part of my argument and I submit that without it, while it may not have its bearing directly on the thing at hand, it is part of the argument and does not bear directly on it. It is something like that word we bandied around yesterday — homogeneous — trying to form one whole.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member is going to quote an estimate of the number of people employed and an estimate made three years ago, and take it and compare it with the actual figures, I don't know what it is intended to show, whether the estimates were correct or incorrect?

MR. HIGGINS: Incorrect, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that a subject for a Royal Commission, Mr. Speaker? Is that in support of the amendment calling for a Royal Com-

mission to investigate irregularities alleged —

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, the amendment says — that a Royal Commission etc. should be immediately set up to make a thorough investigation into the methods used to establish the new industries including the negotiations of contracts etc. to establish — the methods used to establish the new industries. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do submit this speech was one, it may not have been a major method, but it was part of the method which brought about and explained the setting up of the new industries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To explain — but not one of the methods to establish the new industries — not by any remote stretch of the imagination could a speech I made in the House be regarded as one of the methods for setting up one of these industries — it seems to me to be completely out of order.

MR. BROWNE: It is the first time he did not want to hear his speech again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a good speech. But why not stick to the subject? Why not stick to the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: The point is a very fine one. I don't like to be placed in a spot like this. I would welcome, and it is perfectly in order for other members to express an opinion on such a point, where this is a matter of opinion from the Chair. The point is a very fine one. The speech is contained in Hansard. It is just a mere matter of relevancy. I would have, I think, to maintain from that—an estimate of the number of people to be employed—would not be completely relevant to the wording of this amendment.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, we were and have been suffering from a dearth of information. We have been compelled to husband these few occasional pearls which were cast at us, and it is hardly to be wondered at that when we get the occasional opportunity we should leap at them like a hungry trout. However, I would remind the House that at the time that economic development was booming along, after the mandate had been given in November, 1951, the statement was made that one of the qualifications of any new industry which would be considered would be that it had to be a successful firm in its own country, and it had to possess great skill and knowledge. Now that was part of the original formula. It is true that we were told the other night that Koch Shoes was one of the industries in whose case the Government departed from its formula. But, Mr. Speaker, the House is entitled to know why the departure from the formula. If Mr. Koch had been a man of extraordinary ability in his chosen field and just happened to be short of cash that might have been a justification — might have been — but Mr. Speaker, in the absence of evidence along those lines, I submit that Mr. Koch — the agreement made between Mr. Koch and the Government was unjustified, applying that formula, a firm to get this agreement with the Government had to be successful in its own country.

Have we ever been told in this House that Mr. Braun Wogau's qualifications as a rubber expert, unless it be in rubber bludgeons? Has any evidence been brought in here to show that Superior Rubber Company, or the principals thereof, were successful in their own country and possessed qualifications and know-how? In the

light, Mr. Speaker, of the unchallenged and undenied statements made within recent days in this House, I submit that there is very real reason to look into the history of the financing of Koch Shoes and Superior Rubber, not only the beginnings, Mr. Speaker, but their conduct from their inception and their present administration. I submit, sir, that this amendment is proper, that this amendment is supported by evidence which, if I may adopt the words of my honourable friend, the Solicitor General, is well documented. You heard these things here. They were not contradicted. We have this piece of machinery out in Holyrood and we have not yet heard from the Government a positive denial that it was ever there. In the light of these things, Mr. Speaker, there can, I submit, be no alternative for any responsible person sitting in this House than to vote for this amendment. We on this side will vote for it, and I defy any honourable member in the House, forgetting partisanship, forgetting their party, forgetting politics, thinking only of the duty to this country, I say, sir, every member in this House should support the amendment.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, I have only a couple of points to make. I might not have spoken at all but for the last remarks of the honourable member who has just spoken.

The points I want to make are these (1) the evidence which has been furnished by the Opposition has been very well represented, but they have been making the very best of a bad case. There is very little in the way of evidence to support their contentions and (2) bears on the last remarks of the honourable member — We cannot very well forget partisanship and politics when this is tied on to a

political tag. This is a vote of non-confidence in the Government. It is not a simple motion, made by the honourable member for St. John's West merely that a Royal Commission be set up to investigate these industries. It is a vote of non-confidence in the Government. I may say, and I speak sincerely, that I read these reports of the newspapers and heard some of the rumours around town. I suppose everybody did, and I had reached the point where I thought there might be something in them, and I listened with great interest to all the evidence as it has been presented. I am not convinced, if that is all the Opposition could possibly bring forward, my doubts have vanished, and I don't see any reason for this Royal Commission, certainly not one to justify me in voting for this amendment, certainly not enough to warrant my saying aye to a vote of non-confidence in the Government.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend, sir, to belabour this subject very long, but I rise, sir, in support of the amendment. My honourable colleagues have explained the reason why the Opposition proposed this amendment. But, Mr. Speaker, the way I look at it is this: If a person finds one rotten apple in the barrel he generally looks to see if there is any other — Due to all the disturbing reports that we have heard in this Province during the past few months, I think the course taken by the Opposition is warranted. I agree, Mr. Speaker, all the European people have come to this country and have been invited here by the Government to take part in the economic programme, among them are many fine people, people well versed in business methods and good business practice. However, due to the fact, and taking into con-

sideration what has already happened to the former Director of Economic Development wherein, I believe, it seems from the start when he entered this province he began to use fraudulent methods for his own use. That, Mr. Speaker, went on for several years before it was discovered. Of course I do give credit to the Premier for the action he took when he did find out there was something wrong. But, Mr. Speaker, in the first instance, when this programme was first introduced by the Government it was very difficult for the Opposition and for many people in this Island to support such a development programme when they were provided with such a small amount of, and such little information as was given them. Mr. Speaker, when we realize that one of the Ministers of the Crown was quoted by one of our daily papers as saying that this development gamble would either bring unprecedented prosperity or ruin to Newfoundland in this generation — one of the Ministers of the Crown, Mr. Speaker, took that attitude and is quoted as having said that on the floor of this House — is it any wonder that the Opposition looked upon this economic development programme with a jaundiced eye?

I want to read, Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed, an editorial published, April 24, 1952. That is several years ago. It is headed prosperity or ruin: It is from the Evening Telegram and it says: "Anyone who has raised the question as to where the Government's economic plans are heading has been severely rebuked for lack of faith in the future of the Province or has been accused of attempting to obstruct industrial advancement but when the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives from the floor of the House frankly states that the develop-

ment programme will either open the way to unprecedented prosperity or will ruin Newfoundland in this generation..." In other words, when the future is shrouded in such uncertainty as to be hidden even from the promoters of the projects, is it surprising those whose money is so freely used in the launching of the programme entertain doubts, not of Newfoundland's resources, but of the soundness of the plan with which it is hoped to create new industries. Newfoundland, it was stated by the Minister was to have her revolution all at once. She has, it is imagined, heard of the pains and heartbreak experienced by other countries in carrying out a revolution but this revolution has scarcely left the starting point, the obstacles are still in front. And what revolution has the Minister in mind that proved to be successful over-night? The fact that the Minister declares the alternative to prosperity may be ruin for Newfoundland in this generation, by no means supports his opinion that the revolution is complete, that the Government has satisfied itself of their soundness and that the future may not have in store a period of pain and penalties as a result of the adoption of a policy of make or break. The public disconcerted by the statement that the future of Newfoundland is being resolved by the tossing of a coin. It seeks to be sure the plans are actually based on long and careful thought given to every factor — the initial costs for instance, the continuity of development, the marketing possibilities. Not in the Colpitts-Coverdale Report on the industries may be found precise information that tends to give such assurances.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not very difficult for anyone to realize that

the Opposition in that day, three years ago, did not support whole-heartedly this development programme. In fact, we were given very, very little information, which we should have had, Mr. Speaker, in the spending of such huge sums of public money. Perhaps it would have been better if we had a special committee of both sides of this House to look into the plans for these industries before they were put into effect.

The Premier, in his few remarks the other night, said when he quoted some figures in respect to the amount of money paid out to the Newfoundland people by these industries during the past few years — I don't know if he meant that this twenty-three million dollars which I believe he said was paid out, was all in wages or that it included all the moneys paid out by these plants.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All.

MR. FOGWILL: I would like to know what it meant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The amount we did lend them or spent ourselves?

MR. FOGWILL: The amount the Premier said was paid out by these industries?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twenty-seven and a half million dollars.

MR. FOGWILL: What does that include, the wages, light, fuel, power, depreciation and interest?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, wages and salaries on the one hand and purchases and services and goods locally on the other.

MR. FOGWILL: I would like, if the Premier would be so kind, to have a breakdown to show the House what amount of money was paid in wages.

Because, Mr. Speaker, some of the plants which are in operation, no doubt, generally they would pay small wages, but the wages paid in some of these plants, Mr. Speaker, are pitifully small. In fact I have heard and understand some of the wages are as low as \$15 a week, which is very little. As I have said, some of the people who came here, no doubt, are very fine people and would make fine citizens for this province, but when you find one rotten apple in the barrel it is my advice to look for others.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, this amendment to the Speech from the Throne is out of order. Mr. Speaker, I am going to quote from another editorial, if I may — "The Evening Telegram," Sept 20, 1954: "Government's Greatest Blunder" — "In the Supreme Court on Wednesday, Dr. Alfred Valdmanis, former Director of Economic Development in the Smallwood Administration pleaded guilty."

Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I had better not read that part dealing with something not cleared up —

"...pleaded guilty of having by fraudulent means obtained from the Government the sum of \$200,000. On Friday he was sentenced to four years imprisonment. On a further charge of having taken \$270,000, the prisoner pleaded not guilty, the prosecution moved that the second count on which the accused was indicted be deferred "sine die" and this was so ordered.

"The confession of guilt, precluding the presentation in court of the evidence upon which the charge was based, leaves the public completely in the dark regarding the methods used by Dr. Valdmanis in perpetrating this fraud."

The Premier did in his speech, Mr. Speaker, outline somewhat how it was done. Of course the Premier himself cannot be conversant with all the details about how he got away with this money. What I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, is by whom were these recommendations of Dr. Valdmanis made, what high Federal officials made the recommendation that Valdmanis would be a most suitable person to bring about the industrial programme in Newfoundland?

Was the value of these recommendations demonstrated by the facts that this individual was receiving for services for them a paltry salary of \$1,200. Dr. Valdmanis was granted a salary of \$25,000 when engaged by Mr. Smallwood. That apparently did not satisfy the ambitions of the Latvian immigrant. Eventually were disclosed to the Premier the devious means by which his Director of Economic Development was augmenting his salary, and he was suspended from office. Throughout the years in which Dr. Valdmanis occupied that position little information of a satisfying nature could be obtained regarding the new ventures. His prosecution ended with a conviction on the admission of his crime, leaving undisclosed the methods which enabled him to defraud the Government of \$200,000. Further the deferred "sine die" of the hearing on the second charge of having defrauded the Government of a further \$270,000 to which he pleaded not guilty, leaves the grounds on which that charge was based undisclosed to the public, left unexplained what persuaded Dr. Valdmanis to plead guilty to the lesser charge. Incomprehensible to the public is why the proceedings arising from the charge of fraud in a matter involving an even larger sum has been

deferred indefinitely by the Government.

"Here is as shocking a case of malpractice in Government affairs as any in this country's record. It stands as all the greater a scandal because the particulars are not brought out into the light of day. While giving Premier Smallwood credit for acting in this matter with the best of intentions, the Telegram can only describe his Government's part in this sorry affair as a costly blunder."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this development gamble has cost Newfoundland a lot of money, much of it has been invested in what may be called sound ventures but much more or it may be invested in ventures which may not be sound. I end my little talk by saying the same words I opened with, Mr. Speaker—There was one rotten apple in the barrel, and I think the Government should find out and turn the barrel upside down to see if there were any other rotten apples.

MR. JANES: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of making a speech of any length. What I am going to say I am going to say clearly and very quickly. Last night as I sat at home for a little while and read the amendment which had come from the Opposition side of this House, and as I considered everything that had been said and everything which I had been able to read on the matter, I could reach but one conclusion only; that the amendment, sir, is an evil thing in itself, and over and above that it is mischievous —

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think the honourable member ought to say that because the amendment is in order — The honourable member might say what is the effect.

MR. JANES: It is the effect of the amendment, Mr. Speaker, the amendment is not evil itself. It is quite legal. Everything which needs to be said, all the explanation which needs to have been given has been given by the Solicitor General and by the Honourable the Premier.

The amendment, sir, is malicious

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order — the honourable member cannot say that. It imputes bad motives to the honourable member who produced it.

MR. BROWNE: Surely we have a right to move an amendment of this nature.

MR. JANES: The effect of the amendment, sir, is malicious or evil because it revolves around the activities of one Dr. Valdmanis. Now how many times, sir, in this House have we heard Valdmanis thrown to the lions by the very members who are now explaining this motion? When all their efforts had failed they grasp at a straw. The last time they drew in a cage they found a lion there they did not expect, and that lion was the Premier of this Province. Because they have failed in all this they try now by putting into the preamble of this amendment to find some miraculous way in which to implicate the Honourable the Premier in the activities in which Valdmanis has been accused.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that is imputing motives not justified by the wording.

MR. SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order — I do not think that can be read into the preamble.

MR. JANES: Valdmanis, sir, is down in goal and is paying his debt

to society the same as other criminals who have passed through our courts are paying their debts to society, and it is possible that Valdmanis might be paying his debt to the Government, I don't know. We have reached the position, as I have said before, where we have a man who is paying his debt to society and we have a court here which has set itself up to try him all over again because that is what we have been doing. Now if we have any faith in our courts to dispense justice and if justice has been done, is not that enough? Do we have to drag all this into this place and to try and implicate others or to even suggest that others are implicated? I think, sir, the Premier has vindicated himself not only in the eyes of this House but in the eyes of the people of Newfoundland, and I see no reason at all for introducing an amendment of this sort and having the preamble to the amendment concerned with a man already paying his debt to society. I have said that the amendment has the effect of being malicious. In support of that contention, sir, we only have to examine the speeches which have been made in support of the amendment. The honourable members of the Opposition have taken up considerable time in quoting from sacred affidavits taken from mechanics in regard to management. They have gone out deliberately to pick up information from people who are none other than disgruntled employees of the factories.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is meant by "going out deliberately to pick up information". That is not a true statement, implying a motive again.

MR. SPEAKER: It is an allegation of fact in a way of speaking.

MR. JANES: It is a very funny thing that nobody on this side of the House has been offered any information. You have it all over there, whatever it is. I have been offered no information. Then, sir, we have the case of taking to their hearts these people who have allowed their hands to get the better part of their heads, and that information too they used light fingered. That is the information they have quoted ever since this debate started. Then, of course, sir, we could not escape the inevitable rusty machinery. I have a recollection in this House of when an honourable member went into a plant and saw a few rivets being used and came back here and told us — these rivets — watch them — just watch them — just watch how they will come down and be moved to Ontario. They have been putting the things together with bolts, rivets or bolts.

MR. FOGWILL: Nuts!

MR. JANES: Bolts and nuts — I am sorry — So, the fact that we have rusty machinery has been introduced here for the last few days, does not surprise me in the least. Then, sir, of course, the inferior goods; they have to tell us that one of the plants was making inferior goods and dumping them on the market. I am sure every shopkeeper on Water Street, every shopkeeper in Newfoundland was very, very interested to hear that information because they never received any inferior goods from any plant on the Mainland nor anywhere else. The best that can be said is that it is social delinquency and those are the people who have come to this House to move this amendment over the past few days, to tell us how inefficient the Government is in these matters and to point out all of the things which are wrong — one of the factories

is making inferior goods, another has a bit of rusty machinery, another is accused by disgruntled employees and revolving around it all is a man paying his just debt to society in goal, and that is the just basis on which they move a motion of non-confidence in the Government.

We on this side of the House, Sir have every faith in the ability of this Government to properly promote an economic development programme. That is more than can be said for the faith which the people of Newfoundland have demonstrated in the Tory Party. They have one ability, the ability to erect and build a factory, we have the main factory of affidavits, rumours, all-day-suckers and suspicions. That is the best we have learned from the speeches that came from the opposite side of the House in regard to that amendment.

On the basis of these facts, Sir, I have no alternative other than to vote against this amendment. I do so because I don't think it is justified. I don't think the amendment is justified, I don't think any good could possibly come out of it. My only advice to the members of the Opposition is that, instead of carrying on this foolishness about bad rubber boots and rusty machinery and affidavits that they get out and try to see what some of these factories are doing. There are people, Newfoundlanders, working in these factories, some thousands of them who are earning wages whether they are big or whether they are small. It is the first time in the lifetime of these people that many of them ever earned any regular wages. They are exhibiting considerably more interest in the industries in which they are employed than the honourable member of the Opposition. They have worked with management in most cases to help

build an industry, and it is to the everlasting shame of the Tory Opposition in this House that they have taken so little interest in the people who are employed in these factories and the people who are earning their livelihood out of these factories unless they make an affidavit, of course, or bring them rumours and then their hearts bleed. I could speak a long, long time on this, Sir, but it is getting late. I will say again: I am going to vote against this amendment. I have every faith in the ability of the Government to continue with the programme founded by them, and to bring it to a successful conclusion.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I have quite properly interpreted the motion before the House as a motion of want of confidence. Such a motion is generally moved by the Leader of the Opposition. But there is an election pending. There is a spring election pending. The Premier is going to close the House in nineteen days and we are going to go to the country.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that official?

MR. CURTIS: This is a motion from the people of the Opposition, and I am just mentioning it to warn the Honourable Leader of the Opposition what happened Mr. Melnikov and what might happen —

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I object — imputing motives — I have no ambition to be the Leader of this Party — I don't think anybody in this party nor outside it can challenge my loyalty to the Leader since I joined it.

MR. CURTIS: I don't challenge that, sir — This is a motion such as generally comes from the Leader of the Opposition. I am just wondering if there is any significance in the change: The first shot of the campaign has

been fired, and the honourable member for St. John's East has fired it. Valdmanis has been charged, pleaded guilty, sentenced but is not forgotten, no. We are not prepared to stand by and think of the poor fellow eating his heart out in the penitentiary, he is to come into the debates of this House and to the public so that the newspapers can get their pound of flesh or whatever it happens to be — any weapon, Mr. Speaker, to beat the Premier.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of congratulating the Honourable the Premier upon the masterly statement he made a night or so ago. He was very effectively and very convincingly answered the criticisms of the Opposition, not, Mr. Speaker, that they deserved an answer, not that they deserved consideration, but because of the nature of this amendment, an amendment that suggests non-confidence in the Government, it requires a full statement. That statement has been made by the Honourable the Premier. It has been presented well and convincingly to us all.

Now we have heard from the members opposite of what they thought, or at least what they have been able to gather by reading the papers over the past four years. We have heard "Political Notebook" quoted in this Chamber, articles he wrote, as if they were Sacred Wit. We have heard "Way-farer" quoted as if he were another apostle. We have heard Don Jamieson of CJON. We have heard "Meet the Press." We have heard extracts from all these quarters quoted to us—"There you are gentlemen — There it is" "This is it." Not a single new thought, not a single original thought, not a single convincing argument as to why we in this House should throw aside the Premier who has the confidence of the country, the Government which has the

confidence of the country — Why I ask you to look opposite, Mr. Speaker; How long could they function as a Government if we moved them over here tomorrow?

The Leader of the House found himself a year ago in a tremendously, terrifically embarrassing position. News had come to him of the Valdmanis treachery — Valdmanis a man whom he had lauded so profusely, so sincerely — Valdmanis for whom he was prepared to erect a monument—Yet this man had betrayed him and had betrayed the Government of Newfoundland — Oh not the first! Not the first! One of the disciples was guilty of betrayal. There was one rotten apple in the barrel, but they did not throw them all out to check up on the others. If one member of the CNR breaks his faith and lands in gaol should the whole list of employees be examined? That is the purport of what we heard this afternoon.

What did the Premier do when he heard this about Valdmanis? Indeed what could he have done? He could have sat back and said: Valdmanis is gone. He has left the country. Let us forget it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Attorney General if he is seriously making that remark — He could get away with it? When they knew about it over in Germany?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I have the floor — The Honourable the Premier could have said: "Valdmanis is gone, thank God, the matter is disposed of." He did not do that. No, Sir, the Premier had to move. He decided himself that he had to move. He decided himself that he had to move quickly and cautiously so that the culprit could not escape, quickly so he could not get beyond the reach

of our courts. He did not take any of his Cabinet into his confidence except the Minister of Finance who happened to be there when he heard it. He properly did not. A matter like that made known to twelve or more people, might have easily leaked out and the man might have escaped. But Valdmanis, Mr. Speaker, had to be caught, had to be arrested, had to be tried. And when we are asked why we were so anxious that Dr. Valdmanis not get bail the answer is simple — We did not want him to escape. We did not want him to be liquidated. We did not want him to get a chance to liquidate himself. We wanted Dr. Valdmanis to stand in the dock and either admit or deny the charges. Valdmanis had received some money which he should not have received. We have got to consider what his defences would have been. What defence could Valdmanis have made?

First he could have denied every thing, denied receiving any money. We did not know but that he might do that. But thanks to the energy put into this matter by the RCMP, every cent that was paid or was suggested had been paid to Valdmanis was traced, the payments were proved payments from the companies to him, personal payments from the company into the bank and into the account of which he had the only power of attorney. So it was no good. Valdmanis could not use that as a defence.

Secondly: Valdmanis might have admitted he got the money but might have said he had gotten it for the Premier, and that he paid it to the Premier. That is a more serious matter because it involved not only proving Valdmanis got the money but it involved proving what he did with it. Fortunately, thanks to the skill put into the matter by the RCMP by these

hundreds of documents it can be proven where every cent, every single, solitary cent went, and not one cent could be traced to the Honourable the Premier nor to any member of the Government.

He could have said, as a third defence, that he got the money and was holding it in trust for these German companies. That was the burden of a letter he wrote while he was in the penitentiary to some of his erstwhile friends in Germany — "Go to these people" he said: "Go to these people and get them to say that this money was not given me as a commission. Get them to say rather that it was a term that was used. Tell them, get them to say that I was holding the money in trust for them so that they would have some dollars on this side of the Atlantic as and when they wanted money." The letter is there, signed by Valdmanis, written while he was in the penitentiary and smuggled out of the penitentiary. We have the envelope in which it was sent, smuggled out of the penitentiary, and stating in it: "When you reply don't send the letter to me, send it to my lawyer." But the firms refused.

Lastly, what defence was he going to use? He could say he got the money and was holding it for the Premier and the party, and it was being invested in the United States for him and for the party. My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, produced a power of attorney — he suggested yesterday that all that had been done with the knowledge of the Attorney General who had signed a power of attorney.

MR. HOLLETT: No, Mr. Speaker. I must ask the honourable gentleman.

MR. CURTIS: I will be very happy

if the honourable member will withdraw it.

MR. HOLLETT: Certainly, there was no intention to connect you with the doings of Valdmanis. But there was definitely the intention to state and prove you did know the man Lurje, that is all. And the man Lurje had the \$185,000.

MR. CURTIS: I thank the honourable member for withdrawing the suggestion. I don't know why it had been stated I knew Lurje because I did not.

MR. HOLLETT: You knew the name.

MR. CURTIS: I understand the honourable member to say he never made any accusation. That being so, thank you for that. Now he produced here yesterday a document for which we had been looking for months members of the RCMP have been looking for months for this document that was supposed to have my signature on it, and what was supposed to be knowledge by me that there was such a man in the world, and that he had some money for the Liberal Party, a man by the name of Lurje. Mr. Speaker, I don't think I ever heard of nor saw the man in my life, certainly I have no conscious recollection of ever seeing him, and I don't believe I ever did. But on the 9th day of June 1951, Dr. Valdmanis came to my office and he said to me: "Mr. Curtis, I have a power of attorney that must be signed by a notary public would you be good enough to sign it for me?" It is written on the bottom of this document — Newfoundland, St. John's 9 June 1951 — That was the document Valdmanis was going to use to show that all this money which he had robbed was being sent to the States and used and held

in trust for the Liberal Party. I owe my thanks to my honourable friend for getting us a copy of that document. We have been looking everywhere for it. It is a power of attorney, Mr. Speaker, signed in the presence of a notary public. Mr. Speaker, there is not a notary public in this room who has not signed hundreds of powers of attorney without reading them. I never read the power of attorney. I never read this man Lurje's name. I am not sure, I certainly did not read it enough to know what it was I was signing, because if a man comes to me and says: "I want you to sign as a notary public," I look at it, just as if a man comes in and wants you to sign his will you do not read the will through. I think it is most rude to do it.

MR. HIGGINS: It is a good thing it was not a note.

MR. CURTIS: I mean, you would make sure what it is, make sure you are not committing yourself to anything when signing it — That is just what I did.

But what did Dr. Valdmanis say when he was writing his wife, or rather not his wife, but the letter he wrote from the penitentiary? He said: "Lurje lost almost all the money I gave him, and occasionally even threatened, threatened to get more."

There is one more point, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this document which my honourable friend has had, and which in accordance with the policy here and I had photostated. How did this document happen to come into the possession of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition? Here is a private document from Alfred Valdmanis, and only two people in the world have a right to this document, one is Dr. Valdmanis and the other is

Mr. Lurje. These documents are not registered, Mr. Speaker. We made a search in every court in the United States — this document is not registered — Now then the honourable member got this document somewhere — where did he get it? From Dr. Valdmanis? In other words was the voice we were hearing today the voice of the Leader of the Opposition but the hand of Dr. Valdmanis? Did he get it from Dr. Valdmanis? The honourable member said himself that he had not seen Dr. Valdmanis, had not spoken to him since his conviction, therefore. I think we can safely say that he did not get the document from him.

MR. HOLLETT: May I say I have not spoken to Valdmanis for three years.

MR. CURTIS: I accept that. Therefore he did not get it from him unless it came in an envelope through the mail with the other documents the Honourable Leader of the Opposition talked about — or did he get it from Dr. Valdmanis' solicitor? Was this document handed to him by Dr. Valdmanis' solicitor and was it delivered by his solicitor to the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. SMALLWOOD: A fence — he is a fence.

MR. HIGGINS: Would the Honourable the Premier make that remark outside this House? I challenge the Premier to make that remark outside the House where he is not protected.

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we might call it 6:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 o'clock, I do leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock tonight.

THURSDAY, March 31, 1955

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned I was discussing a document which Valdmanis brought to my office and executed in my presence on the 9th day of June, 1951. This document which he signed and which he asked me to witness was a power of attorney, which I had not read, and which had I read, as a lawyer I never would have permitted a client to sign, because it was a complete power of attorney, which gives his attorney more power than I have ever seen an attorney given before. It will be remembered that this power of attorney was to have been used by Valdmanis as evidence that I knew the purport of the effect of it and what was done under it. Why? Because I had witnessed the signature to a document. It will be remembered that this was a part of the possible defences which Valdmanis could have made to the charges against him. The first defence you will remember I indicate that Valdmanis might have made was to deny that he received the money at all. As I said this afternoon just before adjournment, he could not get away with that defence because the RCMP had proved up to the hilt the payments were made to him.

MR. BROWNE: Could I ask the Honourable the Attorney General a question? Could he have denied it in any case if the complainants in Germany said they had paid it to him through the bank — how could he deny it?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has interrupted me.

I am prepared to answer questions although I do not want to be interrupted too frequently. Every accused when he gets in the box denies everything that is charged against him. My honourable friend has been on the bench long enough to know that. Every accused denies everything, whether or not they can get away with it. But in this case he could not even deny anything with any chance of getting away with it. We not only had the witnesses who paid him the money but we had the records of the payments and we could trace the money from the time he got it until it went out the window or wherever else he threw it — He could have denied that — that is an ordinary, a common defence. Mr. Speaker, you must remember that he was by no means sure that all these witnesses would be available to come from Germany. We had no power to call witnesses from Germany to our courts except if they consented to come. Fortunately we were able to persuade them to come, but at any time they might have just packed up or might have gone somewhere else or might have refused to come and we could do nothing at all about it. Nobody knows that better than my honourable friend.

Then he could have admitted — “I got the money but have paid it to Mr. Smallwood, the Premier.” I told the House this afternoon he could not prove that because we were able to show what had happened to the money and that not one single solitary red cent had come to the Premier nor had come to the Government nor had come to any member on this side of the House.

MR. HOLLETT: Not the part on this side.

MR. CURTIS: Except one or two,

I believe, engaged officially — my honourable friend says not.

MR. HOLLETT: Get this straight — there are no Liberals on this side of the House.

MR. CURTIS: I am glad of that — Then I said of a third defence Valdmanis might have raised, might have been, that he had gotten the money and was holding it in trust for Benno Schilde, the firm from whom he got it — I was going to quote just before adjournment the letter that he wrote while in the penitentiary in which he makes this suggestion — After all that happened the only way of escape would be if MIAG and Benno Schilde, the uppermost management, would obliterate the testimony of the smaller people, would testify there was not any commission, but that these moneys were intrusted to me for "X" years in order to accumulate dollar funds, and the term commission had only a formal mention to enable me to obtain permission if necessary from the German Currency Control Authority. "For any friend in distress" he writes, "I would have done it."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable gentleman table that document?

MR. CURTIS: In any event, Mr. Speaker, I cannot file a confidential document like that, although I actually do not know why I should not — I don't think it is fair since the case may still arise.

So, Mr. Speaker, Valdmanis clearly had in his mind this escape — he used the word "escape" — "I am holding the money in trust for these firms in Europe so that they will have dollar currency to their credit."

Lastly he might have said he had gotten the money and he had it in-

vested for the Liberal Party or for the Premier. That he could not possibly prove. At the risk of wearying the House and with perhaps the permission of the House, because it might not be strictly proper to quote it, I would like permission to say that we have a letter which he wrote his wife in which he told her all the money in this account was hers and hers alone and that nobody should be allowed to take one cent of it, and should such be done this letter was to be her authority to stop it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think I can ask the honourable gentleman where he got this document. I pointed out to the House that this same document, signed by Valdmanis is his property and the only other person entitled to it would be Elja Lurje. I invite my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, to tell us where he got this document and if he had Dr. Valdmanis's permission to have it here?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, before I do that I invite the Honourable the Attorney General to tell us how he got the document, and I want it truthfully. I know he is going to be truthful, Sir. I may explain about the document — it is in my possession legally. I brought it here. I did not quote from it. I referred to it. The Attorney General asked if he could look at it, and my learned friend on my left took it across to him. Three times that day I asked the Attorney General for that document and he pleaded, out. I want to know what he did with it? How did he get this thing here. Speaking of stolen documents, Sir, I say right now that no honourable gentleman in this House had the right to take out of this room a document which through courtesy he was allowed to have in his possession.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, what next — the honourable member referred to a document. I asked to see it. This is a document for which the police have been looking for many months and my honourable friend ought to be tickled to death that I got a copy of it, and took a copy of it, because otherwise the police would go to his home looking for this document or copy. I took this document, Sir, as the Attorney General of this Province and copied it as the Attorney General. I did not copy it for myself. This copy will be handed by me as soon as this debate is over to the RCMP. They may be interested in finding out how it got into the possession of the honourable member. I am not ashamed of having it copied.

MR. HOLLETT: They may be interested in knowing why you signed it.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I ask the honourable gentleman to take that back. This document came into my possession through him. This document is signed by me as a witness, as a notary, something I was more or less obliged to do if a man came to me to do it. I signed it purely as a witness, and I don't want to have it suggested by him that there was anything improper in signing it. If I know anything I know I will hear before this next election campaign is over, there will be something about this document. That is the reason I am stressing the point now. There is nothing there that his colleague to his left would not sign and nothing he himself as a "JP" would not sign. I want to make it perfectly clear that the signing of this document by me as a witness was a simple, ordinary, commonplace, every-day duty that a notary owes to a person who asks him to attest a document. But, can I say the

same thing about his possession of the document?

MR. HOLLETT: There you are, Mr. Speaker, it is being suggested — I protest, inasmuch as the honourable gentleman is insinuating I came by this illegally. I did no such thing.

MR. CURTIS: Will the honourable gentleman state where he got it, it belongs to Valdmanis.

MR. HOLLETT: Perhaps you may force me!

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps I may find out some other way. The main thing is that we have the document, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: You can't deport me — could lock me up.

MR. CURTIS: My dear friend, we would not deprive ourselves of having him on the other side for anything. As the Premier said before, the Leader of the Opposition — Don't think I would wish any change, and I am pretty sure those on this side hope my honourable friend will live long to sit there.

MR. HOLLETT: I will certainly not steal any documents.

MR. CURTIS: I hope not, and I hope you are not in possession of any if the honourable gentleman tries to suggest I stole that document by getting it photostated. I want to tell him a couple of things he does not know although he may imagine he knew it all. I speak now subject to the suggestions of my honourable friend opposite and to the lawyers on this side — this is a funny quirk of the law but nowhere in the Criminal Code is it stated to be a criminal offence to photostat documents and keep the photostat. I have been looking for it,

and if my honourable friends want to know why there was no prosecution in the Harbour Grace case — it seems to be possible for any employees, any employees of the Government to photostat any document in the office and pass it out where they like. It is a strange thing, but if my honourable and learned friends find that is not right I would be very glad to hear of it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I submit, Sir, to your ruling, any one honourable gentleman in this House who passes over a document for personal scrutiny within the House, has he the right to remove that document without the consent of the person who passes it over? I have no objection — I had no objection to the honourable gentleman seeing it. I asked my honourable friend there to take it over to him, but I did not give him consent to take it out and photostat it. I would have given him consent to do so. I could have given him this copy if he wanted to use it, the one I had. But I maintain no man has the right to take a document out which I have passed to him, without my consent.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the honourable gentleman rose to a point of order or as an interruption. He did give his consent for me to hold the document over night. I photostated that document, and the photostat will be passed over to the RCMP in the morning. But in the meantime I am interested, and this House ought to be interested in knowing how the document got into his possession and for what purpose. As I said this afternoon, were we listening to the voice of Jacob and the hand of Dr. Valdmanis. I would like to know that. Of course we will not get the answer. But nobody had any right to that document. That document be-

longs to Dr. Valdmanis and belongs to Lurje. I would suspect where it came from. Why it was brought down here I don't know unless as part of a smear campaign, unless as a beginning of an election campaign, and a prelude to the type of campaign we are going to have.

Now then, Mr. Speaker —

MR. HOLLETT: I think, Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to a point of order — I don't think the Honourable the Attorney General has the right to suggest that the Opposition are beginning a smear campaign.

MR. CURTIS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether to reply to the point of order — if it were not a smear campaign why was it brought here? What conceivable interest to this House would be a power of attorney signed by Valdmanis? Perhaps my honourable friend could tell me that and I would accept his point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why was it mentioned?

MR. HOLLETT: Why was it mentioned? I think the honourable gentleman has a list of the payments into and payments out of a certain account in New York. And I think my honourable friend will know that \$165,000 was taken out of that account by Mr. Lurje and he had the power of attorney in his possession, signed by Dr. Valdmanis and witnessed by Leslie R. Curtis. I think, Sir, if that came into our possession we have a perfect right — we have the right to trace certain things. I suppose we can get information. We are trying to find out where the \$200,000 went, as well as anybody else. We are trying to find out lots of things. And if that document came into our possession certainly we had a right to it.

MR. CURTIS: I do think, Mr. Speaker, we should know how it came into their possession, from whom and for what purpose and if it came into it properly.

MR. HOLLETT: Perhaps it was smuggled.

MR. CURTIS: Oh it was not smuggled, but may be quite improperly. If this document was by any chance handed to Dr. Valdmanis or to his solicitor there is no reason why it should be here in this House without Valdmanis' consent. It is very easy to find out if Valdmanis knows about it and if he has consented or if his legal defence used it for political purposes and not Valdmanis' sake. That is the question.

The Premier, Mr. Speaker, was not at all anxious and enthusiastic about our not proceeding with the Valdmanis case. The Premier was very anxious that this matter come before the court and that the facts be given to the public. But here I want to reply to the suggestion of the Opposition earlier in the session — But we had the plea of guilty which was accepted at the request and at the earnest request and at the insistence of Valdmanis' counsel, not essentially the counsel in Newfoundland but his counsel outside of Newfoundland. It is quite likely that the second charge against Valdmanis will be dropped — it is quite likely — There is not much object, Mr. Speaker, in whipping a dead horse. Valdmanis has been tried. He has been found guilty. He has pleaded guilty. He has gone to gaol. He has been sentenced. What would be the object of a further prosecution? Valdmanis has assigned over to the Government all his assets. He can do no more. We cannot get any more from him. If it costs a lot of money,

many; many thousands of dollars to bring the witnesses from Germany to carry out the prosecution, and we could under no circumstances be sure that they would come as we have no control over them — lastly, a trial of the Valdmanis case would not be in the interest of Newfoundland, seeing that it was going to develop, as it shows every sign of developing into a political trial with a political defence — The only good Germans in this country, Mr. Speaker, are the Germans who have gotten into trouble or fallen out with the German owners of the plants. The three Germans the other day who were fired from Koch Shoes suddenly became heroes. Valdmanis became a hero overnight by a simple process of being arrested. The minute any German gets into trouble he is taken hold of and made a hero of, by whom? Need I say? Who sent down the famous lawyer from Toronto to assist in the defence? Who is acting for the Germans who have been fired from Harbour Grace and have thus become wonderful citizens? The very first time, Mr. Speaker, that we heard a good word about any German other than those who are in trouble was this afternoon when one of the honourable members for St. John's East admitted that some of them were good.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution is one of want of confidence in the Government. It is suggested because, mind you, the Premier was courageous enough to take hold of Valdmanis, to have him hauled out of bed at 2:00 o'clock in the morning, to have him brought here and have him put in gaol and have him tried, because the Premier was brave enough to do that, for that reason therefore, we should have non-confidence in the Government.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker on

a point of order — there is nothing in this resolution to that effect.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is no point of order — that is sheer propaganda. It is not a point of order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman would read —

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

MR. SPEAKER: Let the honourable gentleman state his point of order. He has not said enough.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the point of order is: I am not criticizing, I hardly mentioned Dr. Valdmanis during my talk, I hardly mentioned him — the point is —

MR. CURTIS: If the honourable gentleman has a point of order —

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member permit the Chair to speak: I think I may say I feel myself competent to deal with any point of order raised. I say now the honourable member is not making a point of order when he said what he said. He is merely adding to his previous speech. I will say this: Surely no honourable member will expect me to prevent the Attorney General from discussing Valdmanis when that was about the sole topic of conversation here for years, I might say, and certainly in this debate.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, thank you! One of the main reasons given in this resolution is because Dr. Valdmanis was convicted on a charge of fraudulently obtaining from the Newfoundland Government etc. If the Honourable the Premier, having heard the fact, had refused to prosecute Vald-

manis, if he, as I said this afternoon, as he well might have, if he sat back and had done nothing, then this resolution might be quite in order. But what did the Premier do? The minute he heard of it he put the matter into the hands of the police. He did not rest night nor day until justice was done. Now then, if the Premier of this country, if the Leader of this House, will handle his own Director General of Economic Development in that way, if he is prepared to handle him in that way, the man to whom he gave all his confidence, the man whom he lauded so exuberantly, the man for whom he would have almost laid down his life, if he was prepared to go to such extremes to punish such a man, what do you think is going to happen if any of these little, petty, Germans running the industries run a foul of this Government? Do the honourable members opposite think that the Premier who would not hesitate to land one of his best friends in gaol would hesitate to deal with any of the other smaller fry that are scattered throughout the Avalon Peninsula? We in this House, Sir, have every confidence in the Premier. We feel that although we have not said it and although we don't propose to have a Royal Commission, you can feel quite sure, Sir, and this House can be assured, that the Government is watching every one of these industries, and that there will be no double-crossing, and that there will be no foul play if we can avert it.

Mr. Speaker, give these new industries a chance. Why I was in the Legislative Chamber in 1923 when the Government of the day introduced into this Chamber the famous Bowater or the Bill for dealing with the building of a mill on the Humber, and I remember very well Sir Patrick Mc-

Grath who was the president of that body discussing the Bill in Committee, and he said, remember gentlemen what you sign amounts to a guarantee. You must remember that some day you may be called upon to pay that guarantee. And Sir Patrick McGrath was right. In 1927 the Armstrong Whitworth Paper Company got into trouble, and were not able to pay, the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company were not able to pay the interest and the Newfoundland Government had been notified that they were going to be in default and that the Newfoundland Government might have to pony up the amount. What did the Government of the day do, even though it was a Tory Government? What did the Government of the day do? The Government of the day stood by. They did not appoint any Royal Commission to find out why millions and millions and millions of dollars had gone down the drain. The Government of the day stood by and let the company work itself out of its own mess, which they did at a terrific loss to themselves. I forget how many millions of dollars were dropped, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps some of my honourable friends would know.

MR. BROWNE: Not government money.

MR. CURTIS: No, but it might have been government money if they had proceeded with a Royal Commission.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If my honourable colleague will allow — What happened was the Government of the day, the Monroe Government, negotiated in England the sale of some scores of thousands of cords of pulp wood, which the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company were thereby enabled to sell in England. That gave

them the case to pay the interest on the bonds, otherwise the Government had to dip into the Treasury and do it. They escaped by the skin of their teeth. That is how they got out of it.

MR. BROWNE: May I add something to that. The year the International Power and Paper Company bought out the company, right here we put through the deal.

MR. CURTIS: That is what I am trying to explain. The company was not faced with a Royal Commission but the Government stood by, they watched a sale negotiated.

MR. BROWNE: It was negotiated right here in this Chamber.

MR. CURTIS: I know that too — The Government of the day gave sweeping concessions to the International Power and Paper Company. Why they gave them the equivalent of millions upon millions of dollars. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, they had a clause in their agreement made in 1927, such was their anxiety to have the company, they put a tax of 20% upon the profits of the company, a tax which today, Mr. Speaker, we look upon as purely nominal? They put a tax on the company in big print. Then in small print said: "but the amount to be paid under this tax shall not exceed \$75,000 for three years and \$150,000 thereafter until 1927," I think that is the date it was. However, Mr. Speaker, I just quoted that to show the proper attitude of any Government toward any company that is trying to organize.

MR. BROWNE: That is a different thing altogether. There was no Newfoundland money in it.

MR. JANES: Just the Newfoundland forests.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. CURTIS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that we have got to treat each of these industries in the light of what they mean to the people of this country. The people of this country have gotten jobs. There are some of them getting the first money they ever got from profitable employment. Thousands and thousands of people are depending upon these industries for their living. I, for one, will not accept the position of having the Government being increasingly on the tail of every one of these industries trying to create trouble. Let us give them a chance. They have not had as long yet, any of them, as we gave the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company in 1923-27, none of them, not any of them. Yet we have constant agitation for a Royal Commission. Mr. Speaker, some people are Royal Commission crazy.

MR. BROWNE: The Government appointed two.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sensible ones.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need enlarge any further the points that have been made. I think the situation is clear. This is a personal attack upon the Leader of the House. It is an attack upon the Premier as Leader of the House and an attack upon the Premier as Leader of the Government. I want to tell you, Sir, and I want through you to tell the country that we on this side have full and perfect confidence in the Premier. We know that the man who handled Valdmanis can very well handle any other of the new industries that may run out of line, and I ask you gentlemen, through Mr. Speaker, to defeat this amendment.

HON. P. J. LEWIS (Minister with-

out Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I have not had the privilege of hearing all the debate on this amendment, but because of certain implications involved in it, I feel constrained to contribute at least something towards the discussion. It is not my intention, Sir, to deal with the Valdmanis episode. I consider enough has been said in relation to that unfortunate man. As somebody said the other night, after the Honourable the Premier had closed his remarks, it would be a good thing for All of us (and I use "All" with a capital letter) if the last word had been spoken in relation to that unfortunate individual. But I do want to say this: If the Valdmanis episode and its impact upon this Province did nothing else it demonstrated to the world at large that the Premier of this Province is a man of strong moral courage and a man whose integrity, having regard to his association with Valdmanis, is unimpeachable. Because anyone who has listened, as I did the other night, to the disclosures that he made of his intimate association with that man and of the decisions which he came to, having regard to his close association, one must be driven to the conclusion that it demanded unquestionable courage, moral courage with the emphasis on the "moral." They were closely associated as personal friends, apart altogether from the public associations that resulted from his position as Economic Adviser and the Premier as Leader of the Government. I don't know how many of the honourable gentlemen in this Chamber there are who, if put to the same test that he was and in the same circumstances, would have come up with the decision that he arrived at, in the light of the possible political implications that inevitably followed. Why, Mr. Speaker,

there was more publicity given to that episode in Mainland newspapers than there was to the consummation of Confederation itself, when Newfoundland was brought in to Canada. I may say too, from what I saw of it, none of it was helpful to Newfoundland. Very few were prepared to say as I say now unqualifiedly and without reservations, that the decision taken by the Premier in the light of the circumstances is the greatest tribute to his integrity that can be written into his public career in this country no matter how long he may serve as Leader of the Government in Newfoundland. So I finish with Valdmanis. He has paid his debt to society, and there let it rest.

What I am concerned with, Mr. Speaker, is the implication of this resolution that is presently before your Chair, wherein it asks for the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate certain features in relation to these so-called new industries. It is an unfortunate but nevertheless historical fact that this country of ours, now a Province, has suffered more, so I presume, so I imagine, than any other entity in the British Empire from propaganda, particularly political propaganda which is directed in the first instance towards abuse of the Government in power but in the ultimate reflects to the discredit of the Province as a whole. The political history of Newfoundland is stained with political propaganda. It is an old saying that it is a dirty bird that fouls its own nest. If ever that saying was true it has been true of the political history of Newfoundland. I have been in this Chamber as long as if not longer than any other individual in it. I came in here first in 1928. Until the days of the dissolution of Government in 1932 there was a consistent and per-

sistent, diabolical policy of destructive propaganda which was directed against the Government in power. They had their faults of course, every Government has its faults. This one has faults. If and when my honourable friends on the other side occupy the seats to your left, Mr. Speaker, they too will have faults. But not every Government and in fact not any Government can be accused of all faults. The Governments of the past in this country, almost without exception, did their best, under serious handicaps, to keep this country afloat. Gentlemen who sat on the opposite side of the House realized that, but the light of that realization did not stop them from directing towards the Government a policy of slander and invective which was carried to the four corners of the earth, and all of which in the course of time had the effect of building up against Newfoundland a reputation for her public men that was an object of criticism. It was culminated in the famous Amulree Report, when we saw coming to this country from across the sea a board of men to investigate the public affairs of Newfoundland. At that time those who were responsible did not think that we had men of sufficient calibre in this country to investigate the affairs of Newfoundland, so they went outside and brought them in. But they brought them in well briefed. They had been briefed with a propaganda that had been scattered world-wide. What was the result? They came here. They sat. They cogitated and they deliberated. In due course they published the famous Amulree Report, which was the greatest slander that was ever perpetrated upon a free people under an official seal. Following upon that this country lost her independence, and we became a servile

people, and in those circumstances continued until ultimately we found the status in which we are today. Did we learn a lesson? No. We became a tenth Province of Canada. Then from that day on the honourable gentleman who is now Leader of the Government, Premier of this House, inaugurated a campaign, a policy, if you will, in order to make Newfoundland fulfil its destiny and take a proper place in the Confederation. What happened? He found a cupboard that was bare. He found an economy the like of which does not exist between the Pacific and the Atlantic. He found a Province that allegedly had resources of which we had heard for a hundred years, but nothing had been done about it. He had on his hands a problem that called for a solution, and it constituted for him a challenge as the first Leader of the Government of an island that Canada had looked upon with envy for many years, but which had to take her place and pull her weight in the Canadian Federation. The old, orthodox system has failed. The world had been told, under the official seal of Lord Amulree that Newfoundland could not carry on. Commission of Government had attempted to do so for a period of ten years. Where were we? Where was our economy? Where were our public services? What was the standard of living of our people? The lowest in Canada, the lowest in North America, not capable of comparison with any part of the Dominion.

So, being a man of initiative and a man of courage (and I say that not because I happen to be associated with him in Government as a member of his party but as a Newfoundlander) he cast about for ways and means to make this country pay, to make us self-sustaining, to stop what was in-

evitable, what had gone on for hundreds of years, the drainage of the greatest assets any country ever had, its people. It was inevitable, it was said so by my honourable friend on the other side with a lot of truth, when we came into Confederation the population of this island would be drained. Heretofore they had been drained into the United States. The district that I have the honour to represent at this moment has more people in the eastern seaports of the United States than there are voters in Harbour Main District. The inevitable result was that, unless something drastic was done, something unorthodox was attempted, some bold step was taken, the people of this island would seek greener pastures, they would forsake the coastline of Newfoundland, they would leave their hamlets in Fortune Bay as they had left them in Conception Bay when I was a boy growing up there, and they would seek employment and sustenance in the Great Dominion of Canada which was a growing country, prospering, strong, developing economically in a fantastic way, and we would be left here on a barren rock in the North Atlantic a monument to Joe Smallwood, a deserted land, and impoverished people sustained by the bounty of the central Provinces of Canada. What happened?

We had in the chest at that time, as we used to call it in the old days, something that was called a surplus, something that had been accumulated during the regime of the Commission of Government at the cost of the lives and the brawn and the sinew of the people were impoverished and unable to sustain themselves, they fed them at the rate of 6c a day, and they accumulated a surplus of \$40,000,000. That was there. What were you go-

ing to do with it? Keep it in the Treasury and continue paying at the rate of 5c. per day? Feed the old people and let the young emigrate from this land? That was the choice that Smallwood was faced with in 1949. So he inaugurated his policy of industrial development of which we have heard so much. It was not in this Government at that time. It was at a later stage that I did come in, and I came in for a reason not unassociated with that very thought. All right, he cast about him, I presume, for investors. Where did he get them? In Canada? Where did Canada get the investment that developed her great economy? Where did she get her risk capital during all these years? Not in Canada. She got it in the great United States of America. She did not get it in England. No. English dollars can be counted in Newfoundland and carried away on your back. But the American millions that have been spent in Canada to bring up her great economy to what it is and to make her a great nation were never available in Newfoundland. So we had a few dollars in the chest. What did he do with it? He gambled it, if you will, but if ever a gamble was justified that was it. He gambled against what? He gambled against not the possibility, not the probability but the almost certainty of the denuding of the population of this country, the draining of Newfoundlanders into the Mainland of Canada. So he broke new ground and he went to Europe and he induced certain financiers to come. And they came and they established there certain industries. Quite a few of these industries are set up in the district that I have the privilege to represent. That was not done because of any political influence that was exercised upon the Premier. That was done by men who

assessed the position, rightly or wrongly, and they established at Donovans an industry of which you all know, which was based upon the fabrication and manufacture of certain of the natural resources of Newfoundland. Side by side with that, across the track from it, in due course, came another industry which was allied to it, which utilized the by-products of the first industry established. Down the road, not far from it came the machine plant. Then less than a mile from that the battery plant.

Now these industries have started, and from the day that they started up until today who has said a good word about them? They are the investments made by this Government of the public money of this country, invested with the object of creating earning power for our people, an earning power which heretofore did not exist, a source of sustenance which was not available during the dark history of Newfoundland. Today the birch mill employs two hundred people and it is not yet in full capacity. The hardboards plant employs, directly, two hundred people. But apart from that they provide an earning capacity to other people who supply raw wood, 6,000 cords per annum from farmers' lots within the area. I am not certain of how many persons the battery plant employs. I think it is somewhere in the vicinity of forty or fifty. Its entire production, I understand, has been taken care of. Whilst the birch mill has gone through its growing pains, whilst it was the thought of a Newfoundlanders, no doubt there were errors and mistakes somewhere along the line, and that same individual who is no personal friend of mine, but I think he is a man to whom great credit is due for having put the birch plant at Dono-

vans, I refer to Mr. Chester Dawc. A lot of things have been said about him both within and without this House. I have no brief for him. I know nothing about the gentleman except he is a Newfoundlander. As one who represents the District of Harbour Main I will say this in justice to him; without his initiative and foresight coupled with the courage of the Premier we would not have the birch plant at Donovans, which is an asset to Newfoundland even if it takes ten years before it gets in the black.

Now we come up the bay to the rubber plant. I have a soft spot in my heart for the rubber plant. I go along with a lot of people and even with my honourable friends on the other side that things are not as they ought to be with the rubber plant. But it is not because things are not as they should be at the moment that the rubber plant should be condemned, hook, line and sinker by honourable members in this House and not alone in this House but outside this House in the columns of the daily newspapers and everywhere else, over the radio and through every media of public expression that is available.

The rubber plant, and I direct, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, a comment I am about to make particularly to my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition — The rubber plant is a plant that should commend itself to Newfoundlanders. There is in this Province alone a substantial market, Mr. Speaker, for the products of that plant. I grant you that there is not a market for an inferior product, but given the proper workmanship, given the proper management, given the proper directive, and in due course the rubber plant can serve a real economic need to Newfoundland. But apart from that — and what strikes

me most forcibly is this, Mr. Speaker — at the moment, having regard to all that has been said about it — the rubber plant employs seventy people on its payroll, apart from the fact that there are only about five or six Germans there — I don't know how many — I have not gone too closely into the matter — I keep clear of those things — I know this, from Donovans to Holyrood, that in Holyrood the impact of the rubber plant has been found and our people are benefiting as a result. Now I want to say this: One would think that under ordinary circumstances that a product like that, having regard to the needs of the people and the consumption of rubber and rubber boots in the Province, it would at least have the sympathy of some of those who are most directly concerned with the distribution of rubber footwear in Newfoundland. But what has been the history? Only a matter of a few months ago one of the largest distributors of rubber footwear in this country took advantage of a small group and displayed in his window in town and showed as a product of Superior Rubber Company, footwear of an inferior quality. What was the idea? The idea, Mr. Speaker, was to destroy it and say to Newfoundlanders: 'Is this what you are to buy? You won't want to trade in that.'

This plant is financed by public funds. This plant is operated by Newfoundlanders who have been placed on the payroll and who did not have any training in the manufacture of rubber wear. It is a fact which I think must be accepted that every plant of that nature must go through its growing pains. I am not going to stand up here and say that a defective product did not come out of that plant, unfortunately it did. But in due course these things would be rectified.

In due course, please God, the products of that plant will find a proper and perhaps a sympathetic market in Newfoundland. But how much more difficult is it going to be to get a plant like that operating and on its feet if one of the great wholesalers on Water Street, the great distributors in Newfoundland, will deliberately place in his window an inferior product with the object of discrediting the plant and all its connections. If that is not a travesty I would like to know what it is. I would like to know where such a thing could happen except in Newfoundland. I have never heard of it. I think it is dastardly. I think it should be condemned from the house-tops. Nevertheless, in spite of that, in due course that plant will get on its feet. The management there up to the moment has not been what it ought to be, but in due course that will be rectified. And it will not be necessary to appoint a Royal Commission to do so.

I may say this, I have heard talk here about a gentleman who was supposed to have made an affidavit. I did not see the affidavit I was not interested. I only saw that gentleman once and that was not through my own choice. I happened to be in Holyrood three Sunday nights ago when I was advised that this gentleman wanted to see me. I did not even know who he was. At any rate he came and he visited me and he advised me that he had been associated with the plant. He told me he was a pattern maker or some such thing as that. He did not tell me anything that had gone on before. I heard afterwards of his being in St. John's making depositions etc. But he did tell me he was going out on the train that night or on the following night. He was going back to Canada. He had been employed by

one of the rubber companies on the Mainland. He told me that Mr. Pushie, the Director of Economic Development, had advised him that his services were no longer required. He told me his history. He said he was the only pattern maker in the plant. He seemed to be anxious to continue. He said he had come to see me to know if he could be reinstated. I asked him what goes on? He told me the story about himself and Mr. Dehahn. He said Dehahn know nothing about making rubber, but that a new gentleman a Canadian Mainlander had been appointed, who was a good rubber maker, and he said he would like to be reinstated as a pattern maker under that man.

I said: "Is there anything wrong with the plant?" He said: "No, there is nothing wrong with the plant, it is a good plant. The only thing wrong is the manager, Dehahn. He knows nothing about rubber." I called Mr. Pushie the following day, in my office, and told him what had been said. I asked him, if that man is a key-man in that plant should you let him go? He told me, yes, he is a trouble-maker, he is an agitator. Let him go. We will get on without him. That is the position, Mr. Speaker. In regard to Mr. Grube I don't know the facts.

I just want to say this before closing: I have had a little bit of experience in my time with plants, industrial plants. Side by side with the rubber plant, in Holyrood tonight there is a cold storage plant, the first cold storage plant that was built in Newfoundland. It was not built as a fish processing plant, it was built as a bait freezing plant, and I was associated with it. Four of us built it in 1929, I think it was, or in 1930. For five straight years, Mr. Speaker, that plant, which was built on the doorstep of the greatest squid pro-

ducing grounds in this country or in North America, failed to function properly. But when it got over its growing pains it proved itself. Without wearying the House I would like to tell a little story about it: One day I was in Burin, (the native town of my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition) a short time after that plant was in operation but before even it started to make its way, a man for whom I have had and still have the greatest regard though he is dead now, a forebear of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and would understand the language I am talking now, came to me (we were friends, he had been a friend of my father's, they sailed together, the late Captain Tom Hollett, one of the greatest Newfoundlanders this country ever saw), he said to me — "Son," he said, "You have a bait plant down in Holyrood, how did you get it?" I told him how we got it. He said: "I wish we had one in Burin," I said: "You will get it, Captain Hollett." He said: "Do you think so?" I said: "Yes, you will get it because you are a man of vision." Like the Premier of this country, he was a man of guts. You could not stop Tom Hollett when he decided to do a thing, he did it. He built Burin. It is a monument to him. However, he lived to see the day not long after when I was sitting in this House and had the pleasure and privilege of supporting a piece of legislation that came here to endorse the building of a bait plant at Burin. Now my honourable friend on the other side will know the history of that. What Tom Hollett started as a cornerstone today is the greatest fresh fish producing centre on the North Atlantic. True you could tell me Tom Hollett did not do it. No. But he showed the world where and how it should be done. On this

foundation, a little fish plant we put in Holyrood in 1939, today Arthur Montre has expanded and built the greatest processing plant in all North America, and last year expanded it to twice its size, I am not able to say, but if I could show, Mr. Speaker, in this House tonight the figures, the wages that were paid last year in Holyrood for squids and blueberries processed in that plant you would be astounded. Now I only cite that, Sir, as an example of what could be done and what can be done.

Give the rubber plant a chance! Give the local industries a chance, and let us forget this policy of slandering ourselves. My honourable friends on the opposite side of the House are men of honour, they are men for whom I have the greatest respect certainly — some of them — they are men who would do justice to the Government of any country. But we say this: "Don't try to crawl into power over the bodies, the dead bodies of people who are trying to do their best for Newfoundland. We are all Newfoundlanders. We are all members of the same crew. We all have one job to do, and that is to try and put Newfoundland on its feet. And remember, Mr. Speaker, if we have anything amongst ourselves let us keep it to ourselves, forget this business of propaganda and publicity. It is the greatest source of evil that can be adopted in relation to Newfoundland. It can do us incalculable harm. We can settle our difficulties in regard to these local industries, we can take out the growing pains without Royal Commissions, without washing our dirty linen, so to speak, for the world."

Let me close, Sir, on this note: Let us be faithful to ourselves and just to our country. Let us do our jobs as we see them, but remember always that

the one who suffers, the one who has to suffer, and who must suffer, as a result of a slanderous propaganda campaign, damaging propaganda, is Newfoundland and its people.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, to associate with my learned friend, the Attorney General, and vote against this amendment for the reasons that I have stated.

On motion the amendment was put and lost.

MR. BROWNE: Divide, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A division has been called. Will those honourable members who support the amendment please stand and resume their seats as called by the Clerk:

Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Browne, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fogwill.

MR. SPEAKER: All those who oppose the amendment stand:

Honourable the Premier, Honourable the Attorney General, Honourable Minister of Public Welfare, Honourable Minister of Education, Honourable Minister of Finance, Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, Honourable Mr. Lewis, Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs, Honourable Minister of Labour, Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, Honourable Minister of Public Works, Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Bntton, Mr. James, Mr. Norman, Mr. Brown, Mr. Canning, Mr. Mercer.

MR. SPEAKER: The ayes have it twenty to four.

On motion the House then recessed for ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The main question is now before the House, the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I think we will all admit that very few of us have had much opportunity to give attention in any great degree to the Speech from the Throne. We have been very busy talking about a certain particular matter which was recently concluded. On this point I would like to say here now how much we on this side of the House did appreciate the speech of the last member of the Government who spoke, the honourable member for Harbour Main.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. HOLLETT: I think it was one of the finest deliveries I have heard the honourable gentleman make since I have the honour of being a member of this House. I want to congratulate him on it and the Government who has managed to secure him a seat on that side of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. HOLLETT: He made a very fine reference to Skipper Tom Hollett—

MR. SPEAKER: I must interrupt and must say, although I regret to do so — No doubt these words are very pleasing to the Government side of the House. However it is not in order to refer to a speech in a previous debate.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, without reference to the previous debate may I say I did at one time know a gentleman who lived in Burin, Skipper Tom, a fisherman. Although I am only a distant relative, may I say, I thought he was one of the finest Newfoundlanders that ever resided in this island home of ours; one of the great-

est fishermen that it was my privilege to meet at any rate. I am very happy to know that my honourable and learned friend from Harbour Main had the pleasure of meeting him and making his acquaintance and I believe knew him very well.

Now I see the first reference, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne, to matters of importance is perhaps the centenary celebrations which are proposed by the Government to be held here in this country, I believe it is in May, 1955. As we all know, this country had the honour of being granted Responsible Government by the Home Government, and most of us know, particularly any of us who sat in the National Convention are pretty familiar with all the history of all the Governments in the hundred years of Responsible Government or at least most of the hundred years that this country enjoyed Responsible Government. I do hope the Government, if they are going to stage a celebration, will put on a good show. Because I am quite sure, Sir that the present Government, which I hope is responsible, have had plenty of practice in putting on shows, and are certainly good at finding the necessary funds to put on such a celebration. Might I suggest in that connection, Mr. Speaker; it might be advisable if they used some of the films that Atlantic Films have produced. I believe the Atlantic Films have produced a series of films for the Government during the past year or so. I would say they might possibly use some of these films to show the people of this country, in the May celebrations of the centenary, what progress we have made, shall I say, in the last one hundred years — or is it just in the past five or six years?

I don't believe anybody on the op-

posite side was present in 1855 when we started under Responsible Government although I know at least one honourable gentleman over there who knows every comma and every semicolon ever since the year 1855. I should think he could probably be a commentator for a film which could describe the first institution of Responsible Government in this country. Here, for instance, I find in the films which have been made by the Atlantic Films and Electronics — "Education in Progress." Mind you these programmes or films have been paid for by the Government, by the Responsible Government on the opposite side — "Education in Progress." That cost us \$14,140. Then there is: "An Old City with a Young Heart." Is that St. John's, I wonder?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: They got that for the small price of \$5,000. I think they should have been a little more liberal with that. There is another one: "The Northeast Coast," a long version costing \$5,415 and a short version at \$3,000. There is also one on "Danish Sealing," I believe I had the pleasure of seeing that one, \$5,220.20. "Progress Report No. 4;" \$5,000. "Need is my Neighbour"—Well, I should think we would have had enough of need in the years of Responsible Government prior to Commission of Government days, and I should think "Need" is no longer our neighbour. I hope nobody in this country has a neighbour in need.

DR. POTTLE: The honourable member defines "need" altogether too narrowly — We are all in need, of some sort.

MR. HOLLETT: I have not given the word any definition — But give

the word any definition it deserves, Mr. Speaker — as a matter of fact this can be described with all sorts of shapes and colours of a paint brush — Only recently we did some whitewashing on various matters, and I compliment some of the honourable members on the opposite side for doing an excellent job, which they did, of whitewashing. It is not everybody can do whitewashing as well as has been done by some of the honourable members opposite. "Five years of Confederation" — I bet that was a good one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not made yet.

MR. HOLLETT: Why is it paid.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not paid.

MR. HOLLETT: Titles of films and amounts paid —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, it is — I suspect it is.

MR. HOLLETT: I suspect it is, or they would not be able to produce it. To produce a film of that kind would take some advances—At any rate "Five Years of Confederation" cost \$74,000 — if that was all it cost us \$74,000 — What has it cost us, sir, to keep this country going at the rate it is going now as an associate of the other nine Provinces of Canada — The cost, I hope never becomes prohibitive.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend, Confederation does not cost it pays — like advertising.

MR. HOLLETT: "Five Years of Confederation" \$74,000 — Cheap I would say, Sir. Confederation to date has cost us a surplus of \$40,000,000 plus \$22,000,000 loans. I won't say Confederation cost us that, I think that would be unkind. As a matter of

fact I will be honest about the thing right here now — I don't intend to devote my time to it — but there are plenty of benefits that have come to this country as a result of our Union with Canada. I do hope there will be more, and I will come to another matter later, where I hope Union with Canada will bring some measure of help to our fishermen by way of Unemployment Insurance — Well, I want to see that picture when it is finished. "Bridge Building in Newfoundland", I would recommend that the Honourable Minister of Public Works have a look at that. That cost five thousand dollars. "Development of a Community" \$21,395. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have a film already of the development of a community at La Scie which has cost \$21,395 — and I am informed that there is yet no development whatsoever taking place — Perhaps some honourable member could tell me whether I am misinformed. I am just wondering what this film will show. — "LaScie — Development of a Community" — Oh my, Mr. Speaker, when that LaScie is built up the way it is going to be built up under the Fisheries Development Authority, which incidentally costs \$75,000 in salaries a year — At that time how much indeed will this film cost? It has cost \$21,395 now, and I don't suppose there has been a nail driven. "Agriculture in Newfoundland" \$7,340. That would buy a lot of spuds. "You Are Welcome" — Who? Are we welcome? \$25,000 — "Health is Wealth" \$16,387 — I suspect the Honourable Minister of Health or the Honourable Minister of Welfare, one of them had something to do with that. "Local Government" \$10,284. — I am quite sure there is no film made of any place in Bonavista Area —

I suggest that some of these be shown at the Centenary Celebrations which the Government, in the Speech from the Throne said are likely to be staged here in May.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I interrupt my honourable friend — We have not thought of having any particular celebrations of that nature that will occur on any particular day — We have not that thought in mind.

MR. HOLLETT: It would be a good idea, I submit, Mr. Speaker, if the day had been named — we would have known at least that certain things were not going to happen on that date.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend is surely not worrying about an election — He must be looking forward with great eagerness.

MR. HOLLETT: We might go trouting or somewhere on that particular day.

Speaking about elections — I don't know where we are going to find any funds for elections this year after paying for all these films. Why not take a year off and take a look at the films and maybe our friends will better know how to vote.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend would like that — wait a year — We don't have to have it until the Spring of 1957 — we don't have to.

MR. HOLLETT: I suggest it would be advisable to wait until these films are ready to show around the country.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And a few more films besides.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not suggesting now that these be used for propaganda purposes at all — But I do

admire the spirit of the Government who wanted to show what a lovely country this has become since we got back our "Responsible Government" — I put it that was because we lost it, you know, for some years. Mr. Speaker, while I am on that subject — Why did we lose Responsible Government? We lost it because we went so much in the hole, in debt, that the bond holders began to foreclose, in a sense. We could not raise any more money. We were bankrupt, \$160,000,000. I think that was why we lost our Responsible Government. As a matter of fact it is quite simple — that is how we all lose our responsible government, self-government, of our own personal selves. When we cannot back up cheques, cannot meet bonds if they come due and cannot pay our bills we lose our responsibility. That is what happened to this country away back in 1932-33. I must put in here again, sir, when we went into Confederation our national debt was four million and has gone from four million up to twenty-six million dollars, and I strongly suspect that this Government, who are very liberal in the amounts of money which they pay out, are going to have to make another appeal to the people who have money to lend. From four millions up to twenty-six millions in five years. That is racing up towards the one hundred and sixty millions, which lost us our Responsible Government a short time ago.

At any rate we shall all be present at the centenary celebrations.

Now I see the next paragraph is devoted to Jamaica. I was rather startled on that day when His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor started to read the Speech from the Throne. As you know, he started out with the centenary celebrations and immediately

jumped from that to Jamaica. I know the Honourable the Premier can fly down there in a few hours — In one paragraph, sir, we were taken right from 1855 right down to Jamaica. I am inclined to think there are some gentlemen on the opposite side who are very fond of Jamaica. The trips down there, at least for some of the members on the Government side are becoming a bit frequent. I can say that we on this side of the House and I am quite sure the general public are glad when this House is open and they can all rush back to their native habitat and talk about finance and this, that and the other thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Jealousy is not going to get the honourable gentleman anywhere.

MR. HOLLETT: It is a lovely place down there, there is no question about it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, there is no question about it.

MR. HOLLETT: Sunshine?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Every day.

MR. HOLLETT: Marvellous — a good spot for drying fish. I understand the Honourable the Premier on his last visit to Jamaica discovered the sunshine down there would dry fish and probably much better than we do it here. But I think that is a questionable affair. I had to spread fish on flakes and beaches when a youngster and any hot day my parents would not have any fish spread on the beaches, as on a hot day it would get sunburned. I am afraid the Honourable the Premier must have gotten sunburned when down there — I am glad he did not get sunstruck.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, Jamaica brings me along to the fisheries. And

the fisheries, Mr. Speaker I maintain at this juncture, particularly in our first five or six years resumption of Responsible Government, ought to be uppermost in the minds of every man in this House, and of every man and woman in the country. As I visualized the country in my boyhood days, there was St. John's, the Capital City. It was a place that all us youngsters in the outports wanted some day to go in and see. But they had beautiful little fishing settlements, sir, all around the coast. Each fishing settlement had its little church, its little school, and the people were law-abiding and God-fearing, there was the occasional sinner, of course. They were very fine people, sir, in those days that made up these fishing settlements. And of course the fishing settlements were there because there were fishermen there and because there were fish outside the head for the fishermen to catch and market at a price. There were dull times, there were poor times, and occasionally there were very poor times, but I have never seen them as poor as the Premier has described, when a man got one suit of clothes, and probably borrowed that from his dead parent or something like that. Oh no, they were dressed better than than in these days, and I think in most cases they were fairly well fed. There were times and there were parts of the country where conditions were bad, but all along the coast, and particularly along the northeast coast there were settlements where the fishermen lived and moved and had their being and came into St. John's in the fall of the year and got their winter's grub and went back. That day is unquestionably gone. But the settlements are still there, most of them. Is there any man, any honourable member in

this House who can visualize the absolute dying out of these fishing settlements where nobody would reside, a dead northeast coast or a dead southwest coast? It is a pretty grim picture. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that unless we, unless this Government and the Government of Canada can shortly do something which will be of great benefit to our fishermen, there is a grim danger that our people will, as one of the honourable members opposite has recently said, there will be a lot of our people, particularly in the fishing settlements leaving the country, which indeed they love better than any other country in the world. Now I am wondering how long it is going to take before they do leave these communities, unless something is done.

We are a Province of a great Dominion. True we have only just come into the Dominion, but we are a Province, a tenth Province, and the great Dominion of Canada surely can do much to help our fishermen market the fish which they catch around our shores. I have here an item from one of the daily papers. It is dated 28th February, 1955—It is from Grand Bank—"The economic situation in certain sections of the south coast is grim and comparable with the darkest day of the dole. An official advises, having made a tour of the area, at Rose Blanche about 85% of the residents are on Government relief while in certain sections of Fortune Bay the situation is become so bad due to the failure of the herring fishery. At Rose Blanche the fishermen complained they could not sell the fish they produced so had to take it to North Sydney for sale where the demand was unlimited, while the Newfoundland plants take only limited quantities. Meanwhile

at Port aux Basques it is reported considerable employment is available."

Now, sir, I note a reference here in this Speech to the prosperity of this country — "The remarkable prosperity of recent years continues to bless our province and people, so far from showing signs of slowing down this prosperity gives every evidence of still more growth and vitality in the year upon which we have entered. My Ministers are fully convinced this prosperity must be fostered in the main by private enterprise..." I will come to that later. Sir, when we heard that and then reading this clipping from a recent date, February 28, it just does not make sense at all. Unfortunately, sir, that condition there has prevailed during the past winter as it has in various other centres around our fishing coast. Now I am not blaming the Government for that. I am not blaming Union with Canada for that. But I do say it is something which we have to take to heart most seriously. Something has to be done. I submit that greater effort has to be put forth by this, our own Provincial Government, and by the Federal Government, to put, in the several months of the year when nobody can fish, something which can take up the slack. It is not possible in this day and age, Mr. Speaker, for any man to work either at fishing or at anything else for six or seven or eight months of the year and then have an earning power or ability during the remaining months. Now the miner who goes down in the mine or the woodsman who goes into the forests, if he is laid off he gets what is called Unemployment Insurance. It is a great blessing. It is a God-send. It means all the difference between prosperity and the lack of it. But our fishermen — take on the northeast coast, sir, they fish six or

seven or perhaps eight months and then during the rest of the year they have to lie on their oars, so to speak, with no income whatsoever coming in to the family. I say, sir, that should be one of the prime objects of any provincial government in this land, to insist from the parent government, from the Federal Government, that some form of fishery unemployment insurance be brought into being as quickly as possible. Otherwise you will have that situation come into being which I have described of the fishermen in this country, in this cove, and that cove and the other cove, leaving the country altogether. And as there is not too much employment anywhere in the country today — as a matter of fact — unfortunately we were told the other day that there are twenty thousand people out of work. There are the ordinary workmen who go to work in industry, they are not the fishermen at all. So that the fishermen who are half starving in some of the coves around the island — it is no use for them to leave Ramea, if you like, and go to an industrial area in Newfoundland where there is still unemployment, they have to leave the country altogether. That is not what any of us desire, and not what any of us dreamed, sir, and not what any of us were told and promised in those days not so far away — I am quite sure the government or any government in this Province will endeavour to their utmost to bring about that situation whereby our fishermen can have at least a decent living in this Tenth Province.

I don't know if I should say anything on the "Terms of Union". I will say this without fear or favour or affectation — A clause similar to that which I just described in regard to unemployment insurance for fish-

ermen should have been put in the Terms of Union at the time we made an entry, were taken into Union with Canada. It could have been done. I can assure this House that Canada, the Mainland, wanted us so badly that they would have been quite happy to put that in. Now I won't blame the Government or blame the Premier or anyone for not putting it in, because I know a lot of study would have had to take place. I do hope, however, that this Commission which is being set up under the able chairmanship of the honourable member for Harbour Main will in some way or another fight that battle when they bring the conditions in this country before the Royal Commission.

The Speech from the Throne speaks of the public services. I said last year, as I say now, great credit is due several of the departments of Government for the manner in which they have gone about endeavouring to bring the public services in this country up to or near the standard of some of the other provinces. But, as is admitted here, not nearly enough is done yet. Great credit is due, I say — I have certain dealings, of course, with people in my own districts which I have the honour to represent, and I too see instances where people have been benefited greatly by such things as Mother's Allowances and Sick Children's Allowances and Cripples Allowances and that sort of thing. I want to compliment the Ministers in charge of these departments and I want to thank them now for the courtesy which they have shown me on any occasion when I have brought to their notice such cases — but we must not think, mind you, — I will give you a case in point — I had a letter the other day, it was from the honourable, the Pre-

mir's district, strange as it may seem — I don't know what happened —

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are several Tories in my district. There must be a couple of dozen or more.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, this widow did not say whether she was a Tory or whether she was a Liberal. I strongly suspect that she would not even know what the word "Tory" meant, because the woman was not brought up on that terminology. But she described to me her conditions — I am only quoting those conditions to show some of the Honourable Ministers it is not sufficient to give a widow with two children \$25 a month.

DR. POTTLE: That is not the scale, sir.

MR. HOLLETT: It is the scale, it says it is.

DR. POTTLE: That is not the scale.

MR. HOLLETT: It is the scale for this widow.

DR. POTTLE: Not for a widow qualifying under the Mothers' Allowance Act with two children under seventeen.

MR. HOLLETT: Anyway, there may be something else — She got \$25 a month and described to me what she did buy with that — Now it is granted that the two children had the family allowance. But I think everyone knows that today it won't go much further than a pair of boot laces not to talk about the boots. She got \$25 and divided it into three lots and described to me what she bought for her share. I have that here somewhere — I just forget the amount.

DR. POTTLE, Excuse me, Mr.

Speaker, the gazetted copy of the Mothers' Allowance scales was laid on the table.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that a new allowance.

MR. HIGGINS: No — Gazetted in Angst.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it this woman received none of that yet. I have no reason to believe she told me something wrong. She told me she got \$25 for herself and her two children. She bought for herself — 1 lb. of tea, 1 lb. of coffee, 5 lbs of sugar and three or four other items which made up the balance. When I look at that, — she was given flour by a married son — but as I looked at that I thought what a condition that poor woman must be in with these two children, two small children. I merely cite that to show — Could the honourable gentlemen tell me what a woman with two children of family allowance age gets?

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, the minimum remuneration for a woman with two children begins at \$30 a month, and there are supplements of varying degree in addition, depending upon the circumstances. These amounts make up anywhere from ten to thirty dollars a month depending on the circumstances. These allowances, I may say, Mr. Speaker, are uniform and consistent for the province. So that if a mother with two children is getting only \$25 a month there must be certain extenuating circumstances such as income or other factors involved, which cut the allowance down to \$25 a month. All the facts are not there.

MR. HOLLETT: I am glad, I raised it for that purpose. If that lady is in hearing of the radio she will

probably find out she is not getting enough, probably as she is in the Premier's district he would not like her to think that. But I got her letter and I hope this thing would be published. There are some people that even yet do not know exactly what they are entitled to.

DR. POTTLE: If I may interrupt again — It does not depend on whether they know or not the welfare officer in the district has instructions and manuals of instructions in very great detail to what or what not he may recommend to the board concerned.

MR. HOLLETT: I see. Probably the welfare officer has not gotten around to that case yet. At any rate I do hope that the public services in this country will be raised to a standard even higher than some of the other provinces. I don't think it could be higher, but I do hope it will be higher than it is at the present time.

Now the next paragraph, Mr. Speaker in the Speech from the Throne, is devoted to matters of self-government. The Government, it says is continuing to pursue its policy of extending and strengthening local self-government. Five new municipalities have been incorporated since we last met, bringing up to 53 the number of town councils, rural district councils and community councils now in operation in the province.

Now I am quite sure there is no town council or municipal council in Bonavista. There is one thing though on that point which I am worried about. I noticed the other day in the Doyles News Bulletin, and I don't know how many others had a full page of news. The news consisted of a Government release from the Premier's office stating that a certain

town council in St. Anthony, I believe, wired and asked him to come down and be their representative in the House of Assembly in the next general election. That was followed by statements of other municipal councils wiring in and town councils wiring in and asking the Honourable the Premier to do the same thing. Now I think it would be nice if the Honourable the Premier had suggested to these town councils that perhaps it was not the right thing to do. Or may I suggest to the Honourable the Premier that for the sake of politics it is not wise to use municipal councils and town councils and what not. There should be no politics with regard to town councils and no politics with regard to municipal councils — I mean there should be no provincial politics. I think it was very unwise on somebody's part to bring that matter of municipal and town councils into a request for a man to become a member of the district, a candidate in the next general election.

BUT I am glad now to see these town councils are on the increase anyway. I don't know that I am so glad or happy over it in some cases. I am quite sure the people in certain areas are not quite ready yet for municipal councils. The more they come under it, I take it, the more they are getting ready to get to their destination to which they are bound to come under Union with Canada.

Housing: Again I believe the Government is doing something about housing. I can only say I do hope they can use more of the money which is taken from the peoples' pockets in helping to build sanitary homes for some of our people who even today find it difficult or almost impossible to build new homes.

Then the Speech from the Throne devotes a very small paragraph to the matter of tourist development. When I saw that there I came to the conclusion that therein lies the reason for the many trips abroad of our Cabinet Ministers. I suppose they were away finding out all they could about how tourism is handled in other countries, and now there would be set up such lavish spots as they found down in Jamaica and over in Switzerland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mind the green-eyed monster.

MR. HOLLETT: Austria. By the way are there any tourists going to Austria at the moment besides the Honourable the Premier?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Lots.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder that they would be allowed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not make any difference about the Iron Curtain. In Austria the curtain is very thin, it is not like the curtain separating East Germany from the West.

MR. HOLLETT: Well I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in this matter of tourism — You remember, sir, for about three years or four since we joined the Dominion of Canada we were going to have a road through this country, the Trans-Canada Highway connecting St. John's with Port aux Basques, and there would be a palatial boat waiting in Port aux Basques to take us, after we drove through the country, across to the Mainland. The boat was built. It was all ready some time ago. But somebody suggested that she not be put on the gulf yet because the road, the Trans-Canada Highway is not com-

pleted. At any rate we have been promised time after time — it is going to be finished this year — next year and so on.

MR. SPENCER: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker: It has not been promised as far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, in this Province, which handles the highroad. It has definitely not been promised that the highroad would be finished to Port aux Basques year after year, as the honourable gentleman said. I would point out for the information of the honourable gentleman that the contract with the Federal Government that the highway be completed between St. John's and Port aux Basques was by September 1956. That is the specific contract.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could assure us it will be finished on that date?

MR. SPENCER: I regret I am not in a position to say when it will be done. The weatherman does not always permit us to work as we like.

MR. HOLLETT: At any rate that road has been promised us, and it is being sung from the housetops all around the country year after year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It will be built.

MR. HOLLETT: And it will be ready — I am quite sure, I am almost definite it was said it would be ready by the time the ferry was built to take the people across the Gulf. But now in this Speech from the Throne I find that the Government has apparently abandoned the Trans-Canada Highway — not altogether perhaps — But it is pointed out here that the Trans-Canada Highway will be built — it is progressing and so on — But you

must remember that there are other roads besides the Trans-Canada Highway. I just can't find the note here now, but the policy apparently is to start building more local roads, for they say, what is the sense of completing the Trans-Canada Highway unless you have roads from all the various little arteries running in from the sea to the main highway. I think there is some sense in that. But I could point out that in my opinion there has not yet been any proper overall road policy in this country. I don't see any signs of an overall road policy. One day we are stressing some particular section of highway and another day we are stressing some particular area through which the Trans-Canada Highway will go. Some other times we are building a road, one and one-tenth miles in Grand Falls at a cost of \$165,000 — so it goes on. If somebody cries out for a road in some particular area of the country and demands a road the answer is — Yes indeed, we will give you a road. And in a good many cases a road is put there. There is no general overall policy with a certain amount of money allocated definitely for a certain road. I submit that in making that statement which is pretty nearly correct.

Now I want to say that the question of roads is a big one, it is a costly one. One of the most expensive departments of government to handle. I feel quite sure the Honourable Minister of Public Works is doing justice to that—I know he is—I can speak for the fact that he is and has an excellent staff, probably not as large as he would want. I do know that there has not been enough moneys allocated for the many purposes and roads which are needed. There are many places in which roads are needed. In spite of all that I return to the statement I

made: There is no general overall policy to which the Government can stick and carry out. I am not blaming the Minister. I can only blame the Government. I am quite sure, if the Honourable Minister were given the money he would do the job, because he has the experience and he has the staff. May I say right here, Mr. Speaker, or he has a staff here in St. John's up here in the west end hardwood shed, a staff as good as any part of Canada. They do a good job during the winter in snow clearing etc. I have nothing against the Department of Public Works at all, altogether I have something against the Government. The Government is not allocating the amount of money it should for road building. They have put this money into other ventures, Mr. Speaker, which could well have been left alone until they had done a little better job on roads. We all know where that money has gone. My contention is that a lot of that money should have gone into the building of new and better roads.

There is something here about an airstrip being built. I don't know if that is of great importance. It says here, it will serve the interest of tourists as well as other people. I was on tourists when I left that subject for roads — Mr. Speaker, we are allocating every year a certain amount of money to this business of tourism, and for the life of me I cannot see what is being done. Is there anybody in this House who can show me anything that has been done in the way of tourism? We know the highroad is not built. That is not the job of the Tourist Department. But what has been done by the way of tourism in this country? Where can tourists go in this country if they come in? What is there for them to do? Are

here any lodges, or many lodges to take care of tourists who come in here? I ask again what is being done in tourist development? The allocation last year for expenditures was \$89,900, the year before there was spent \$79,000 and this year the allocation is \$89,000. I strongly suspect that when we get the exact amount which has been spent on tourism or on tourist development in this country it will be well over a hundred thousand dollars. That has been going on practically every year during the lifetime of Responsible Government, since we got it back, and what have we got? What have we got to offer tourists? I maintain, sir, the present set up in the Tourist Department is merely a sinccure. I have nothing against the Tourist Director whatsoever nor anybody in his department, but I do say that we are at the moment wasting a lot of money. I have yet to see any overall plan for the Tourist Department. There was a time I think when an attempt was almost made to keep us from going fishing in certain streams and salmon rivers. I do think that if tourists can come in here and enjoy themselves, then there are a lot of Newfoundlanders going to try and enjoy themselves as well. But since our Cabinet Ministers have gone spending their time gallivanting to this capital and that capital —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't forget Jamaica.

MR. HOLLETT: No, sir, Jamaica is only small stuff. The new industries have not started to roll in on account of that trip. There will be something to come in on account of that trip I guarantee you, so far as I can see — the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Economic Development and somebody else —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Pushie.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you very much! They travelled all across the world, not only to Europe but they came back too. But was anybody in this country informed? When they came back did they tell us what their mission was? Have they told this House yet why they spent thousands of dollars on that trip, gallivanting across Europe. Well, if they did tell us they were trying to work out some tourist programme for Newfoundland, that, at least would be something.

The Honourable the Premier spoke of Jamaica. He told us something again today, I believe they had a glorious holiday down there. I can see him down there now, stripped off in shorts, with dark glasses and his feet stuck in the sand, and the Attorney General with him or somebody — They are having a grand holiday but suddenly somebody passing by mentioned the fact they should have a bit of salt fish or something like that, anyway the Premier thought he heard something beneficial to our fishermen, and he was no sooner back here when he calls them all around and gets the helicopter working and takes one man from Bonavista, I believe it was Mr. Hazen Russel. He sends a helicopter up to Ramea, I think, for Mr. Lake and somewhere else for someone else. He calls Mr. Chceseman and off they go to Jamaica again, the Minister of Fisheries, the Premier and these four gentlemen — They go down there on a business trip, a mysterious trip. Nobody knew what it was for. But the Premier comes back and says — When I was down there on my holiday I heard something which I thought beneficial to our fishermen, so I instantly wanted to tell the people of Newfoundland, but was afraid they would not believe me — Can you

imagine the Honourable the Premier making a statement like that — afraid the people would not believe him.

MR. COURAGE: Let us have a Royal Commission on it.

MR. HOLLETT: So he took four gentlemen down there. Not one of them told us yet what they saw down there. Nobody knows what they saw. The Honourable the Premier told us that there was going to be a union of all the islands in the Caribbean and that there were fifty million people down there, and they could eat a lot of fish. There is no doubt they could. I take it what they are going to do is that these men are going to form a group or something and ship salt fish down there as soon as the federation is completed. It must be remembered we have been shipping fish down there long before the Premier or I were thought of. I believe it was in 1947 or 1948 that we sent about six million dollars worth of fish down there. But the point I want to make is this: Who definitely, actually controls the marketing of fish now — we have it all here, the work of the recently appointed Fishery Development Authority, which is now beginning to take definite shape and direction — that is after a year — they were going to start last year, they were set up and had already received several months pay. Now we are told they will start this year and launch the projects laid before us last year.

Now then, we were told last year that NAFEL would be given another short period, a short breathing space of two or three years, I believe. But the actual marketing of fish, the handling of the marketing at any rate, to foreign countries has been passed over to Honourable Mr. Howe, and would be no longer the Government's job

but the job of the Honourable Minister, Mr. Howe, on the Mainland, of the Federal Government. They would look after everything. They would arrange the exchange and everything. Now then, first there was NAFEL then Mr. Howe. How, therefore, I ask, could the Honourable the Premier with the Minister of Fisheries and four fish merchants here in Newfoundland, how could they as a group go down to the Caribbean or to Jamaica or wherever they went and make an arrangement down there in regard to the marketing of our fish? I would like the Honourable the Premier sometime to explain that to us.

The Speech from the Throne said: "My Ministers are hopeful that private enterprise will take careful note of these projects and will be quick to emulate them if they prove to be technologically economically sound." Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a Fishery Authority. Last year we gave them three million dollars. The Federal Government to chip in, building all sorts of public works, shipways and docks and in refrigerator and other buildings, and the Fishery Authority can go ahead and help the fishermen in that particular area to cure the fish for market. But they are advised now at least private enterprise is now advised that they must emulate this plan. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what private enterprise is going to try to compete with a subsidized industry of that nature? I maintain, Sir, although I do believe some help should be given to certain individuals in Newfoundland in the fishery business, I do maintain that setting up big firms and giving them five million dollar loans is driving out of the fishery other fish merchants who are undoubtedly equally as well qualified to carry on the fishery business as are these men to

whom huge loans have been given. This Government is setting up a group of monopolists in this country, and making the little man, making it impossible for the little man to operate in the fishery business. I think the Government ought to give some consideration to that. For instance, the group that went down to Jamaica the other day with the Premier. I have nothing against any of them at all — one of these men already had a loan of four or five million dollars for the fisheries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How much?

MR. HOLLETT: I said four or five — I believe it is around five million. I think one has four millions — He did not go, that is right — He has two millions, the other man did go.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The biggest amount is 3.6 millions. That is Fishery Products Limited.

MR. HOLLETT: One of the principal ones went. One had two million dollars another had four hundred and fifty thousand and the other one, I believe had about three quarters of a million dollars altogether. What the other one had I just forget. But I say, these are men who already are being helped by the Government, subsidized in that they have been given loans by the Government. There are other fish merchants here in St. John's and around the coast of our island who are unable to secure such loans and consequently, in my opinion, will never be able to compete with this group who are being allocated this huge amount of money. I have no objection to helping these men whatsoever. I think the Government ought to be a little more careful and not put all their eggs in one or two or half

a dozen baskets. One begins to wonder at times who actually is in charge of the policy with regard to the fisheries. I do hope that the Federal Government and the Provincial Government, the Fisheries Authority and all will get together and that they will settle on one policy which will redound to the benefit of the fishermen around our country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I had better carry on until 11:00 o'clock — I might think of something.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman did not mean that.

MR. HOLLETT: I wanted you to have a laugh. I have not heard you laugh for a while.

Now there is some mention in the Speech from the Throne relative to the Iron Ore Company of Canada who have started to produce and export from Labrador. That is all to the good. There is some mention also of the activity of Javelin in Wabush Lake area. I am, I must say a bit concerned about that. First, in that particular area a huge concession has been given Mr. Doyle who was a promoter of that. He seems to me to be a bit of a mystery man. He has wandered around the universe and turned up in New York one day and in Montreal another and then I think he comes into St. John's every once in a while, and he is connected with NALCO. NALCO, as we all know is a corporation which has been given control of practically twenty-five thousand miles of territory and they have the right to grant leases and licenses, etc. to various companies. They were almost bought out last year by Mr. Doyle. I heard of a fantastic arrangement whereby he was going to buy out NALCO with some seven million five

hundred thousand dollars. I think he actually paid some six hundred and fifty thousand dollars. That was not last year, I think it was the year before. Then he did get into some little difficulty and put the most fantastic scheme up to the other directors of NALCO. I am glad it did not go through. At any rate I do hope this chap will be able to make good in this particular area there, and that their stock will go up and eventually some benefit will come to this country from the iron ore which they have discovered there.

Now my honourable and learned friend on my right here, I believe, raised the point of United Towns application on electric current to our people around the bay, Blackhead Road and various other places, the other day. Since that time various petitions have come in and I am not quite clear yet as to just what the attitude of the Government is towards it. I see by today's paper that—Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General has nothing better to do than laugh and talk with people on his left it is not only disconcerting but rather discouraging.

MR. CURTIS: Actually, Mr. Speaker, I was going to suggest we call it 11:00 o'clock.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, you may do so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman should have seen his own colleague on his right reading busily and not listening at all.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am so used to having insults hurled across this table here in the past two years—

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest we should not spoil this sweetness and

light by now having a squabble at this time.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the thought in my mind, Mr. Speaker I should like to go to bed with a peaceful mind for once. Mr. Speaker, do you wish to call it 11:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable gentleman wishes, I am prepared to call it 11:00 o'clock. Quite often members who speak are being distracted by the conversation of other members. I am afraid there is nothing to be done about that. Members may converse provided they do so in undertones.

It being now 11:00 of the clock, by Standing Order 8 the House is adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 3:00 of the clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION

FRIDAY, April 1, 1955

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. C. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of Musgravetown, Bloomfield and Lethbridge: We the undersigned of Musgravetown, Bloomfield and Lethbridge do hereby petition Her Majesty's Government of Newfoundland on behalf of the public in general for the improvement of the public road through Lethbridge, Musgravetown and Bloomfield, and pray the said road be made wider and the turns and hills be made safer for traffic. In view of the heavy traffic from this and outside we consider the road dangerous. We further ask that the short strip of less than one mile of old road adjoining

the Cabot Highway, known as Goose Arm, be opened to motor traffic as this would shorten the road from Musgravetown to Clarenville by approximately eight miles — This request is signed by some 169 residents. I know the area in question very well, Sir, and have much pleasure in supporting this petition and ask leave to have it placed on the table of the House to be forwarded to the department concerned.

On motion petition tabled for reference to the department concerned.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of the voters of Bonne Bay, the district which you represent in this House. The petition reads thus: We the petitioners of the undersigned residents of Bonne Bay, in the electoral district of St. Barbe in the Province of Newfoundland, do humbly pray the settlements in Bonne Bay and in fact the District of St. Barbe be linked with the road network on the west coast and the railway via Bonne Bay—Deer Lake Highway. During the winter season that portion of road from Deer Lake is clear of snow leaving the settlements to Woody Point, a distance of 85 miles, uncleared. In mild weather the snow melts off the cleared section making it impossible for snowmobiles to get through to Bonne Bay thus isolating us completely. This isolation is inconvenient to travel and delays mail and occasions hardships with sick patients who have to be transferred to Corner Brook and St. John's. It impedes business and employment adversely also insofar as products cannot be shipped out or goods brought in, and employees are delayed from getting to and from employment. Your petitioners request the road from Deer Lake to Woody Point be put on the programme and kept open every year

all through the snow season — This petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by some 410 residents and is also endorsed by yourself. I have much pleasure, on your behalf, in supporting this petition and would like to have it placed on the table of the House to be forwarded to the department concerned.

On motion petition tabled for reference to the department concerned.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the voters of Fairhaven in Placentia Bay. I presume the reason they sent me the petition must be that I am the only politician they know personally, I having visited there in 1953. It is a very inaccessible place. One has to go by motor boat from Long Harbour as there is no road to go by. This petition is signed by some 57 voters of Fairhaven, asking that the road be constructed from Fairhaven to connect with the railway. Fairhaven has about forty people and have only a footpath so that anyone sick has to be brought by stretcher to the road. I ask leave to have the petition placed on the table and sent to the Department of Public Works, and trust the Minister of Public Works will see his way clear to have this matter investigated and find if the prayer of the petition is justified. I trust he will see to it that this road is put in condition.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of 71 residents of Harbour Grace Road in Spaniards Bay. This road, Sir, was originally built solely for horse traffic. It is very narrow in places. Now with the advent of motor traffic and trucks over there the road during the last ten or twelve years has come to be in

a very bad state. I have travelled over that road consistently, Sir, and in fact I was talking to the medical officer this morning. He asked that repairs be done immediately.

It gives me great pleasure, Sir, to add my support to this petition. I ask that it be tabled in the House and referred to the department concerned.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare) : Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table of the House copies of a report on the plan approved by the Government for the assistance of dental students and the expansion of dental services.

Giving Notices of Motion

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Premier) : Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Life and Accident Insurance Licensing Act."

Also on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Fisheries, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Payment of Bounties on the Construction of Fishing Ships."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply) : Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Provision of Building Standards."

Also on tomorrow I will ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Elections Act."

Giving Notice of Questions

MR. BROWNE : To ask the Honourable Minister of Finance to lay upon the table of the House the following information :

- (a) A statement showing the revenue and expenditure on current account for the past fiscal year.
- (b) Was it necessary for the Government to borrow money on current account during the year? If so, give particulars of amount and source of such funds and the balance, if any, outstanding as at March 31, 1955.
- (c) What was the amount collected for the Cancer Tax during the past fiscal year and the previous fiscal year. State the disposition of such funds.
- (d) How many prosecutions were taken for breaches of the Social Security Assessment Act during the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1954 and March 31st, 1955? What was the total amount of revenue received during the past fiscal year from this tax?

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

A statement showing the balance sheet of Nalco for its latest financial year.

Answers to Questions

Question No. 26 — In course of preparation.

Question No. 27 :

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General) : I have the information here, Mr. Speaker. We have purchased from Koch Shoes for the con-

stabulary and for the fire department and for the penitentiary 127 pairs of boots and 137 pairs of shoes.

Newfoundland Constabulary

120 pairs boots @ 10.60 1272.00
9 pairs shoes @ 9.60 86.40

Total—129 pairs at cost of \$1358.40,
including \$10.75 social security assessment tax.

The 9 pairs of shoes were distributed as follows :

3 Head Constables.
4 District Inspectors.
Assistant Chief of Police.
Chief of Police.

The boots were distributed to the other officers and men of the Constabulary.

St. John's Fire Department

94 pairs shoes @ 9.60 929.47,

Question No 29: Answer tabled by Minister of Mines and Resources.

Question :

How many cords of pulpwood were exported from Newfoundland for each year since 1949? Give names of shippers and amount shipped by each shipper. What proportion of the amount shipped in any one year from Crown Land?
Answer :

The information requested is set forth hereunder :—

Year	Exporter	Private and	Crown Lands	Total
		Licensed Lands		
		Cords	Cords	Cords
1949	
1950	Bowater's	25,162	25,162
1951	Bowater's	52,797	52,797
1952	Bowater's	84,581	84,581
1953	Bowater's	66,265	4,520	70,785
	Labrador Development Co. Ltd	1,415	1,415
1954	Bowater's	72,723	3,667	76,390
		<u>302,945 cords</u>	<u>8,187 cords</u>	<u>311,130 cords</u>

including \$27.07 social security assessment tax.

These shoes were distributed to the officers and men of the St. John's Fire Department.

H. M. Penitentiary

34 pairs shoes @ 9.60 306.00
7 pairs boots @ 10.60 74.20

Total — 41 pairs at cost of \$391.61,
including \$11.41 social assessment tax.

6 pairs of boots were distributed to the uniformed staff of the Prison Camp, leaving 1 pair on hand.

The shoes were distributed to the uniformed staff at the Penitentiary in St. John's.

Total cost—127 pairs boots
—137 pairs shoes \$2720.23

Question No. 28: In course of preparation.

Question No. 30 —

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): The answer to that question in detail, Mr. Speaker, will have to be prepared by the department. I have knowledge of most of the answers, but perhaps it would not avail anything to give them today, and should wait until I get the regular report from the department.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 6 on the Order Paper of Friday, March 25, asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The answer to subsection 5 is in the statement of Public Accounts. The answer to all the other sub-questions, Mr. Speaker, are here for distribution to the honourable members of the House.

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare in reply to question No. 6 (Mr. Hollett) Order Paper of Friday March 25th 1955:

Information requested by the Hon.

Leader of the Opposition, 24th March, 1955.

Q. "Give the rates per person or per family of Able-bodied Assistance".

A. The following table establishes a scale of basic rates within which Welfare Officers may use their discretion in recommending assistance for unemployed able-bodied persons in need:

No. of Persons		
in family	Minimum	Maximum
1	\$ 5.00	\$15.00
2	10.00	19.00
3	15.00	23.00
4	20.00	27.00
5	25.00	31.00
6	30.00	35.00
7	35.00	39.00
8	40.00	43.00
9	45.00	47.00
10 or more	50.00	51.00

In addition to assistance on the above scale, needy persons may also be provided with fuel, clothing and rental allowance if there is extreme hardship.

Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-

Bodied Relief, by Provincial Electoral Districts, February 1954

District	Sick		Able-Bodied	
	Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
St. John's East				
West	114	2,936	384	10,308
Hr. Main-Bell Island	30	1,016	48	1,538
Port de Grave	26	839	18	578
Harbour Grace	28	806	78	2,129
Carbonear-Bay de Verde	95	2,090	104	2,415
Trinity South	51	1,428	68	2,055
Trinity North	44	957	63	2,127
Bonavista South	40	1,074	30	915
Bonavista North	16	381	20	657
Fogo	41	1,121	112	3,391
Twillingate	29	706	48	1,509
Grand Falls	55	1,251	22	579
Green Bay	40	1,087	30	787
White Bay	43	1,016	211	6,621
St. Barbe	37	1,055	48	1,616
Humber	29	770	11	335
St. George's-Port au Port	51	1,574	—	—
Burgeo-La Poile	32	681	141	4,066
Fortune-Hermitage	80	1,852	204	5,700
Burin	29	739	84	2,939
Placentia West	46	1,594	136	4,888
Placentia-St. Mary's	22	460	37	1,125
Ferryland	34	687	22	644
Totals	1,012	26,120	1,919	56,919

Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-
Bodied Relief, by Provincial Electoral Districts, March, 1954

District	Sick		Able-Bodied	
	Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
St. John's East				
West	72	1,392	384	10,709
Hr. Main-Bell Island	33	1,113	55	1,734
Port de Grave	26	846	20	623
Harbour Grace	34	894	70	1,916
Carbonear-Bay de Verde	99	2,200	101	2,997
Trinity South	53	1,515	84	2,477
Trinity North	50	1,276	93	3,267
Bonavista South	44	1,153	37	1,093
Bonavista North	20	506	37	1,186
Fogo	36	1,028	132	4,151
Twillingate	23	726	32	1,020
Grand Falls	56	1,369	22	635
Green Bay	71	1,920	43	1,423
White Bay	45	1,109	292	9,479
St. Barbe	39	1,116	66	2,286
Humber	33	883	17	520
St. George's—Port au Port	58	1,810	—	—
Burgo La Poile	36	824	119	3,219
Fortune—Hermitage	73	1,902	141	3,752
Burin	36	890	90	3,027
Placentia West	50	1,603	169	6,048
Placentia—St. Mary's	22	444	42	1,345
Ferryland	32	637	31	989
Totals	1,046	27,156	2,077	63,896

Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-
Bodied Relief, by Provincial Electoral Districts, April, 1954

District	Sick		Able-Bodied	
	Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
St. John's East				
West	79	1,268	390	11,408
Hr. Main-Bell Island	40	1,293	68	2,168
Port de Grave	29	944	21	679
Harbour Grace	39	996	79	2,573
Carbonar-Bay de Verde	97	2,173	108	3,361
Trinity South	58	1,559	77	1,801
Trinity North	54	1,383	87	2,876
Bonavista South	48	1,226	35	1,029
Bonavista North	16	405	30	971
Fogo	39	1,077	135	4,180
Twillingate	28	784	27	808
Grand Falls	56	1,370	15	470
Green Bay	39	1,067	45	1,398
White Bay	55	1,319	313	9,796
St. Barhe	42	1,163	82	2,056
Humber	30	735	13	400
St. George's—Port au Port	53	1,569	1	43
Burgeo-La Poile	35	781	102	2,755
Fortune—Hermitage	71	1,542	101	2,912
Burin	43	1,158	70	2,641
Placentia West	52	1,799	166	5,912
Placentia—St. Mary's	20	309	51	1,563
Ferryland	33	660	39	1,232
Totals	1,056	26,375	2,055	63,060

Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-
Bodied Relief, by Provincial Electoral Districts, May, 1954

District	Sick		Able-Bodied	
	Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
St. John's East				
West	134	3,534	379	11,001
Hr. Main-Bell Island	43	1,415	68	2,147
Port de Grave	32	1,002	25	829
Harbour Grace	48	1,187	109	2,912
Carbonear-Bay de Verde	83	1,976	123	3,402
Trinity South	54	1,438	40	926
Trinity North	49	1,254	82	2,638
Bonavista South	44	1,108	32	926
Bonavista North	14	375	20	552
Fogo	45	1,147	102	3,029
Twillingate	25	654	14	420
Grand Falls	67	1,557	13	423
Green Bay	42	1,186	37	1,165
White Bay	57	1,409	293	9,219
St. Barbe	47	1,377	34	718
Humber	32	685	15	365
St. George's—Port au Port	59	1,701	—	—
Burgeo—La Poile	31	700	17	512
Fortune—Hermitage	66	1,514	68	1,802
Burin	38	1,024	69	2,371
Placentia West	49	1,687	122	5,205
Placentia—St. Mary's	20	354	42	1,342
Ferryland	26	613	39	1,259
Totals	1,100	28,897	1,737	52,958

**Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-
Bodied Relief, by Provincial Electoral Districts, June, 1954**

District	Sick		Able-Bodied	
	Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
St. John's East				
West	96	3,457	283	8,875
Hr. Main-Bell Island	42	1,220	50	1,688
Port de Grave	30	1,004	22	669
Harbour Grace	49	1,455	87	2,504
Carbonear-Bay de Verde	83	2,305	82	2,187
Trinity South	50	1,367	39	1,080
Trinity North	46	1,176	29	963
Bonavista South	38	922	1	23
Bonavista North	17	435	4	187
Fogo	55	1,402	55	1,656
Twillingate	24	637	4	94
Grand Falls	48	1,139	4	115
Green Bay	44	1,231	13	512
White Bay	56	1,325	81	2,255
St. Barbe	38	1,040	2	25
Humber	26	610	12	305
St. George's—Port au Port	55	1,584	—	—
Burgeo-La Poile	33	697	25	608
Fortune—Hermitage	69	1,652	84	1,967
Burin	41	974	38	1,142
Placentia West	47	1,573	93	3,255
Placentia—St. Mary's	25	537	13	292
Ferryland	26	524	18	581
Totals	1,039	28,266	1,039	30,992

Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-

Bodied Relief, by Provincial Electoral Districts, July, 1954

District	Sick		Able-Bodied	
	Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
St. John's East				
West	84	3,069	312	9,269
Hr. Main-Bell Island	43	1,400	45	1,392
Port de Grave	26	905	7	150
Harbour Grace	60	1,832	9	195
Carbonear-Bay de Verde	88	2,360	35	855
Trinity South	61	1,566	16	562
Trinity North	54	1,383	4	118
Bonavista South	31	732	1	25
Bonavista North	22	521	5	163
Fogo	34	1,005	5	215
Twillingate	26	802	8	222
Grand Falls	50	1,210	3	110
Green Bay	38	995	5	160
White Bay	62	1,474	18	574
St. Barbe	34	950	—	—
Humber	26	623	1	10
St. George's—Port au Port	54	1,566	2	46
Burgeo-La Poile	35	689	25	678
Fortune—Hermitage	68	1,563	37	960
Buriu	41	1,014	25	754
Placentia West	35	1,104	176	5,956
Placentia—St. Mary's	27	567	6	155
Ferryland	24	640	5	148
Totals	1,023	27,971	750	22,717

Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-

Bodied Relief, by Provincial Electoral Districts, August, 1954

District	Sick		Able-Bodied	
	Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
St. John's East				
West	101	3,269	240	7,805
Hr. Main-Bell Island	45	1,434	36	1,034
Port de Grave	24	775	6	215
Harbour Grace	52	1,535	7	160
Carbonear-Bay de Verde	78	1,779	33	920
Trinity South	55	1,550	14	453
Trinity North	53	1,352	5	202
Bonavista South	31	738	—	—
Bonavista North	19	432	3	93
Fogo	44	1,229	1	25
Twillingate	26	800	4	120
Grand Falls	43	1,184	4	125
Green Bay	39	1,033	3	55
White Bay	60	1,390	4	130
St. Barbe	36	974	—	—
Humber	22	600	—	—
St. George's—Port au Port	56	1,522	—	—
Burgeo-La Poile	35	741	12	351
Fortune—Hermitage	65	1,548	29	750
Butin	42	1,047	28	839
Placentia West	38	1,141	172	5,798
Placentia—St. Mary's	31	591	5	112
Ferryland	20	474	2	66
Totals	1,015	27,138	608	19,253

Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-

Bodied Relief, by Provincial Electoral Districts, September, 1954

District	Sick		Able-Bodied	
	Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
St. John's East				
West	147	3,694	231	7,314
Hr. Main-Bell Island	32	1,120	35	1,108
Port de Grave	24	868	1	50
Harbour Grace	62	1,486	6	130
Carbonear-Bay de Verde	106	2,376	31	808
Trinity South	40	1,056	17	593
Trinity North	47	1,217	8	272
Bonavista South	27	630	2	65
Bonavista North	28	580	3	93
Fogo	42	1,215	4	91
Twillingate	23	640	—	—
Grand Falls	58	1,411	2	45
Green Bay	37	982	4	141
White Bay	58	1,305	6	190
St. Barbe	29	877	—	—
Humber	25	505	1	20
St. George's—Port au Port	58	1,629	—	—
Burgeo-La Poile	35	721	28	768
Fortune—Hermitage	77	1,772	49	1,330
Burin	50	1,217	49	1,532
Placentia West	62	2,088	29	963
Placentia—St. Mary's	28	556	4	87
Ferryland	18	417	—	—
Totals	1,113	28,312	510	15,605

Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-
Bodied Relief by Provincial Electoral Districts, October, 1954

District	Sick		Able-Bodied	
	Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
St. John's East				
West	147	3,957	216	6,776
Hr. Main-Bell Island	39	1,322	42	1,157
Port de Grave	23	797	4	135
Harbour Grace	71	1,612	21	475
Carbonear-Bay de Verde	95	2,234	37	1,057
Trinity South	47	1,340	14	429
Trinity North	52	1,354	4	130
Bonavista South	31	665	3	85
Bonavista North	17	407	2	58
Fogo	43	1,251	8	195
Twillingate	19	551	—	—
Grand Falls	58	1,428	—	—
Green Bay	35	991	—	—
White Bay	58	1,379	3	75
St. Barbe	22	605	2	60
Humber	33	751	3	65
St. George's—Port au Port	65	1,805	—	—
Burgeo-La Poile	36	759	68	1,861
Fortune—Hermitage	75	1,838	95	2,539
Burin	56	1,421	91	2,961
Placentia West	78	2,587	56	2,045
Placentia—St. Mary's	27	539	16	420
Ferryland	23	455	4	144
Totals	1,150	30,049	689	20,667

Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-

Bodied Relief, by Provincial Electoral Districts, November, 1954

District	Sick		Able-Bodied	
	Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
St. John's East				
West	133	2,379	237	7,266
Hr. Main-Bell Island	46	1,447	50	1,539
Port de Grave	26	913	12	355
Harbour Grace	78	1,875	72	1,942
Carboncar-Bay de Verde	105	2,058	61	1,816
Trinity South	52	1,627	24	845
Trinity North	49	1,267	21	707
Bonavista South	34	727	4	125
Bonavista North	16	445	4	140
Fogo	43	1,261	—	—
Twillingate	25	725	—	—
Grand Falls	44	1,108	3	100
Green Bay	58	1,621	2	62
White Bay	55	1,314	8	206
St. Barbe	26	752	14	460
Humber	27	607	3	40
St. George's—Port au Port	65	1,774	—	—
Burgo—La Poile	34	671	93	2,581
Fortune—Hermitage	74	1,801	182	5,121
Burin	52	1,283	125	3,993
Placentia West	97	3,180	70	2,612
Placentia—St. Mary's	29	692	36	1,040
Ferryland	28	671	14	508
Totals	1,196	30,198	1,035	31,457

Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-

Bodied Relief, by Provincial Electoral Districts, December, 1954

District	Sick		Able-Bodied	
	Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
St. John's East				
West	127	3,669	265	8,319
Hr. Main-Bell Island	36	1,151	71	2,359
Port de Grave	25	935	16	473
Harbour Grace	79	2,001	97	2,465
Carbonar-Bay de Verde	108	2,971	88	2,672
Trinity South	58	1,680	49	1,508
Trinity North	52	*1,300	51	1,735
Bonavista South	39	893	13	449
Bonavista North	25	695	2	35
Fogo	22	468	53	1,790
Twillingate	26	709	5	145
Grand Falls	35	933	11	313
Green Bay	58	1,699	11	410
White Bay	64	1,565	37	1,221
St. Barbe	32	881	34	1,107
Humber	28	704	2	50
St. George's—Port au Port	75	2,045	—	—
Burgeo—La Poile	36	644	114	2,980
Fortune—Hermitage	68	1,564	210	6,186
Burin	47	1,210	105	3,426
Placentia West	97	3,182	118	4,310
Placentia—St. Mary's	35	726	61	1,747
Ferryland	27	603	17	617
Totals	1,199	32,230	1,430	44,317

Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-

Bodied Relief, by Provincial Electoral Districts, January, 1935

District	Sick		Able-Bodied	
	Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
St. John's East				
West	131	3,726	377	11,860
Hr. Main-Bell Island	48	1,319	74	2,248
Port de Grave	30	1,064	23	640
Harbour Grace	76	1,854	121	3,274
Carbonar-Bay de Verde	109	2,701	100	3,071
Trinity South	55	1,608	74	2,392
Trinity North	51	1,319	91	3,088
Bonavista South	42	924	33	942
Bouvista North	25	640	27	642
Fogo	40	1,143	75	2,404
Twillingate	31	881	83	2,836
Grand Falls	36	981	18	517
Green Bay	58	1,565	53	1,813
White Bay	70	1,807	129	4,295
St. Barbe	37	885	55	1,856
Humber	28	758	4	125
St. George's—Port au Port	83	2,409	—	—
Burgeo—La Poile	32	620	144	3,953
Fortune—Hermitage	54	1,300	300	8,502
Burin	52	1,208	129	4,186
Placentia West	94	3,231	193	6,747
Placentia—St. Mary's	38	842	67	1,912
Ferryland	29	680	38	1,419
Totals	1,243	33,471	2,208	58,722

Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-

Bodied Relief, by Provincial Electoral Districts, February, 1955

District	Sick		Able-Bodied	
	Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
St. John's East				
West	101	2,824	447	15,156
Hr. Main-Bell Island	49	1,586	127	4,030
Port de Grave	35	1,154	27	799
Harbour Grace	66	1,743	110	3,032
Carbonear-Bay de Verde	120	2,774	109	3,196
Trinity South	61	1,796	97	2,754
Trinity North	56	1,514	101	3,399
Bonavista South	47	1,073	51	1,563
Bonavista North	18	465	11	375
Fogo	44	1,225	120	3,867
Twillingate	34	931	98	3,226
Grand Falls	42	1,066	12	359
Green Bay	72	2,121	51	1,600
White Bay	71	1,890	171	5,656
St. Barbe	31	731	37	1,231
Humber	43	1,047	7	190
St. George's—Port au Port	77	2,390	15	458
Burgeo—La Poile	37	615	169	4,623
Fortune—Hermitage	66	1,334	326	8,962
Burin	60	1,454	150	4,908
Placentia West	96	3,028	270	9,596
Placentia—St. Mary's	45	945	84	2,351
Ferryland	40	810	54	1,979
Totals	1,311	\$4,516	2,642	83,310

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Economic Development has the answer to Question 15, which I asked in regard to the birch plant?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have not. My recollection is that there are two questions on this one copy, one asked by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the other by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West, one being in part a duplication of the other. I have asked the Attorney General to prepare the answer to that question as the matters are very closely within his knowledge. I think he is the proper one to say now when he expects to be in a position to table the answers.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I must say, the Honourable the Premier is correct. He did ask me to prepare the answers to this question, but some of the answers involved have to come from Finance. I have been in touch with Finance no later than a few minutes ago. They sent the information which I was seeking to the Premier's Office so that I am hoping to have the answer very early in the week.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day, I think it would be the wish of the House that some formal notice be taken of the fact that this is the sixth anniversary of Newfoundland becoming a Province of Canada. Just before the stroke of midnight we became a Province. It is not generally known that we did not become a Province on the 1st of April but rather just before the stroke of midnight on the 31st of March six years ago last night. I might say that the thought was that Newfoundland should become a Province on the 1st of April. The 1st of April is the beginning of the finan-

cial year of the Government of Canada, as it is, I believe, for all of the Provinces of Canada, and it was the beginning of Newfoundland's own fiscal year. So therefore as Newfoundland became a Province it meant, automatically, the application to Newfoundland of certain financial arrangements between Canada and Newfoundland as they were then. It was thought desirable that Newfoundland begin her career as a Province of Canada at the beginning of the new financial year. I, however, was aware of another interpretation the 1st of April has besides the fact of its being the first day of the financial year. I had a very vivid awareness of the fact that if Confederation began on the 1st day of April, if Newfoundland on that day became a Province of Canada then forever after the die-hards, the anti-confederates, those who had been anti-confederate and were not willing to become reconciled, would taunt the confederates with the fact that Newfoundland had become a Province on "All Fools Day." So I objected quite strenuously at the meeting at which the terms were being negotiated and were ultimately signed. It was agreed by the Prime Minister that even so slight a matter might have some psychological importance. It was therefore decided that Newfoundland should become a Province of Canada just before the stroke of midnight on the 31st of March, six years ago last night.

Well, Sir, those have been six very remarkable years! The whole history of Newfoundland has changed, the whole course of our history has changed. I don't think that I will waste the time of the House to argue that Confederation has been a great thing for Newfoundland and a great thing for the people of Newfoundland and for the people of Canada general-

ly. I will not waste the time of the House to try to show what does not need to be shown, that Confederation was a gift from the good God in Heaven to the good people of Newfoundland. I won't waste time to prove what does not need to be proven; that it would have been a great tragedy indeed for Newfoundland had we not become a Province of Canada.

Now today in Newfoundland there are still ten or twelve or fourteen persons who oppose Confederation. I would not say there are as many as twenty. I am quite convinced in my own mind that if a referendum were held now with a secret ballot of all adult persons in Newfoundland, the vote between keeping Newfoundland a Province or ceasing to be a Province, we would not get twenty persons in this entire Province to vote to have Newfoundland cease to be a Province of Canada. Even the die-hards have become pretty well reconciled because I think now, Mr. Speaker, that everyone agrees that Confederation hurt very few but helped a great many. Even the few that were hurt were not entirely hurt and none were fatally hurt.

I am not permitted to refer to any debate that took place in this House in the present session, and I shall not do so. But I am delighted to say how pleased I was to hear from the lips of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition the generous and manly statement that Confederation had brought great and precious benefits to Newfoundland. I believe he spoke the feelings of the hearts of the Newfoundland people, and I honour him for it.

Sir, before I sit down may I draw to your attention, and the attention of this House to the fact that we have

present as a stranger, that is a visitor, inside the bar of the House, a very distinguished person indeed, a former member of this House, one who was elected to represent the people of a great constituency and took her seat in this very chamber and served as a member of the House, on this side of the House, under the leadership of a great man, a great leader who was her husband. I am sure that the whole House rejoices to see her here today, in good health. I extend a word of very warm and very cordial welcome to Lady Squires.

Orders of the Day

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne:

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before going on I would like to say that with most remarks of the Honourable the Premier I am in perfect accord and certainly I am in accord with the felicitations tendered to the honoured guest in our presence. With regard to Confederation it is not the time nor the place for me to say anything except to say that if we have gained great benefits it is up to us to preserve these benefits. I think we all in Newfoundland should unite insofar as possible in the endeavour to preserve for our people those things which we would not have today were it not for our entering into Union with the Dominion of Canada. I am quite sure, Sir, that every member in this House will agree with me that we can lose a benefit as easily and sometimes much more easily than we can gain it, or retain it, as the case may be. So that it is up to us in this House, and certainly it is up to any Government which has the confidence of the people to see that nothing is done which will lessen in any way those great benefits which

we all, even though we may be called die-hards, admit have come to our people. I refer, Sir, to Old Age Pensions and Family Allowances and all the other benefits that have come in connection with health and welfare etc.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay the debate on the Speech from the Throne. I am deeply mindful of the fact that the Honourable the Premier expressed a wish that the House should close at an early date in order that he and other Ministers may attend a conference of Premiers in Ottawa. I think that is to be sometime late this month. In that connection I noted a dispatch in yesterday's paper, I think it was, which gave a statement from the Honourable Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. St. Laurent. He is quoted there as saying that his Government granted Quebec a ten per cent cut in the Federal income tax. It was granted, he said, in order to maintain Canadian unity. Now that comes to me as rather a shock because I was not keenly aware of any large amount of disunity in our Dominion. But here we have the Honourable Mr. St. Laurent saying that he had agreed to give a ten per cent cut in Federal income tax to maintain Canadian unity. He said there was enough disunity in the world without causing more in Canada. I agree with him. He said the Federal tax provision in Quebec was only a stop-gap measure pending the working out of long-term arrangements. And Mr. St. Laurent will meet with the ten Premiers this month, to prepare a general agenda for a full-scale review next Fall, of Federal-Provincial Tax Revenue.

Now in that connection I am quite sure that we will all wish the Honourable the Premier and any members of the Cabinet or any other people whom

he may take along with him, to be well armed and well informed and well fortified with facts relative to what is necessary for this Province of ours to keep her place in the Dominion without the imposition of too great taxation upon us people who make up the Province. I can well see, Sir, that is not an easy job that the Ministers will have next October or November or whenever they get together after these preliminary conferences at the end of this month. It will not be an easy job to draw up some sort of tax rental scheme which will apply equally to the ten Provinces and which will leave all people in more or less the same position with regard to taxation. But it is a job that has to be done if we are to keep united as ten Provinces. And I would say to the Honourable the Premier and to the Government right now that it is most important that he select and take along with him to the crucial meeting at any rate, later in the year, the best financial experts upon Newfoundland's finances that he can obtain. Surely if we can risk money on things as we have risked it in this country in the past few years nobody will begrudge the Government if they have to retain very expensive services in an effort to look after the financial interest of this Tenth Province.

Now yesterday, Sir, I was referring on one occasion to a little matter of a little widow in one of the districts of the north. The House was quite familiar with most of the things I said about that case and particularly the Honourable Minister of Welfare. But I wanted to draw some sort of a picture of the present day and the dark days. Now this lady, as I pointed out, says her husband died last year. There are two family allowance age children. I think she gets about \$5, \$6 or \$7 for each per month. In addition to that,

she states that she gets an allowance from the Department of \$25 per month, and that she has been unable to get any further increase. In other words, she tells me \$25 has to suffice for her and her two children under sixteen years of age. \$25 has to provide everything for them for the month, apart from the Family Allowance, which, as I say, can only take care of boots and shoes and stockings in these days. She told me that she had divided the amount up into three separate lots. That is how she described it to me. Her amount came to \$8.43 and this is what she bought. And I ask every honourable member to see just how our wives would get along if we had to spread the amount between our families. 1 lb of coffee \$1.40; 1 lb of tea \$1.20; 3 lbs pork; \$1.14; 3 lbs butter \$1.07; 10 lbs sugar \$1.14; 3 lbs beans .55c.; 4 tins milk .75c. and 5 lbs hard bread \$1.00; a total of \$8.43. She said that is what she had to live on for the past month and as long as this allowance continues. The other children of course get the same amount. I am quite sure the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare, when the matter is brought to his attention, will rectify anything that may be wrong. As I said yesterday, Sir, I have always found him most anxious to carry out the spirit of the Act with regard to dependents. One pound of coffee today costs \$1.40. In the old dole days of course they did not get coffee. I remember the old cocoa which used to be doled out. One pound of tea \$1.20. I am quite sure that nobody who remembers back to the dole days — it did not cost anything more than one-third of that amount. Three pounds of pork \$1.14. That to me is probably about three times as much as the same amount would have cost in the dole days. I am just reading these prices to com-

pare them with what had to be paid out in these days, because I want to point out in most instances the dollar is only worth about one-third what it was in those days. When we speak of \$25 a month for a widow and two children we have to take into consideration in the dark days of the 30's \$25 a month would perhaps mean they were on safe ground and could live fairly well. But \$25 a month today for three persons I am quite sure we all agree is not sufficient to maintain even life not to say health and strength.

Now I made some reference to the fishery yesterday, and in my saying a few more words, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will sympathize with me. It is because I come from a fishing settlement that I, like many others here, almost born in the bow of a boat (it was not quite so bad as that, but it was not long before I was in the bow of a boat) and naturally had to do with fishermen most of the years of my life. For a good many years while I was magistrate in Burin I had to do with fishermen. I am greatly interested in our Government and the Federal Government doing everything that it is at all possible to do to see that those men who remain in the fishery will be enabled to keep body and soul together, which cannot be done in the present day and generation with the cost of everything four times what it used to be.

I hope the Honourable Minister of Fisheries is not here so I will not hurt his feelings! It is the Government at any rate I am after. This is "Hansard" 1950. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, at that time the Honourable Minister of Fisheries introduced a Bill which was known as "An Act to Provide a Life and Accident Insurance for the Fishermen of Newfoundland."

It was given second reading in a masterly style by the Honourable W. J. Keough, who is undoubtedly one of the best orators we have in this House. I believe he even quoted poetry there :

"It took the sea a thousand years, a thousand years to trace
The granite features of this cliff, in crag and scrap and base.
It took the sea an hour one night, an hour of storm to place,
The sculpture of these granite seams upon a woman's face."

I am quite sure the House appreciated such very fine poetry :

MR. SMALLWOOD : That is E. J. Pratt.

MR. HOLLETT : Thank you very much I thought I recognized it.

The Honourable Minister ended by : "Let me have this to say in closing : There is going to be some form of fishermen's insurance whether voluntary or compulsory. That will depend to a great extent upon the response to the appeal to be shortly made. But there is going to be some form of fishermen's insurance, and thereby will dreams that have been dreamed since long ago come to be realized, and thereby will the pieces of our early heritage be put together in a pattern of an equitable social structure."

Then he goes on : "As a great Newfoundland poet writes : "No man lives alone nor laughs nor loves nor hates nor dies alone nor is an island'."

Now that piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, was introduced in such grand style, I am quite sure every member of the House at the time (I was not here) felt the Fishermen's Insurance Act would be factual within a very few months. This is now 1955, and

to my knowledge there is no such legislation at the moment.

MR. SMALLWOOD : In fairness, in the absence of my colleague, if the honourable member will allow me to point out that the fishermen rejected it completely. We did not give it second reading, we merely debated it at second reading and deliberately did not give it second reading, so that when the House closed the matter could be referred to the fishermen and the decision be left to them. They rejected it as completely as they ever did anything. So the matter was dropped.

MR. HOLLETT : I thank the Honourable the Premier for telling me that. I wonder if that makes much difference. I might read the first two or three lines — I was referring to a speech made by the Honourable Minister of Fisheries in 1950. Now that the Minister is in the House I am not going to repeat the full text of the quotation but just these few words :

"There is going to be some form of fishermen's insurance whether voluntary or compulsory, this or that will depend to a great extent upon . . ." (It is going to be, whether the fishermen liked it or not.) It was going to be compulsory. It was going to be put in force. It has not been put in force. It has not been put in force because there has been such a great expression of opinion against it by the fishermen that the Government felt it would be unwise to do so. That is all to the good. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, it was in this connection that I think I raised the point the other day in connection with this Hausard — I asked the question — "Is this supposed to be official or is it not official?" Because I am quite sure that in this sentence here of the Honourable the

Premier he had intended to pay a compliment to the Honourable Minister of Fisheries, and the Honourable Minister of Fisheries was certainly deserving of the compliment for the masterly way in which he delivered his address. But this is what the Premier said, Mr. Speaker: "I would like to say a word by way of congratulation to the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, for what the House has come to regard as rather unusual, when he speaks, that is, a very fine speech."

Now I draw that to the attention of the House particularly the Honourable the Premier to show there must be a proper editing of these books before they are issued to the general public or wherever they are sent, because, whereas the Honourable the Premier was intended to pay a compliment and a well-deserved one, it looks there as though he was doing quite the opposite. I am quite sure that he was not — But that is getting away from the matter of the fisheries.

I referred to that matter of the fishermen's insurance because I think, even though the fishermen themselves rejected it, I do remind the House it was to have been a foregone conclusion. They were going to get it whether they liked it or not — "You are going to have some insurance" I am quite sure, Sir, that our fishermen are certainly entitled to that sort of protection. I remember in the old days the only protection the fishermen had was the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund. I know in Burin we always had disasters every year particularly in our banking vessels. There was scarcely a year but that some poor widow was left with anywhere from one to seven or eight children, and the only thing such a widow could depend upon was the Permanent Marine Disaster

Fund, so ably handled in those days, I believe, by the "Daily News." It was quite a help in those days. It was not too much, \$80 and \$90 and sometimes \$100 every three months. It was not a big lot but it meant about three times as much as it would today. Certainly there should be some form of fishermen's life insurance. I put it to the Government that it is up to them to bring into this House a proper Bill which will be acceptable. I don't suppose there is any scheme of insurance that is acceptable to everybody. That is why life insurance companies have dozens of different schemes to suit the different whims of the people — we are all very whimsical, Sir. So I say: it is up to the Government to try to bring in some form of fishermen's insurance.

We were speaking of Confederation a few moments ago. I do hope that before many years go by it will be possible in co-operation with the Federal Government of Canada for this Government to arrange some form of unemployment insurance for fishermen. I prophesy, Mr. Speaker, that unless that can be done there is no possibility whatsoever for our shore fishermen to continue to fish and live at it. Surely, Sir, if the man who goes down in the mines and risks his life digging out the ore when he gets laid off is entitled and receives a certain amount of unemployment insurance, surely, a fisherman who goes out on the Grand Banks and goes to Labrador or even who goes a mile off shore, if you like, and risks his life, then there ought to be devised some means whereby he can get a somewhat similar assistance for his family in case of accident. I can assure the House that in the day in which we are living unless they can do something more to keep or to make the fishery a little more attractive for

our young men then our fishery will be a dead issue and we won't have to bother about it any more. But, my goodness, Mr. Speaker, what a Newfoundland this would be if the whole of our coastline became practically deserted because of the fact that our Government, (and I don't mean this Government) I mean the Federal Government has not lived up to its responsibility. There was a time, in this country when if the farmer in Western Canada was unable to grow sufficient wheat he would be hungry and he would have to get dole etc., so the Federal Government devised a means whereby there was certain assistance given him. Surely, if it can be done for the farmers then it must be done in this generation for our fishermen. I say if we can get that then we got something for Confederation. Union then would really be worthwhile. It is worthwhile today, yes, but there are an awful lot of people today merely subsisting, and that includes a lot of our fishermen. My honourable friend from Placentia West, I think, will bear me out that there are men in his districts and I know of many up on the southwest coast between Burin and Port aux Basques who are only just subsisting now on the fishery. Unless we can do something for them then I am afraid tragedy will await this little Province. I am quite sure every member on the opposite side and everybody in Newfoundland is desirous of helping the fishermen — So, if we put our backs behind this thing, if we think about it every day, if we shout from the housetops every day the Federal Government will have to do something about it. That is what they did in Quebec. That is why they got a 10% deduction in their Federal Income Tax, and the Honourable Mr. St. Laurent who represented the people of Canada said: "Yes, we will give it to

them." We did it, he said, to prevent disunity in the Dominion of Canada. Let us do that for our fishermen.

Now I am not going to say but very little about the paper mill. We shall all be happy if the Government can bring it into being. I had very little time to look at the forestry report, but there it was suggested by the Commissioners that the possible and properly feasible way to bring it about would be by the AND Company and Bowaters getting together and pooling their resources and building a mill of about four or five hundred tons daily. They said that is the only way possible, to get these two great companies to pool their resources and build a mill on the east coast. Now I put it to the House that there is quite a problem to be solved before we should go around, Sir, shouting to the housetops that we are going to have a third mill. Don't let us raise the hopes of our people unless we are pretty well assured that the thing is going to happen. I think the Honourable the Premier won't mind if I say that he himself, four or five years ago, as the case might be, was full of hope that a certain programme which he had and would be initiating would bring about, I think, some twenty thousand jobs for our people. He even admitted today that it did not come to the point he expected and wished and was quite sure of at that time — So, let us not build up too much the hopes of our people on this mill until we can say definitely it is going to be built. It will be a grand thing. It will be a wonderful thing, I am quite sure it will help an awful lot of our people in this country. As I have said, I have not had the opportunity to read the report fully, therefore I am not in a position to discuss it properly. But I believe the Honourable the Pre-

mier has promised a day to be set aside for consideration of this report.

There is another matter, Sir — Some mention was made of the agricultural report, and the matter of mink raising seems to have been taken right out of the agricultural report. I have yet not been informed as to the exact connection between mink raising and agriculture. I take it when the Honourable the Premier explains the matter he will be able to tell us why mink raising was taken care of by the Agricultural Commission. At any rate this is what the Speech from the Throne says: ". . . Arising out of their study of these advance sections of the report a policy has been adopted actively to encourage the establishment of mink-raising ranches in Newfoundland, and you will be asked to provide funds to implement this policy by making commercial loans, at an economic rate of interest" — Now I am wondering was that one of the jobs they were supposed to do in making a report on agriculture, to find out exactly what was to be done with regard to mink raising?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, it was.

MR. HOLLETT: Now in reply to a question which I tabled a day or two ago I was given the numbers and amounts of loans which had been made, and apart from this speech altogether, I find that loans have already been made, that people had already received money. Now that is not unusual with this Government. I know they usually give out the money, ask us to give it to them and make good the loan. But in this particular instance, here was a Commission working for two years. We know nothing whatsoever of the report. We have not seen it. But for some reason or other the Government lifts out a little

piece about minking, after two years, before the report is completed — and they have loaned out an amount of money to a number of people from the Mainland. I have heard a list of the people from the Mainland who had received loans — There are two from British Columbia; three from Saskatchewan; two from Manitoba and one from Winnipeg; and one called "Trinity Mink."

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is an American.

MR. BROWNE: Did they get loans too.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is lucky.

MR. HOLLETT: Would you like it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh I love the honourable gentleman having it because it is so rare.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I did not quite get that — He makes a lot of statements at times —

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: "Trinity Mink Limited" — an American Company —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes from Maine.

MR. HOLLETT: William Dawe — that is a familiar name, but he comes from British Columbia.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is a Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: And Kenneth Butterfield from Winnipeg? \$25,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is one of the executives of the Canadian Mink

Breeders Association and one of the leaders of the industry in Canada.

MR. HOLLETT: And he had to come down here to Newfoundland to get a loan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not to get a loan, no.

MR. HOLLETT: From this generous Government — At any rate I have figured out that during the last few weeks, Sir, these men have come in here to this country, and the Government has given them loans of approximately two hundred thousand dollars, I believe it adds up to \$190,350, and that is not all of the loans, mind you, recently granted in relation to the raising of mink. Now, Sir, there is not much one can say — I suppose if the Government wants to loan out two hundred thousand dollars to any Canadian Company here who say they are mink raisers there is nothing we can do about it. But I really think — and I have gathered something else from that reply — I look at the loans that had been granted to Newfoundland people and I notice there were about forty Newfoundlanders had received loans, dating back for some years. During the past five years they have received their loans from the Farm Loan Board, the amount of the loans received, \$66,525 I ask the Honourable the Premier to give me some indication as to what chances these mink raisers have in competition with the Mainlanders who have received loans ranging from \$25,000 to \$30,000 and to \$34,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman will allow me — that until he knows the details of this mink scheme he would not be serving Newfoundland's interest to draw any dis-

inction between Mainlanders and native born Newfoundlanders, for the simple reason that the whole basis of the scheme is to bring the Mainlanders in here to help the local ranchers. He must not judge the benefits to either by the size of the loans, because the two sets of loans were made under entirely different schemes. The small loans were made five, six or seven years ago, just after the war, when the Government had a ridiculous puny little scheme that failed. The larger loans made are part of a very big project. There is no point in comparing them. When local people, under this new scheme, get little loans and cannot get what they need, then there will be room to complain.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am not complaining — just relating the points that came to my notice — I did hear a story some years ago about bringing in Icelanders, I believe, to teach Newfoundlanders how to fish. Now they are bringing in Mainlanders to teach Newfoundlanders how to mink, I suppose. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, if you give a man a \$34,000 loan and Bill Jones next door \$600, surely he is not then in a position to compete with the other fellow. But in deference to the Honourable the Premier's request I shall say nothing else about the matter until the thing is explained to us.

Now I don't intend to say anything more, Sir, except that I think it would be a very good idea if some of the excessive travelling of our present Government was eliminated in the year to come. We have a travelling Cabinet, Sir. We only see them occasionally. It is nice to open the House once a year so we can get them together. I am afraid, Sir, I will have to make this remark. It may be harsh. There are literally hundreds of thousands of

dollars needlessly wasted in travelling abroad. Any day you wish, Sir, you can look in the paper or listen to the radio and you will find somebody going to Ottawa, somebody going to Boston, New York, Jamaica, Switzerland and some others going somewhere else. That happens all the time, all the year around. I am quite convinced, Sir, there is no other Province of Canada has that sort of thing going on. If they have, and if this Government can set up some sort of decent hotel in the centre of this country and induce the travellers from the Governments of the other Provinces to come here our tourist problem will be solved. If we can only induce them to come here, then Mr. Vardy's programme will be all set.

Anyway I would strongly suggest a suitable policy of housing in this country whereby all members of the Cabinet would be able to establish permanent homes. How can you expect a man to stay home very long at one time if he has, as the Honourable the Premier confessed, to sleep in a bail box.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am promoted, I sleep now in a quonset hut.

MR. HOLLETT: If he has to sleep in a bail box, and an imported bail box, I don't expect the Honourable the Premier to stay too long at home.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a high-class bail box, an imported one.

MR. HOLLETT: I would have thought the Honourable the Premier would have used some local birch in getting a bail box. Incidentally I do not think I would like to have it published abroad that the Premier of Newfoundland, on this the sixth anniversary of Confederation, is living in a bail box. It shows the condition

we are in six years ago when we went in, and only today, six years after, the Honourable the Premier has been promoted from a bail box to a lowly hut, a quonset hut. I think that is not good —

MR. SMALLWOOD: It shows progress though.

MR. HOLLETT: It is progress. Undoubtedly it is progress, of course slowly but surely. That is the Honourable the Premier, "Slowly but surely." Anyway I would suggest that this bail box be taken care of. I was about to suggest or urge that the new museum expert recently retained by the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs or by the Government at once take possession of that bail box and place it in the museum as a sort of historic hut.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The trouble is, it is still in use.

MR. HOLLETT: To prove to Newfoundlanders yet unborn the unprecedented prosperity here in the sixth year of Union with the great Dominion of Canada.

There is just one other matter, Sir, and then I am done. I referred to this before but want to refer to it again because it is highly out of order. I may be wrong — On page 93 of the Public Accounts I find that this Government, this House granted loans, special assistance grants of \$250,734.43 to various town councils and municipal conventions and municipal councils etc. Included in these are St. Anthony, Englee and a few other of like nature. I mention that because this looks to me to show the impropriety of this item of news which came from the Premier's Office a few days ago when he received a telegram from a town council, St. Anthony in the

District of White Bay suggesting he go down and represent that district, and suddenly there was a rush from town councils, local councils and various other places in White Bay. A number of these, Sir, had received loans from this House, I don't like it. I don't like it if a local council or a municipal council is to engage in provincial politics to the extent that they would wire the Premier to come down and represent them and saying: "We will support you," and he wires back and says: "I am sorry I can't do it I have to go to Bonavista North but I will put a good man down there. Tell all the people I am sending a good man down there." That appears over a daily news bulletin, Sir, a release from the Honourable the Premier.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a very good point to close on because it is not so very important after all, but I am quite sure it rather tickles the Honourable the Premier's sense of fitness.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be long in speaking to the Address in Reply, but before I really begin perhaps it would meet the convenience of the House to have a recess of ten minutes.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are not many things I want to say in closing the debate on the Speech from the Throne. In the first place my honourable friends opposite have not created the necessity for me to do much by way of replying to them, and in the second place I think the whole House is anxious to use up as little time as possible in anything other than straight business. This session is pri-

marily a business session to enact legislation and the estimates and budget and the like. So I shall not take up very much time. I do, however, want to say something on the last topic introduced in his speech by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the matter of mink:

Now we have quite a good deal of faith in the possibility of developing an important mink industry in Newfoundland. The belief that mink could be a pretty good thing for Newfoundland was first brought to my attention almost five years ago by Mr. Victor Clouston, who is the biggest Newfoundland fur farmer, the biggest we have ever had, the biggest we have now unless we include the new farmers who have recently decided to move here from the Mainland. Mr. Clouston is truly a pioneer in the business. He went to Prince Edward Island and worked on a farm, the farm of the late Senator Jones, one time Premier of Prince Edward Island. There Mr. Clouston worked at cattle in which Premier Jones was quite outstanding in Canada and quite outstanding in North America, and also at foxes. Now Prince Edward Island, of course, was the centre of the great silver fox ranches until the long-haired fur rather went out of fashion, and the raising of foxes became pretty unprofitable and unimportant, to be replaced by the short-haired furs, particularly mink. So, with his experience in Prince Edward Island farming as a basis he returned to Newfoundland some fifteen or eighteen years ago, and set up in the business of fox ranching, which soon was supplanted by the raising of mink. Mr. Clouston is still raising foxes. He has still kept his basic breeding stock of foxes. I think he has a hundred and fifty or a couple of hundred foxes to this

day. By careful, selective breeding he has continued to improve his fox-breeding stock against the day when the long-haired furs will come back into popularity in the eyes of the women folk of the world. But in the meantime he has become a fairly important producer of mink. He has had on his ranch something of the order of fifteen hundred mink, not all of them breeding mink, but breeding mink and kits totalling about fifteen hundred.

Well, Mr. Clouston convinced me pretty thoroughly about five years ago that Newfoundland had some pretty important assets and advantages in the raising of mink over any other part of North America, and indeed probably over any other part of the whole world. He pointed out to me that mink eat meat and fish as well as cereals. An almost ideal diet for mink is a ration made up of 40% red meat, 30% fish and the other 30% made of brewers yeast and the minerals wheat germ and several other things — 40%, 30% and 30%. The reason that made him think, and made me think, that Newfoundland is a very good place in which to raise mink is the fact that we have in our pot-head whales such a very large supply of fish, non-oily fish as you must give them. You cannot give them the oily types of fish, caplin and herring and the like. It is far better to give them codfish and haddock and ground fish and white fish, non-oily fish. Now the climate is excellent for mink. Mink like it cold. We are not quite cold enough perhaps. We do not get 20° 30° and 40° below zero here as they do out in the prairies and in the interior of Canada or for that matter in the interior of Newfoundland. But we do get a considerable amount of dampness, and dampness is good for

them. So that our climate is excellent for mink. They are kept outdoors. They are not kept under cover except for the purpose of furring. When the kits are born, at five weeks of age they are taken away from the mother and each kitten is put in a separate cage by itself, and ideally at that stage they are put under shelter to keep the sun and the wind and the rain off them so as to get a better pelt. Except for that, mink are outdoor animals. In nature they live outdoors naturally and they eat other animals and fish. They will even fish a trout out of a stream with a quick flash of the paw.

Well if we have a good climate for mink and a great quantity of all the food, or of 75% of the food, all of it indeed except the minerals, the yeast and a few other things like the wheat germ — if you can begin with a great supply of low-cost feed for mink and a good climate then all that is necessary after that is know-how, skill. Well, I became quite convinced personally that there were really sizable possibilities in this thing here in Newfoundland. My way of looking at it was, if the good God gave us the climate, and there is not much doubt that He did — although sometimes we may think it came from another direction — and if He gave us these pot-head whales and such varieties and quantities of fish, and the combination of the two made possible a real mink industry then I became convinced we ought to have that industry. Remember now there was one great draw-back, know-how, knowledge and experience. To hear two or more mink men discuss the genetics of mink breeding is one of the real experiences of life. It is not just a thing that any chap can go at. Mink are valuable little animals and yet get big prices

for their pelts and they got to be handled just right. So I asked my colleague of that day, the Minister of Natural Resources, as he was known, to give me a plan a programme, I told him the Government, I felt would be happy to back it, and if it cost a million dollars, or a couple of million dollars, we thought we would find the money, provided it was a good thing. I never got the plan. I got a plan but it was not "the plan". Then a couple of years had passed and there was a series of changes in the department until finally we got a permanent Minister, at least he has been there now for two or three years. Upon his taking office I asked him if he would mind giving very special attention to this question of raising mink. I outlined for him the situation up to then from the facts as I knew them. It was not long before he began to buckle down to the thing.

At the same time I called in his Deputy Minister, Mr. P. J. Murray and I called in Mr. Coliu Storey from the Department of Fisheries, and the four of us and sometimes with Victor Clouston present, if you put it all together spent days and days and days and days discussing that matter and gathering data and gathering statistics and gathering information. Then two years ago we referred the whole matter to the Royal Commission, and then these members of the Royal Commission really gave it very careful attention, very careful study. As a result now of five years, not rushed, not hustled, unlike the way I usually do things: (I don't usually take five years) we came to the final but sure and certain conclusion that we were on the right track, that there is a great opportunity for the raising of mink here in Newfoundland. But again and again and again we came

back to the great facts that mink raising is a highly specialized profession and not one that anyone can go at without training.

After the war the Commission of Government started a mink farm out here on Mount Pearl Road, immediately beside the experimental farm. It may have been during the war. But it was started primarily for the purpose of being a training-ground for the war vets who when they returned from the war and needed civil re-establishment could in some cases go in to that school for a year and by going through a complete season of mating, of whelping, of furring, of pelting and the practice, of course, of handling mink, the practice of feeding mink and the theory of the genetics of it, in about a year a man could qualify himself, if he were fairly bright and had a fairly good education, in about a year he could qualify as a very good mink man, not perfect, but very good.

The Commission of Government had maintained this mink school and they had put some dozen of men through that school. Now the school was very good. It was fairly well equipped. Mr. Victor Clouston was the instructor, and Mr. Francis (not the man of the same name who is one of the new-owners from Saskatchewan) a local man was there in charge of the mink ranch. They trained some very good men, Dick Voisey, Albert Dunphy, Bill Eaton, who is now a pilot with EPA — some outstanding men. But the whole scheme collapsed because the Commission of Government, having trained the men, an excellent thing, gave them the most miserable backing. The amount is shown in the table that my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition has there on his desk in reply to a question tabled by

him. They gave each of these war veterans fifteen mink. Now mink are not, I can assure the House, the most profitable of animals. They gave them twelve female and three male mink, Mr. Speaker. If you begin with three male mink and twelve females and if everything goes along well and if they have a fair average number of kits per year, (they whelp once a year) and if you have the average percentage of mortality, with fifteen mink it would take you about five or six or seven years to have a herd or whatever it is, enough to live on, so that the annual yield of pelts would give a living, so that you could get married and support a family. So we have the completely miserable picture of war veterans, having given a year of their lives to become qualified, being then set up in business with fifteen mink to begin with. They could not possibly live on it and in the second place they had to stay where they were.

If you have fifteen mink down in your back yard in Green Bay or Bonavista Bay or Conception Bay or up on the Southern Shore, you cannot leave throughout the whole year. You have to stick there because they require daily and very careful care, very careful daily attention. So you are tied down. You cannot make a living out of it and yet you cannot go away and make a living. You are tied down completely. Because of this failure of the Commission of Government to give these men a chance to live the way they should have done — If each one of them had been given say \$75 or \$100 a month either as a straight gift or as a loan for say two years or three years and then for the next year cut it in half and in the fifth year cut it down one-quarter, a man should be earning enough by then to get along properly and live on his mink. What

happened was that one after another they just had to give up. They had to abandon the whole scheme. Therefore, what might have been the birth of a very substantial strengthening of our Newfoundland economy died and amounted surely and certainly to nothing.

So that when we agreed that there were great opportunities in the raising of mink the first great problem was this: Know-how, experience, skill — how were these to be attained by the people who would raise mink in Newfoundland? Now our first thought was to revive the school. That was our first thought — that we would re-open the mink ranch in here on Mount Pearl Road, and we would bring in to that school a number of young Newfoundlanders for training. Then, after they were trained, we would make loans to them — not enough to buy fifteen mink but at least fifty and more likely a hundred. But we did not like that idea for a number of reasons. Then the second idea we got was that we would arrange with mink ranchers, large, important, experienced and successful mink ranchers on the Mainland of Canada, in Quebec and Ontario and Saskatchewan, we would arrange with them that they would receive young Newfoundlanders whom we would send up there, and that their ranches would become training schools for Newfoundlanders. The Government would pay their expenses up and down and their board while up there and give them a wage and the ranchers would get free labour from these young men. Then in a year or fifteen or eighteen months they would become good and proficient mink ranchers. Now that was the second thought we had. Again, frankly, we thought that if we sent several young men off like that at considerable

expense there would be a certain percentage of failures. A certain percentage would be weeded out as being temperamentally unsuited to mink ranching activities, or they would not measure up entirely. There would be a certain percentage of failures, which would mean money down the drain. Then again such smart and bright young men might get to like living on the Mainland and all Newfoundland would have done would have been to have paid the expenses of sending off some of the brightest young men she had and losing them to the Mainland of Canada. So that idea did not appeal to us.

We came finally to the third idea. We had thought to bring down individual mink ranchers as instructors, but this idea was to bring them down not as tutors, not as instructors, but to bring them down as ranchers, bring them and their ranches here to Newfoundland. They had to be successful firms; they had to be prosperous firms; they had to be very substantial men in the main, that is why we have made these loans. We have eight or ten important mink ranchers from across Canada. This man George Neil of Saskatchewan to whom we have loaned \$25,000, as against a quarter of a million dollars worth of live mink.

MR. HOLLETT: How many would that be?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fifteen hundred. They are high-class mink. My honourable friend must understand that a mink may be worth anything from fifteen dollars to fifteen hundred dollars, and in fact more than that. The president of the American Mink Breeders Association with two of his companions, two other great mink ranchers from Wisconsin, came down to see me last year. They wanted to

come into Newfoundland and start taking pothead whales and shipping the meat off in refrigerated boats of their own to the Great Lakes, up the St. Lawrence to the Great Lakes, and then by refrigerated trucks to their mink ranches in Wisconsin. I told them; "Over my dead body." I would not permit it. They went off. But they gave me a lot of information. These three men and another seven ranchers, that is ten ranchers between them bought from another rancher who had developed a new mutation, a new colour, a new shade of pelt in a live mink by a specialized breeding programme. They bought from that rancher that one family of mink for \$250,000. The ten ranchers put up \$25,000 each to buy the only family of mink of that colour in the world.

Now mink, in their natural condition, are a sort of a dark colour, something between brown and black. They are a dark-haired animal. But by breeding you can get them snow white, spotless as this sheet of paper. And in between that they have pastels, a whole variety, a whole host of shades and mutations brought about by highly specialized breeding.

Now I want this to be clear to the House: We are not so foolish as a Government as to think that we are going to build up Newfoundland by bringing into Newfoundland immigrants from Saskatchewan and Manitoba and British Columbia at the rate of ten and twenty and twenty-five thousand dollars each. You do not build up Newfoundland in that way obviously — unless the House thinks we are just a pack of fools — obviously that is not our idea — Our idea is to build up hundreds of young Newfoundlanders as mink ranchers, many hundreds possibly twelve hundred and

possibly fifteen hundred mink ranches, owned, each of them, by a young Newfoundlander. That is our thought, and to lend public money to each of these young Newfoundlanders to give them the capital to make the changes and get the mechanical equipment they need to keep the mink in and to buy the breeding stock — a layout of possibly a million or a couple of million dollars to build up over there on the southside of Trinity Bay, where we plan to do it, between Whitbourne Bay and Heart's Content — maybe a little bit beyond Whitbourne and maybe Conception Bay; generally speaking from Whitbourne to Heart's Content, right in the heart of the pothead country — over there we would like to see develop the greatest concentration of mink raising in the whole world — in the whole world — We think we can do it. And our plans call for inviting into this Province enough famous and successful young, mainland Canadian and United States ranchers — young — we insist that they must be young — They must be young enough to be able to take root in Newfoundland but must be old enough to have been successful mink ranchers and to have made money on them and to be thoroughly experienced — to bring in enough of these from other parts of the Continent to constitute schools for the training of Newfoundlanders.

Now that is not their primary reason for coming, but it is our primary reason for bringing them. Their primary reason for coming is to make more money than they could make in Saskatchewan or in British Columbia or in any part of the United States. Our reason — and I want this to be clear — our reason is that we think this is the most practical form of training, because the next step is that we

set up a panel of young men, Newfoundlanders, who wish to become mink ranchers.

We have begun to advertise for applicants to come to us and say they want to become mink ranchers so that we can get a panel of names drawn up. And we say to these mainland ranchers — "You may come yourselves to Newfoundland, and you may bring with you any foremen or workers you have had on your ranches to work on your ranches here in Newfoundland, but you shall not employ anyone in Newfoundland to work on your ranches except from this panel. Here is a list of names. Now pick any one you like or two or three or four, any number you want. You must employ from this list and you must give that chap a break. Pay him the regular wages. This is not free labour now. This is paid labour. But if he does not measure up you are free to fire him. If it develops that he is temperamentally not suited to handle live animals — and there are men who are not — it is better that we find out through you, you lay him off and report to us, and then pick another man from the panel. But always you must pick from our panel. If you fire anyone within Newfoundland it must be someone from our panel — Give him a break. If he is saucy to you don't fire him just for that unless he is saucy again. If he is lazy get rid of him. If he begins to get drunk get rid of him. In other words we expect you to become a sort of screen for us — if he passes your test, if he graduates, so to speak, from your ranch at the end of a year or a year and a half we are going to invest public money in him, two or three or four or five thousand dollars. So the best service you can render to Newfoundland is to screen that chap for us, and

if he passes successfully he is in, otherwise fire him and hire somebody else from the panel." Now that is our scheme. It is the result of five years of careful analysis and consideration. It is going to cost money. It is going to cost, I would say, in 1955 and in 1956 the best part of a million dollars to get the whole thing going.

MR. HOLLET: Cost the Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. I don't mean to say a loss of that much to the Government. I mean to say the Government will lay out that much in loans. Another thing we must do is this: We must give these ranchers, extending from Whitbourne to Heart's Content, good service. So the department of my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines and Resources is going to erect in Whitbourne a fine modern building which is to be a mink institute. In that building there are to be offices for the secretary and management of the Mink Breeders Association and offices also for the Mink Breeders Co-operative Federation which they just formed, because they are going to obtain their feed, whale meat and fish and are going to process it and deliver it to the different ranches on a co-operative basis. These men have come into Newfoundland from the mainland and are strong co-operative men, especially those from Saskatchewan. So these two organizations already have their offices in this Mink Institute the Secretary-Manager of the Mink Breeders Association and the management of the Mink Breeders Feed Co-operative Association. In that same building will be the veterinarian. We are going to get the best veterinarian with experience in mink that money can buy. He will have his headquarters there in the Mink Insti-

tute. Then in addition we want in it a room large enough for meetings, for membership meetings of the Associations. Then again, we want classrooms in which these Newfoundland students who will be working on these ranches can go together by truck and by car to meet in the Mink Institute for the theoretical side of their instructions, the genetics. In other words this Mink Institute in Whitbourne will be the centre of the mink industry in Newfoundland — it will be the great centre for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make this clear — The mink ranchers we have in Newfoundland today are very widely scattered. There are some down in Green Bay; there are a couple in Fogo, although I notice one of the two in Fogo, or is it Change Islands, I think it is Fogo, has decided to move and the Government are helping him. One of the two mink ranchers in Fogo has decided it is better for him to get up amongst the big fellows, get a ranch up there near them so that he will be able to attend these meetings and will be able to go from ranch to ranch and compare notes. And these big ranchers will be able to visit him and give him tips. He thinks one of his biggest drawbacks is the isolation. No one advised him — no one knows any more than he does himself. In the town of Bonavista there are six or seven mink ranchers. They too have been labouring under a terrible disadvantage in that they have had no one to show them, no one to help them, no one to advise them, no one to tell them anything more than they know themselves. You have another case of a man down in Lower Island Cove, and I think a man up on the Southern Shore, and so it goes. The mink men are very, very scattered. In Corner Brook, Tony Grace, I think, is

one of the biggest in Newfoundland. I think he is now up to five or six hundred mink. He is probably the second biggest of the Newfoundlanders who are mink ranches in Newfoundland, next only to Victor Clouston. We have got to help them.

Now I hope this is made clear: Any mink ranchers anywhere in Newfoundland who are already operating and who wish to move into this big new mink area between Whitboutne and Heart's Content can do so with Government help. We are just as glad and happy here to help them financially to move in and establish over in the mink area as we are to help the mainlanders to come in. But if they will not move, and some will not and some cannot, the Government nevertheless will be happy, as far as it is feasible and practical to do so, to help them as well. It will be a bit difficult to do, but some way will be found.

Now, Mr. Pat Murray and Mr. Colin Storey went off the other day on a special trip at the request of the Minister, my honourable colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources. They went across to British Columbia. In British Columbia, near Vancouver they went to a Mink Breeders Co-operative Feed Plant and they heard a lot about this, the mink ranchers who had come here from Saskatchewan and Alberta and Manitoba had told them a lot about this big co-operative feed plant in Vancouver. They took a look at that. The management took them over the plant and showed them and told them everything and gave them every information they possibly wanted. But they were told they should go across the border down to California and see what the mink ranchers have down there in the way

of a co-operative feed plant, where the feed is mixed co-operatively by the plant on behalf of all their member ranches on a co-operative basis. So that instead of each rancher having to have a feeding plant of his own in which he would take the pothead whale meat frozen and fish frozen and the other parts of the 30% and mix it up in the right proportion and put it into the grinder, instead of that, one central mixing plant with controlled temperature would mix it each day and deliver it in refrigerated trucks to each rancher. That is on the plan. They were told they should go down and see it. They wired me and asked if it was all right to go. I said: "Go anywhere in North America where you may find anything that may be of some help in this mink programme." So they took me at my word.

MR. HOLLETT: What time do you expect them back?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh they are back! They went down to California and saw that plant and they were tremendously impressed by it and learned an enormous amount about it. But the co-operative society who owned that said that it was nothing. They had not seen anything at all yet. Over in Salt Lake City is the place to see how mink ranchers really operate a feed mink plant co-operatively. They were told to go over there, and they did. They went to Salt Lake City and they saw it and they also went to a number of other places on other business about which I will have the pleasure to tell the House later on in this session in connection with quite another matter altogether.

Well now they have formed a co-operative feed society here, the mink ranchers have, and the Government

are lending that society some money, and they have begun construction or if they have not begun they will begin pretty soon. So there at Dildo there is to be constructed a new feed plant, that is a plant with cold storage and freezing facilities to receive the pot-head meat, to freeze it. And our hope is that that same plant will receive the fish and the cereals and the rest and that a co-operative feed mixing plant will be established there so that in refrigerated trucks the feed can be delivered daily throughout the year to the ranches; which would be another excellent reason for keeping the mink ranches within the limits of a fairly small area, as I remarked before, between Whitbourne and Heart's Content. That would be within a reasonable distance for daily trucking and delivery of the co-operatively mixed feed.

Now one thing that I hope for on the southside of Trinity Bay is that someone will be energetic enough to come to the Government and say we would like to put up a fish freezing plant to serve this mink industry. We think it will take millions of pounds of fish to keep these ranches going, and we think in the end it will take many millions of pounds of fish to keep them going as it will take millions of pounds of whale meat.

MR. BROWNE: How many mink do you expect to have over there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Half a million. We expect to become Canada's greatest mink Province. We don't expect to become as great as the greatest American State, Wisconsin. One man alone there, Otto Goose has fifty thousand mink that are worth many millions of dollars, many, many millions of dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: What are the skins worth?

MR. SMALLWOOD: As pelts you mean not alive? A male pelt runs from \$12 to \$15 up to \$70 or \$80 depending on the type. If it is just the natural dark pelt it runs anywhere from \$12 to \$20 depending on other factors, whether it is large or small, the condition of the fur, the pelt. Then the mutations run anywhere up to \$70 or \$80, and the prime, the very latest, the ones they are developing say this year and have come on the market for the first time are worth probably two or three hundred dollars each. The mink is only a tiny little animal, but mink coats are the last word in luxury — mink coats and deep freeze — We don't propose to go into deep freeze but the mink is on the way.

MR. HOLLETT: You want a deep freeze though over there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A deep freeze for the mink, yes.

Now there is not much more to say about that.

MR. BROWNE: Would the Premier like to tell us while he is on the subject how he contacted these people out west?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly — that is easily done. I went up last year to the conference, the annual conference of the Canadian Mink Breeders Association. I was invited there. It is a very big and very important association. They invited me up and I went there and told them of the advantages and said: "Why don't you come down and see?" And I chartered a plane to bring them down. We landed here in St. John's and next day drove them over to Dildo. And

as God should have it — as a matter of fact there had not been a pot-head seen for three weeks before that, not one, not a solitary pot-head to be seen — In fact we had sent a helicopter out looking for some and they saw a small patch out around Conception Bay. But as God should have it, we arrived over there and twenty minutes before we arrived four hundred whales came in on the beach, and the clamor was something to behold. The water of Chapel Arm was red with blood. I never saw the like of it. These men just stood there — paying 12c., 14c., 15c. a pound for meat and they saw tens of thousands hundreds of thousands of pounds of good red meat on that beach. They were left speechless. They went back to their various provincial associations with their movies that they took. Some of them bought movie cameras and took movies, and all of them brought still cameras and took snapshots. Some got pictures of themselves standing on top of a whale out in the water. The mink journals across Canada were ringing with the story. Then I extended the invitation to Canadian mink ranchers to come and establish here in Newfoundland. The next thing they began flying down at their own expense to discuss the matter. And each one had his credentials to say who he was — anyhow we would not let them out of our sight until we landed them because we wanted a few dozen. We want another couple of dozen good substantial mink ranchers. Now we have applications literally in hundreds. But we don't want our potheads to be used up all of them by Mainlanders. We just want enough of them to be good trainers and instructors for our young Newfoundlanders whom we intend to help.

Now I ought to say that a good many people have travelled around Trinity Bay and have gone by the beach in Chapel Arm or have even gone down on the beach while the killing is going on, and they would be well aware of the fact that there is much to be desired in the way that things are handled. Visitors from outside Newfoundland who drive around there go off with a pretty terrible impression of us and of Newfoundland. They have not grown up in a pioneer country, the historic connotation of "Bloody Decks and Good Luck to You" — bloody decks do not mean a thing to them — but apart from the look of it, it is a terrible waste of good meat and good bone. So steps are being taken to have the slaughter and handling and cutting and loading and transporting and generally the whole business of these pothead whales made efficient and clean, by the use of power saws on the beach for sawing up the whales, with shelter to keep the sun off and possibly even with refrigerated warehouses in which to hold the meat in good condition prior to its removal to the freezing and processing feed plant in Dildo. We have pretty substantial plans. Then in addition to that it will be necessary to develop other pothead centres in Bonavista Bay; in Southern Bay near Princeton is a very important area where the pothead industry may be developed and then again in Placentia Bay. My friend the Minister of Finance tells me that right in the north-east arm at one time the pothead whales whelped. In Fogo these two men who have mink ranches if they want a pothead whale they get aboard a boat and just go out and shoot one and tow it in. In Hermitage Bay there are lots of them. One by one we will develop these sources of meat. And as we develop the sources of meat the

number of ranches can of course increase and the number of mink on these ranches that may be fed by that meat can be increased correspondingly. I don't think this whole programme can possibly get into its full stride in anything less than the next two or three years. I don't think that it can reach its maximum in anything less than the next five or six years. But I would hope that five or six years from now Newfoundland will have become the biggest mink ranching Province of Canada and that some six, seven or eight hundred young Newfoundlanders will have become successful mink ranchers.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker? Suppose the fashion changes and the ladies go back to wearing fox furs have you thought of any provisions for that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well that is a matter of course under frequent discussion in the American and Canadian, and in fact in the European mink breeders' association meetings, and in their various journals. And it is now thoroughly and universally agreed amongst minking men and style and furrier experts, etc., that even if long haired furs came back they never can take the place of mink because there are about four million minks a year in the United States, that is, the market is about four million pelts. It takes eighty pelts to make a coat, fifty thousand coats. Now what is fifty thousand fur coats in a nation of 170,000,000 that is so rich and wealthy and whose economy is expanding at such a rate? There must be in the United States many millions of millionaires, many millions of millionaires and their wives and daughters — Then again the House must remember the very large number of chorus girls that there are in the United States.

It is agreed that fox can never be as distinguished as mink, never as expensive, never as profitable. A fox might be worn by a lady for one part of the day but for the theatre party and the opera the highclass fur is mink. And mink will always command, at least for many years to come, a good price. But even in that Newfoundland will be the last part of North America in which it will become unprofitable to raise mink because the cost of raising them is so much lower in Newfoundland than anywhere else in North America. Mink ranchers might be losing money hand over fist in the raising of mink in other parts of North America and even go out of the raising of mink and yet we could go right on not only raising mink but making money out of it at the same time and even making good money. It is something like the mine at Buchans. The price of zinc in the world would have to fall so low that hundreds of zinc mines would have to close up and Buchans would still make good profits out of their zinc because it is so rich and so relatively cheap to produce that they can make a very great profit. The price can fall and fall and fall, and they can still make a profit, while hundreds of zinc mines would have to close. Similarly mink — yes I am distinguishing now between zinc and mink. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the story of what we are trying to do in connection with the starting of a mink industry. It is a subject that lends itself to a lot of hilarity, and we hope that the Opposition will think this screamingly funny for the next two or three years. I hope they will laugh their heads off over it. We hope they poke fun at us, but give it a chance, and three or four years from now —

MR. HOLLETT: It is up to the mink.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. It is not entirely up to the mink. Give them a little luck, and even making allowances for some blunders that are inevitable, some by me, some by my honourable friends here, some by the department, some by my honourable friend here and his department and by others — there will be blunders — but I believe that in spite of blunders in a few years this thing will have taken root and will no longer be cause for hilarity but will be one more item, one more feather, or if you like, one more jewel in the crown of the Liberals. Because, as the House knows, it is always a Liberal Government that creates industries, and Liberalism that creates further development of our resources in Newfoundland. Now that is the furthest I have gone to be partisan in any speech this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the budget we will all have further opportunity to discuss matters we have not discussed in this present debate on the Address in Reply, and I was not even going to speak in this debate at all except that my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, raised that matter of mink, and I was so anxious that our newspapers and radio stations would not introduce the matter to the public in a way that would prejudice the cause, that would damage the prospects by creating bad will in the public, that I was anxious to inform the House and inform my honourable friends, and through the House inform the public by means of our friends from the newspapers and radio stations just what it is we are attempting to do, so that they will suspend judgment and perhaps keep their minds open on the matter and see how it shapes. One of these days

within the next two or three weeks there will arrive here at Torbay an aircraft with the greatest value of minks ever flown across Canada, a quarter of a million dollars worth of live mink, that will attract enormous attention all across Canada — the fact that Dawe shipped his seven or eight hundred or a thousand or whatever it was all across Canada from British Columbia, with his wife and son and brother was published by newspapers right across Canada, of these shipments of live mink crossing the whole continent of Canada and going down to Newfoundland — And there have been several other stories of other shipments, and now soon there will be more, and capping it all, there will be this great aircraft touching down with a quarter of a million dollars worth of live mink — I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that all of us here in Newfoundland have some reason to feel a little proud that we have been able to develop something in this Province which has attracted successful and experienced and able men from four or five other Provinces of Canada, as far west as the Pacific Ocean —

On motion the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: I will inform the House of the day when we present the Address in Reply.

It being now 6:00 o'clock I do leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock to-night.

FRIDAY, April 1st, 1955

NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

Mr. Speaker (Mr. Courage) in the Chair:

On motion a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Fire Prevention Act" read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Disabled Persons Act, 1954" read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Committee of the Whole on various Bills:

A Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Protection of Justices and Other Public Authorities:—"

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause No. 2 was held over.

On motion Clause 2 carried.

MR. CURTIS: Before we move on to Clause 15: The other night we amended and struck out a section in Clause 10. I would ask the Committee to reconsider Clause 10.

On motion the Committee reverted to Clause 10.

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Chairman, if we could make that back to "6" again — because in the case of outport magistrates two days does not give enough time, and the feeling of the department is that if a notice is served pending which application will be made to a superior court, the magistrate should have time in which to do the act complained of rather than be compelled to do it. For that reason I ask we change it to "6 days."

Clause as amended carried.

MR. BROWNE: The only point there is the composition of No. 5 where he has no jurisdiction he is liable to an action under Section 5 — It seems

to be a contradiction — How do you reconcile it?

MR. CURTIS: In this case this refers to an order made by a justice which would have been perfectly in order and which would have been perfectly legal and perfectly proper if the warrant was in order. In other words, it is to protect the magistrate in the case of the information not being in order but might have been in order had it been properly worded. The whole effect of this, Mr. Chairman, is purely to protect the magistrate acting on information which was found to be defective and which might have not been defective if it had been worded properly. It is merely to protect a magistrate who acts on information erroneously taken.

Clause 13 carried.

Clause 14 read:

14. — (1) Where an order is made quashing or altering a conviction or order made by a justice, the court may provide that no action shall be brought against the justice who made the conviction or order or against the informant or any officer acting thereunder or under any warrant issued to enforce the conviction or order.

(2) An order under sub-section (1) may be made conditional upon payment of the costs of the motion to quash or upon any other condition that may be deemed proper.

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Chairman, Clause 14 refers back to Clause 4: Clause 14 says: "Where an order is made quashing or altering a conviction or order made by a justice, the court may provide that no action shall be brought against the justice who made the conviction or order or against the informant or any officer

acting thereunder or under any warrant issued to enforce the conviction or order.

(2) An order under sub-section (1) may be made conditional upon payment of the costs of the motion to quash or upon any other condition that may be deemed proper."

and Section 4:

"An action shall not be brought against a justice for any act done by him in the execution of his duty as a justice with respect to any matter within his jurisdiction, unless the Act was done maliciously and without reasonable and proper cause."

Now the court may thereupon decide the question. Apparently, I presume, that means the higher court, the Supreme Court — provides no action may be taken against him.

MR. CURTIS: Does not that seem reasonable — In the courts here a case comes before an appeal court which sets aside a judgment or an order and says there was no malice, and in any event it may not be entered at all — the court may provide that no action shall be made by a justice, the court may provide that no action shall be brought against the justice who made the conviction or order and no action shall be brought if the costs are paid.

MR. BROWNE: Is there any precedent for this?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, the Ontario Act, Section 7, I think it is. It is a good clause. We want to protect our justices as far as we can.

Clause 14 carried.

Clause 15 read:

15. Where a plaintiff is entitled to recover, and if he proves the levying or

payment of any penalty or sum of money under any conviction or order as part of the damages he seeks to recover, or if he proves that he was imprisoned under the conviction or order and seeks to recover damages for the imprisonment, he shall not be entitled to recover the amount of the penalty or sum so levied or paid, or any sum beyond the sum of five cents as damages for the imprisonment, or any costs of suit, if it is proved that he was actually guilty of the offence of which he was convicted, or that he was liable by law to pay the sum he was so ordered to pay, and, with the respect of the imprisonment, that he has undergone no greater punishment than that assigned by law for the offence of which he was so convicted, or for non-payment of the sum he was so ordered to pay.

MR. BROWNE: In connection with Clause 15 — I just forget why this was allowed to stand.

MR. CURTIS: That is from the English Act, Section 13 — I might say, Mr. Chairman, we have gone through all the Acts of all the Provinces on this Act, and we have found that most of them are uniform, and most of them are based on the English Act. We have followed the one that is sanctioned more by adoption generally. In other words, we have not swallowed any one wholesale. We have taken the one that is most conspicuous by being adopted most frequently.

Clause 15 carried.

MR. CURTIS: The only other section I undertook to look into for my honourable friend was "thirty days" in section 19. That, we think is not an unreasonable time. It was passed and we do not need to refer to it.

MR. BROWNE: Is this the same as any other Province?

MR. CURTIS: It is the same as Ontario.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment. Carried.

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Coming into Force of the Civil Service Commission Act, 1953."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I have not very much to say on this, but perhaps I could ask a question in regard to the Civil Service Commission in Newfoundland. It is a comparatively new affair, and last year we had a memorandum from them complaining or setting out, at any rate, that their jurisdiction was very limited or limited to a number of minor posts. I was wondering whether since that time any extension of their work has been made, any enlargement of their duties, and how the thing was working in general. I think this should be a suitable time for some statement about the operations of this Civil Service Commission:

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Civil Service Commission idea was adopted only a couple or three years ago and put into statute form, and the Civil Service Commission itself was appointed only within the past one and a half years or one year ago. Two of the members of that Commission are former civil servants. One of them is a former Deputy Minister, the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Carter. The other civil servant, Mr. Taylor, was an old railway man on the administrative or clerical side of railway work. When the original 6c. a day dole was devised and introduced by the Commission of Government he was secured from the railway to that division. From that he went on to the Department of Health and then into the Department of Health and

Welfare. So that both of these gentlemen have had a fair amount of experience as civil servants. The third member of the commission is not a civil servant.

We feel that the sound principle is that all civil service appointments must come eventually under the Civil Service Commission except certain types of appointments such as Minister's personal assistants or secretaries; and Deputy Ministers which appointments are the prerogative of the Premier, whoever he may be, and members of commissions, the liquor board, compensation board, utility boards and all these public boards and perhaps the staff of the Department of Health other than clerical and administrative. In the various institutions there are literally hundreds of nurses, aids, domestics, kitchen staff, cleaners, utility workers, watchmen, firemen, twelve or fifteen hundred and perhaps as many as two thousand, who might well continue to be employed as they have always been employed, there being no particular point, perhaps, in having them come under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. Now leaving these out there would remain perhaps a couple of thousand positions in the whole of the civil service which should come under them, and which will eventually come under the Civil Service Commission.

Now the whole idea of a Civil Service Commission made up of men who devote their full time to that work is so new in Newfoundland that it seems prudent, to say the least, that we make haste slowly in extending their jurisdiction. We want that Civil Service Commission to gain not only experience but prestige which comes with experience. At the present time they are doing very well, getting along very nicely, and we are quite satisfied with

their progress. They will gradually have their jurisdiction broadened to give them even more control over the civil service by putting even more and more of the civil service positions within their control.

MR. BROWNE: Do they advertise for positions?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Quite completely. One sees advertisements in the newspapers and, I believe, they broadcast over the air for civil service positions. Of course every position is advertised within the service, the idea being that naturally that if a man or woman is already working for the Government in some department or other that person should be able to apply for a position within the same department if it is a better position or in another department because it is all one Government. Indeed, generally speaking, persons already within the civil service are given the preference to those outside of the civil service. I say, generally speaking. There are times when obviously someone who is not in the civil service who applies for a position is better qualified for it than anyone in the service. Sometimes this is obviously the case but not always, but it is very obviously so sometimes. And I don't think that the Government should by any rule be bound to deprive itself of the services of a particularly able person. Now I may say that the one thing concerning the Civil Service Commission about which I am very proud is that there has been no political influence brought to bear on it whatsoever, to my knowledge, and I believe I would know if any had been brought. The position is that the selection of persons for posts is entirely within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission, and what the Government receives is merely their recommendations.

What the Government does is merely to appoint the person so recommended or to reject him. If the Government accepts him that ends the matter. If the Government rejects him the name goes back to the Civil Service Commission who then sends us another name and the Government again may accept or reject this person. To this moment we know of no case (in fact I have not attended every cabinet meeting. I have missed a few when I was away) but I don't believe there has been a single instance where the Government did not just automatically, without discussion, appoint, or order the appointment, of a person who has been recommended by the Civil Service Commission. There has not been a single instance where we sent the name back refusing the appointment. We have that power. We may decline to appoint, but we have not used our right to do so. I don't know if there is anything I can add to that.

Clauses 1 and 2 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment.

Carried.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Tax Act, 1949."

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister or the Attorney General could tell us to what extent this is still being used — Each year there seems to be an amendment of this character. Surely there are no outstanding taxes due since 1949 and it must be in the current year or for future years.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance) : As I understand, it is just to bring it in line with amendments made in the Federal Act.

MR. BROWNE : Because we get a certain proportion of the tax.

MR. CURTIS : No. They collect it in our name.

MR. SMALLWOOD : Under the authority of our Act.

MR. CURTIS : We pass an Act a five per cent tax Act but they collect all as one tax, Ottawa does, we make it five per cent, but the Provinces who have not signed the tax agreement they collect it entirely. This is an Act that protects the Provinces who do not sign the tax agreement.

MR. BROWNE : Who signed it.

MR. CURTIS : Therefore in this case we enact the Legislation but they collect. Now if we had not signed the tax agreement we could collect it.

MR. BROWNE : Do we not get five per cent just the same?

MR. SMALLWOOD : No, if we did not enact this Bill they would charge us the five per cent from the tax rental they give us, so we impose the tax. We are required under the tax rental agreement to do that, we impose it by law, five per cent. They collect it and keep it. It is theirs. It belongs to them. It is a tax imposed within the Province by our own law but they having the right to collect and retain it. If we do not enact the law they can't collect whereby they would deduct the amount they would have raised from the tax rental agreement due us. As they themselves amend their legislation from time to time ours also has to be amended accordingly each year.

Clause carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment. Carried.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act :"

MR. CHAIRMAN : I might say at this stage that there were two Bills over which there was some dispute as to whether they were money Bills or not. I was not certain whether this was one.

MR. CURTIS : No, Mr. Chairman, this was not one.

MR. BROWNE : This is a money Bill, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN : This has passed second reading.

Clauses 1 and 2 read and carried.

Clause 3 read :

3. Sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the said Act is amended by inserting immediately after the words "no vendor shall" the words "except when he is exempt from the provisions of this section by the regulations."

MR. BROWNE : What is the difference in this and the one repealed?

MR. POWER : Are you referring to Section 2?

MR. BROWNE : Section 1 (A). Say you are turning in a motor car as part payment and you have already paid the tax on that — I am just wondering what the section repeals. Say he paid before the Act came into effect does he still have to pay it now.

MR. CURTIS : No. I would say not. "Every person who after the coming into force of the Act takes delivery of any personal property pur-

chased by him prior to the coming into force of this Act." It is the date of delivery.

MR. BROWNE: Suppose a man buys a car at \$50 a month. He pays for it. Supposing property is sold and repossessed because the purchaser defaults and the vendor sells the property again. Now the full assessment has been levied on it — it has been repossessed by the vendor and he again sells it. Does the vendor then collect the assessment again from the new purchaser? Or does he repay to the first purchaser the amount which he paid, the proportionate amount which he paid.

MR. CURTIS: I think everybody pays, Mr. Speaker, it is a tax on purchases it is not a tax on the car. If I buy a car for a thousand dollars and pay a thousand and sell it for five hundred dollars the purchaser from me pays the tax on five hundred dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Suppose a person buys a car on the instalment and pays fifty dollars and falls down on the instalments and it is repossessed and taken possession of by the vendor or IAC or whoever they are, and they sell it again for six hundred dollars. So they get a surplus over and above what is due to them. Do they make amends to the first purchaser on the difference between what he should have paid and what they collected? It is a little complicated, I know.

MR. POWER: If, say, there was a sale made on a certain article that cost a hundred dollars, on the instalment, and the purchaser paid fifty dollars and he paid the tax on the one hundred dollars — when there would be another sale it would be another transaction — it would be repossessed and could be sold again and again.

MR. CURTIS: I know. But what the honourable gentleman wants to know is what happens when he pays five hundred dollars and the tax on fifteen hundred say, and the sale is then cancelled. Does the person who pays the tax on fifteen hundred dollars get the tax back?

MR. POWER: I assume he gets his tax back.

MR. CURTIS: I don't know — it depends — we would have to read the whole Act for that, Mr. Chairman. Is that strictly a question arising under this section?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, it arises there under 2 (a).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the Committee that this clause stand?

MR. BROWNE: I was asking about sub-section 6 — That has to do with Section 2?

MR. CURTIS: No, sub-section 6 does not come into the question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: The point is, if a person buys something —

MR. POWER: This is not supposed to be a change — These are just regulations now being incorporated into the Act.

MR. BROWNE: It seems to be connected with that sub-section 6. We could let it stand anyhow.

MR. CURTIS: It is up to the Minister.

MR. POWER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think that section should stand.

On motion Section 2 stand.

Section 3 read:

3. Sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the said Act is amended by inserting immediately after the words "no vendor shall" the words "except when he is exempt from the provisions of this Section by the regulations."

MR. BROWNE: Could someone tell us what that means?

MR. POWER: The Deputy Minister of Finance's office is on Harvey Road and the Social Assessment Department is on Water Street, so to facilitate matters this is put in here. As a matter of fact the man in charge of Social Assessment, on the spot, should not be continually referring to the Deputy Minister of Finance.

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Chairman, I might assist. I happen to have the Act here. Section 4 sub-section 1 of Section 4 reads now (and I will add the amendment as I read it) "After 90 days, following the coming into force of this Act no vendor" (and then there is an amendment put in) "except when he is exempt from the provisions of this Section by the regulations" "shall sell any tangible personal property in Newfoundland at a retail sale unless he has been granted on his application a registered certificate." Now this is a Section saying nobody shall make a sale without being registered as a vendor and the amendment just adds "except when exempted otherwise by this Act." So it is just a tidying up of the Section.

MR. BROWNE: I don't know whether this is a case of tidying up or not. There used to be a time when any person could go into a wholesale store and buy goods wholesale. We are not able to do that any more.

MR. CURTIS: If the wholesaler will take out a license. But the wholesalers refuse. It is too much trouble as they sell too few items.

Clause 3 carried.

Clause 4 read:

4. The said Act is further amended by inserting immediately after Section 28 as Sections 28A and 28B the following:

"28A. The Lieutenant Governor in Council may assign to any officer of the Department of Finance designated by him the performance of any of the duties and the exercise of any of the powers imposed or conferred on the Deputy Minister by or under this Act and any officer to whom the performance of any such duties or the exercise of any such powers is assigned in accordance with this Section shall perform the duties and may exercise the powers as if they were imposed or conferred on him by this Act.

28B. — (1) Where a vendor whether registered or unregistered fails to collect any assessment which by this Act he is required to collect, the Deputy Minister may in addition to any other penalty imposed by this Act impose on that vendor a penalty not exceeding the amount of the loss sustained by Her Majesty by reason of the failure of the vendor so to collect together with ten per centum of the amount of such loss.

(2) In any case referred to in subsection (1), the Deputy Minister may make an estimate of the amount of the loss sustained by Her Majesty and subject to proof to the contrary, on appeal, in accordance with this Act to the Minister or to a judge of the Supreme Court or a judge of a District Court the amount so estimated shall for the purpose of this section be deemed to be the actual loss so sustained."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask, is there any power such as that in the Act at the present time?

MR. CURTIS: No. These are new Sections.

MR. BROWNE: This seems to be similar to provisions in the Income Tax Act of Canada and had been in our own Act. How do they come to be introduced now? Is there some reason for that?

MR. CURTIS: These are just clauses put in to tighten up the Act. It has been found that in trying to carry out the Act there were some loopholes and it is desired to stop these. Actually this Act was adopted from the British Columbia Act and I don't think it was the most modern version, and we are finding it necessary all the time to revise it to meet local conditions.

Clause 4 carried.

Clause 5 read and carried.

Clause 6 read:

6. Sub-section (1) of Section 31A of the said Act is amended by inserting immediately after the words "penalty or interest imposed under" the expression "Section 28B."

MR. BROWNE: Section 6 here refers to sub-section (1) of Section 31A of the Act. I wonder was that last year?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, that was last year's amendment, an appeal section.

Clause 6 carried.

Clause 7 read:

7. Section 32 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"32—(1) Every person guilty of an offence under this Act is liable on summary conviction to a fine of not less than twenty-five dollars and not more than one thousand dollars, and in default of payment of the fine to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or to both such fine and imprisonment.

(2) Sections 74 to 77 of The Summary Jurisdiction Act, chapter 117 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, do not apply to a person charged with an offence under this Act."

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister, what is the present penalty under Section 32? This says not less than \$25 and not more than \$1,000 and in default of payment of the fine to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or to both such fine and imprisonment.

MR. POWER: Not less than \$200.

MR. HIGGINS: Well now, Mr. Chairman, I raised this point the other night in second reading and I make no apologies for bringing it up again. I still say the minimum fine of \$25 is too much. It is quite conceivable a substantial number of the people who might be in default are guilty of an offence merely in respect of an amount of \$1 or \$2 and the minimum fine is \$25, taking away, as you do in the second Section, any discretion of the magistrate. It seems to me to be a most unfeeling provision. As I mentioned before, it is only today that we have witnessed the coming into force of the Canadian Criminal Code where the Dominion Government recognizes the right of magistrates to discretion, where they have removed the former restrictions on magistrates exercising jurisdiction — Now we are taking a

step backwards. We are not trying to emulate the thinking of the older body, and we are bringing in this harsh provision. I would move, Mr. Chairman, that fine of \$25 be reduced to "not less than \$5" leaving the maximum, of course, as it is.

MR. BROWNE: In support of that, Mr. Chairman, may I point out that there is no minimum imprisonment set forth here. It is for a time not exceeding six months. To be uniform we really should have such a provision in this. I think the suggestion of my honourable and learned friend is a good one, \$5 as a minimum fine.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I must say that in the eyes of the Government the amendment is not acceptable. We felt that the magistrates trying these cases both in St. John's and outside should have taken a more serious view of the defaults of these people. This is an Act for the collection of revenue. If we allow people just not to pay it we may as well take the Act off the books. There is no reason why I should pay and you should pay and other people not pay. I think, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend can feel absolutely assured if there is a minor case or any reasonable excuse the department will not prosecute. But it will prosecute those wilfully guilty and guilty in most cases for the second time. The department has the right to feel that we will stand behind the legislation and stand behind the department and see that there is a proper punishment meted out in event of default. There has been far too many suspended sentences, and \$5 is certainly too small a fine for a breach of the Social Assessment or any Tax Act. This is an Act where we get our salaries from and the Government gets its revenue,

and if the people are not going to pay their fines, let us wipe the Act off altogether — the fine is small enough.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General is getting indignant. But as one who has had a great deal of experience in imposing penalties, I should like to point out there are great variations in the nature of any offence. A very small shopkeeper may commit a very minor offence only involving a small amount of money, a few cents, but technically it is there — \$25 — and \$25 means a lot to such a person. And the magistrate has no discretion whatsoever. Now the Attorney General refers to a second offence — well why not have the punishment different for the second offence. That is quite common. Set it at \$5 or \$10 as the case may be for the first offence and \$25 minimum for the second offence and \$100, if you like, for a third offence. But for the first offence a minimum of \$25 seems to me, where there are so many small shopkeepers involved and where the transactions themselves may be so insignificant — The principle that the Honourable the Attorney General mentioned is important — Everybody should pay his just tax especially if he has collected them like that. Yet the amount involved in this particular case might be so insignificant as not to merit a fine of \$25. \$25 is a lot of money to a lot of people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe there are three shops in the length and breadth of Newfoundland, and I think in Labrador, to whom a fine of \$25 would be serious. I don't believe there are three in the whole Province. Now if there are three and \$25 would put them out of business they should be put out of business. If it is a wilful and deliberate crime against the law

why should they not be put out of business if \$25 will do it. If it is an unintelligent or trifling or a harmless infraction of the law the Crown won't prosecute in any case. Only if there is clearly in the Crown's opinion an effort to evade collecting the tax or if it has been collected and there is good reason to believe they pocketed the money. In that case why not prosecute? And if a \$25 fine would be serious, that is what it is meant to be. It is meant to be serious. Now let us not exaggerate. It is \$25 we are talking about and not \$2,500. Or let us make it 25c. then it will be harmless. Let us keep it in proportion. There is no great popular principle at stake here.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, surely we ought to have the right to speak here without being ridiculed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I did not ridicule the honourable member. I only argued. I did not ridicule him.

MR. BROWNE: I grant the Premier is able to tell a fascinating story about mink. He has far more knowledge and experience in that. But I think I can claim more experience with regard to fines than he can. It is not as simple as he states it is. It is not altogether a question of whether the shopkeeper is going out of business. It is a question of giving to the magistrate or justice the power of imposing a punishment to fit the crime and not leaving it in the hands of the Crown. The Crown is not supposed to impose penalties and say we will let this chap off and we will go after that chap because one is a minor and the other a terrible offence. The Crown is supposed to put the case forward and leave it in the hands of the courts. That is what the courts are

for. What are the courts for if the Crown is going to take unto itself the right to say we will prosecute in this case and won't in that. That is leaving it open to suspicion. If the offender has a good friend in the Department of the Attorney General or in the Government he won't be prosecuted at all.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I agree with my learned friend of this side of the House. I myself was a magistrate for twenty-five years, and I can appreciate the point which has just been made by the honourable member for St. John's West. I think in a matter of this kind the magistrate is the person to fix the fine commensurate with the offence. If we put the reading of this thing "not less than \$5" and not more than so and so we leave it to the magistrate and he knows whether the offence is a serious one or just a little error or technical offence — I think it should be left in the hands of the magistrate to decide. I see no reason, as my honourable friend says, we here should fix the penalty; on this particular point certainly I agree.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In that case why not just say the magistrate may fine something up to but not exceeding a certain amount, and let the magistrate decide how much it is to be.

MR. BROWNE: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "Yes," he says. Well the answer is no.

MR. BROWNE: That is what magistrates are for.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. That is not what they are for. They are there to hear cases that are brought before them, that is my opinion, and to give

judgments according to the law. If they find an offender guilty and determine the degree of guilt then they give the sentence the law says, and not give the sentence they feel like. But my honourable friend is right when he says, ironically, don't fix any minimum.

MR. BROWNE: That was the law for years — a fine up to, say, \$200, and the magistrate had the power to fix any fine up to that. As my honourable and learned friend says, the Criminal Code, which comes in today gives that very power.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This says; "shall have discretion to fine between the amounts mentioned."

MR. HIGGINS: That was not quite my argument. The point to which I directed the attention of the Honourable the Attorney General was that hitherto, and you Mr. Chairman, know that as well as I do, the right of the magistrate to suspend sentence in certain offences where the punishments were imprisonment for a term of greater than two years was conditional on the consent of the counsel representing the Crown in this country. The amended Criminal Code which is now the Criminal Code, has removed that and the magistrate is now completely unfettered. The Attorney General has substituted for it, in the event of the magistrate being unreasonable — it is that principle, Mr. Chairman, we might well apply here because, if the Dominion Parliament has after two years intensive study agreed that the courts are better qualified than legislatures to apportion punishments, they recognize discretion sense in giving magistrates discretion and it seems to me to be a rather retrograde step for us to take.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But are we not giving in that the wide sweep between \$25 and \$1,000? Surely within these two limits a magistrate is given a little elbow room. When we make it too rigid for him we make him a mere rubber stamp. But when we say not less than \$25 and not more than \$1000, we leave him lots of elbow room.

MR. HIGGINS: I still think, Mr. Chairman, there might well be cases (the Attorney General assures us that as long as he is Attorney General it won't happen) where a situation might well arise where a magistrate may feel honestly that whilst there has been a breach it has been a breach through ignorance of the law, which is no excuse so to speak, and some party has omitted to do something. Then that magistrate says; "well, I am very sorry for you but I give you the minimum fine of \$25," although if he had the discretion he might simply say — "I will suspend sentence in this case."

Now we have a very interesting point, which the Premier, I think, raised. We have no provision at the moment for a second offence. As the Attorney General will recall, he has various legislation in Newfoundland — The Alcoholic Liquors Act — which provides for the offence of selling alcoholic liquors. The first offence shall be a fine of \$100 to \$400 depending whether it is sold for profit or for the general pleasure of breaking the law and a second offence, I believe, is two years — If we are going to be so rigid I think we should have cognizance of the persistent offender whom the Attorney General had in mind.

MR. CURTIS: Most of the prosecutions in this case, Mr. Chairman, are taken after and when a vendor

still persists in not filing returns and not collecting the tax after warning. You see, Mr. Chairman, this is a tax and the vendor is told to collect that tax and if he collects that tax it is money which belongs to the Government. And if he fails to pass the money in to the Government and fails to give the Government a full accounting of that money he has stolen that money, and \$25 is a very, very nominal fine for it. If we made it, as my honourable friend suggests, five dollars to one thousand dollars in every case what would the fine be? Five dollars? It is an invariable practice to help the magistrate. He has no alternative. There is the fine. There is the offence. Anybody who goes before the magistrate cannot expect any sympathy because he cannot give any. He can give all the sympathy he likes between \$25 and \$1,000. But I venture to say, even under this section the fine will not be more than \$25. We are not prepared to accept the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think there is an amendment, merely a suggestion.

MR. HIGGINS: I merely suggested it.

Clause 7 carried.

Clause 8 read:

8. Subsection (2) of section 34 of the said Act is amended,

(a) by deleting paragraph (a) and substituting therefor the following: "(a) prescribing the forms and records to be used and the returns to be made for the purposes of this Act and of the regulations, and prescribing the time and manner in which such returns are to be made;"

and

(b) by deleting the period at the end of paragraph (e) and substituting therefor a semicolon and by adding to the subsections as paragraphs (f) and (g) the following:

(f) providing for the exemption of specified classes of vendors from the obligation to obtain a registration certificate imposed by Section 4, subject to the condition that any such exemption shall not relieve a vendor from any other obligation imposed on him by this Act; (g) prescribing the manner in which refunds of assessments authorized by this Act shall be made."

MR. BROWNE: Are these powers of making regulations? Does it make provisions in the Act for gazettement?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, any such regulations shall have effect from the date of publication in the Newfoundland Gazette.

Clause 8 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Apprenticeship Act, 1955":

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendments.

Carried.

A Bill "An Act Respecting the preservation of Historic Objects":

Clauses 1 and 2 read and carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I wonder if that includes the Tory Party?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6 read and carried.

Clause 7 read :

7.—(1) The Minister shall keep or cause to be kept a record of historic objects declared to be such under Section 3 or acquired under subsection (1) of Section 4 together with any information on each of them that he deems fit.

(2) The record referred to in subsection (1) shall be kept in a place which the Minister designates and shall be open for inspection by the public at times to be fixed by the Minister.

MR. HOLLETT: Referring back to Clause 2(c), Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if the year 1900 has any significance?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Actually, Mr. Chairman, the thing that is desirable is not that you should go very far back. If, for instance, we made the principle and details of this Bill applicable to objects down to say 1850 rather than 1900 it would mean that articles in the period from 1850 to 1900, fifty years from now, would be as old as articles now of 1950 are today — if my honourable friends follow me — In other words the desirable thing is to make the date as late as possible and not as early — This pencil, for instance, which is so commonplace today may a hundred years from now be a valuable antique, might well be, like the Tory Party, for instance.

MR. HOLLETT: There is a lot of difference between an antique and a historic article.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not too much. Now, according to that reasoning — this thing here for instance, 1932, is the only copy in the world of the thing that it is, the Hansard for 1932, which is a very good reason for making

this Bill 1932 rather than 1900. If it is purely from the historical side, archaeological, antique and all that aspect ought to be taken into account, and is meant in the Bill to be taken into account — So I don't think we ought to complain that 1900 is being set —

MR. HOLLETT: I am not complaining. I was just wondering what the significance was in selecting the year 1900.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Some year had to be fixed. In American and Canadian and English customs laws an antique is a thing a hundred years old, an heirloom. For customs purposes, if it is a hundred years old it is free of duty.

MR. HOLLETT: But it is not a historic object.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The one article might be both. In the Vatican Library, I believe, when a thing is a hundred years old it becomes public and if it does not become public it is much more apt to be seen by the public. That is to say it is far more likely than even the privilege to go and examine documents after they are a hundred years old is granted. In all these things you have to pick a date out of the air and say, before that a thing is or after that a thing is this or that. You have to fix a date. So we fixed a date, 1900. If there is a better date let us find and fix that date.

MR. HOLLETT: I would say 1932 and then we would get that book.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are going to get the book anyway.

MR. HOLLETT: It is a Hansard, is it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

On motion Bill passed without amendment.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the School Attendance Act."

On motion Bill passed without amendment.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act:"

I. This Act may be cited as The Newfoundland Teachers' Association (Amendment) Act, 1955.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there is only one question I have to ask — Are these laws published anywhere? — Is there provision that they should be published in the "Newfoundland Gazette?"

MR. CHALKER: Yes, I believe there is, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think there is. I have the Act here and there is no provision for the publication. They have the effect, I suppose, of regulations as far as the association is concerned. It is important that they be published somewhere. How would a teacher know?

MR. CHALKER: They are published in the weekly news letter which goes out from the department.

MR. HEFFERTON: More than that, I believe all teachers are provided with copies.

MR. CURTIS: Are amendments made from time to time?

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 read and passed.

On motion Bill passed without amendment.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act."

Clause 1 read and carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. Paragraph (k) of Section 2 of The Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act, chapter 103 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952 is amended.

(a) by deleting the expression "not lower than C License" wherever it appears in the paragraph and substituting therefor in every case the words "not lower than Probationer's License;" and

(b) by adding at the end of the paragraph the following:

"and includes also a person who by virtue of the provisions of The Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act, chapter 107 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, is deemed to retain his status as a teacher for all of the purposes of this Act."

MR. BROWNE: I have the section here before me, a very long section with 15 different subsections. Where are you going to add that.

MR. CHALKER: That is the last paragraph.

MR. BROWNE: Yes — Where do you add that?

MR. CURTIS: After (k).

Clause 2 carried.

On motion Bill passed without amendment.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act."

Clauses 1 through 4 read and carried.

Clause 5 read:

5. Section 8 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"8. Subject to the other provisions of this Act respecting the holding of special elections in certain circumstances, elections for the selection of councillors to replace those whose term of office has then expired shall be held on the second day of November, 1957, and thereafter elections shall be held on the second day of November immediately following each and every succeeding period of four years from and including the second day of November, 1957 to replace those whose term of office has then expired, but where the second day of November falls on a Sunday or on a statutory holiday in any election year the election prescribed by this section shall be held on the day first following which is not a Sunday or a holiday, and in respect of any Municipality the Minister may by order from time to time defer an election for the selection of councillors prescribed by this section for a period not exceeding nine months in the aggregate."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, in that section, in order to bring into conformity what is already in the St. John's City Act I suggest "The second Tuesday of November" in the fifth line rather than the 2nd of November.

MR. BROWNE: Supposing that Tuesday falls on a Sunday?

MR. HEFFERTON: The same wording as is our St. John's City Act at the present time — "The second Tuesday in November." That also means the last four of five lines have to go out too, if I am not mistaken.

MR. BROWNE: Well "where a second Tuesday of November falls on a Sunday," that is there now.

MR. CURTIS: I think if we are to amend that we might hold over the section and do it properly.

Clause 5 stand.

Clause 6 read:

6. The said Act is further amended by inserting immediately after Section 44 as Sections 44A and 44B the following:

"44A. The Council may rent any of its mechanical equipment to any person upon such terms and conditions as the Council may prescribe.

44B.—(1) Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the Council may order the holding of a plebiscite in the Municipality controlled and managed by it for the purpose of determining the views of the electors in the Municipality on any matter and shall in any order made under this subsection.

- (a) set the date for the holding of the plebiscite;
- (b) define the question to be voted on in the plebiscite; and
- (c) appoint a returning officer for the holding of the plebiscite.

(2) A returning officer appointed under this section shall have all of the powers and exercise all of the functions of a returning officer appointed under The Local Government (Election) Act.

(3) A plebiscite held under this section shall, subject to this section and any regulations made hereunder, be conducted as nearly as possible as in an election for the election of councillors for a Municipality.

(4) In any plebiscite held under this section only those persons may

vote who would be qualified to vote in an election, other than a first election, held to elect councillors for the Municipality concerned: Provided that when a plebiscite is held involving the increase of the capital indebtedness of a Council, a person who is not liable to taxation by the Council may not vote in that plebiscite.

(5) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make regulations for the better carrying out of this section and in particular but without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing may make regulations,

- (a) prescribing the form of ballots and other documents to be used in a plebiscite;
- (b) prescribing fees to be paid to returning officers and other plebiscite officials; and
- (c) prescribing the method by which due notice of a plebiscite shall be given.

(6) Regulations made under this section shall be published in The Newfoundland Gazette and shall have effect from the date of publication or from such later date as may be stated in the regulations and shall be laid before the Legislature within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session."

MR. BROWNE: Well now, Mr. Chairman, this is the section in which I draw attention to the very wide powers the council has here of holding a plebiscite on any matter. It seems to me it should be on matters in connection with the operation of the council and not matters outside of its jurisdiction. Has the council any jurisdiction over the matter of carrying on local plebiscites — because in the Alcoholics Liquors Act there is provision for holding a plebiscite in re-

gard to local option. Is it now the intention these councils should have the power to hold plebiscites on such matters or is it only on such matters as are within their Act?

MR. HEFFERTON: The Act takes care of it. Under the Alcoholic Liquors Act the plebiscite may be held by local option and under the Education Act the School Tax Act set up a school tax authority which would have the right to determine it for itself.

MR. BROWNE: They quite obviously do not have power on every matter.

MR. CURTIS: They could have a plebiscite. But what is the good of it. They could have a plebiscite on "Who Killed Cock-Robin."

MR. HOLLETT: Or they could have a plebiscite as to whether they should send for the Premier to have him come down as a candidate. They have a lot of authority down in White Bay area.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They evidently have done that.

MR. HOLLETT: They should do it before they sent such a request.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The big point is subject to the court of appeal.

MR. HOLLETT: I missed my point. It has to be subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. I understand they all passed it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We approve it very heartily.

MR. BROWNE: There is just one point in connection with publication in The Newfoundland Gazette, I notice that the regulations in that section now are to be published but as

to the general regulations that are to be made by the Councils, I don't think there are any provisions in the Local Government Act for their publication.

MR. CURTIS: I don't think it is much good to put them in the "Gazette."

MR. BROWNE: They should be put somewhere. The Rural District of Placentia Act had provisions for putting them in such places as the Council may desire and must decide. So they did not decide to put them anywhere, nobody could see them. One had to go to the office to see whether they were there. There should be some provisions as to the post office or some place where they should be put.

MR. CURTIS: I don't know whether they would be put up in the post offices. They are Federal. We could demand that they do it.

MR. HEFFERTON: I might say, most of the Councils publish their regulations in the press, particularly when they make any change.

MR. BROWNE: There is no obligation on them to do that.

MR. HEFFERTON: No. It is the same way with reports. As a matter of fact the annual reports of the local governments we are not supposed to table here. There is nothing in the Act to say we have to table them.

Clause 6 carried.

Clause 7 read:

7. Section 45 of the said Act is amended.

(a) by deleting paragraphs (cc) and (dd) of sub-section (1) and substituting therefor the following:

"(cc) For controlling and regulating

the use of vehicles, except vehicles travelling on rails, plying for hire within the limits of the Municipality, including power to

(i) restrict the classes of persons who shall be permitted to ply for hire with particular kinds of vehicles for the conveyance of passengers and for the transport of goods respectively within the limits of the Municipality;

(ii) fix the number of vehicles permitted to ply for hire within those limits;

(iii) enquire into and decide upon the fitness of individuals belonging to the permitted classes to receive a license and to carry on the business of plying for hire within the limits of the Municipality and into the fitness of each vehicle used or to be used in that business;

(iv) require any person permitted to carry on that business to take out an annual or temporary license therefor;

(v) fix the fee to be paid for the license and the terms and conditions upon which it shall be held;

(vi) prohibit any person other than a licensee from driving or causing to be driven any vehicle for hire within the limits of the Municipality;

(vii) fix and establish a scale of fares, rates and charges to be paid to licensees and provide a summary method of recovery thereof; and

(viii) fix and prescribe the duties and regulate the conduct of licensees in relation to the

public and the rights and duties of the public in relation to licensees in all matters pertaining to such business."

(b) by renumbering paragraph (hh) of sub-section (1) as (kk) and by inserting immediately after paragraph (gg) of that sub-section as paragraphs (hh), (ii) and (jj) the following:

"(hh) for acquiring, establishing laying out and improving lands where vehicles may be parked and for regulating supervising and governing the parking of vehicles therein and for providing a fee to be charged and collected for such parking;

(ii) for authorizing and assigning stands for motor vehicles not kept for hire, on roads and in public places controlled and managed by the Council, and regulating the use of the stands, and for authorizing the erection and maintenance of covered stands or booths on the roads and in the public places for the protection or shelter of the drivers of any such vehicles, but a covered stand or booth shall not be placed upon a sidewalk without the consent of the owner and occupant of the adjoining land;

(jj) for designating areas of land, to be used as tourist camps or trailer camps and for prohibiting the use of other land therefor, and for the purposes of this paragraph

(1) "tourist camp" includes an auto camp, any parcel of land or premises equipped with cabins used or maintained in the accommodation of the public, and any parcel of land or premises used or maintained as a camping or parking ground for the public, whether or not a fee or charge is paid or made for the rental or use thereof; and

(ii) "trailer camp" means land in or upon which any vehicle so constructed that it is suitable for being attached to a motor vehicle for the purpose of being drawn or propelled by the motor vehicle is placed, located, kept or maintained even though the vehicle is jacked up or its running gear is removed, if the vehicle is used for the living, sleeping or eating accommodation of persons therein."

MR. BROWNE: Does it say anything about publication there in the regulations? Because I might say, from the point of view of a lawyer when a case is involved —

MR. GURTIS: Such regulations being made public either in a newspaper situated in the municipality or by a poster.

MR. BROWNE: That is my complaint. The Councils do not bother about making up the posters or if they do put them in some place not noticeable to all—they don't advertise. In the case I am referring to they did not advertise and did not post the regulations in all parts of the municipality. So it would be very important to have it so that everyone could see what the law is. In that way a man can be saved from violating the law. If he does not he gets the impression it is all right to go ahead and do it. While I don't insist it be published in the "Gazette" because not many outside the legal profession see that.

MR. GURTIS: It is a very difficult matter and how we get around it is to give the power to the Council to determine. The Council is elected by the people and it is pretty hard for us to say what papers shall be made public in either one of the ways, pos-

ters or advertising in a paper. We cannot go much further than that unless we say you have to go and give copies to every man in the place.

MR. BROWNE: Let us say by newspaper and poster.

MR. HERRERTON: I have known occasions in the past two years where Councils had published them in a newspaper and had to carry them as advertisements very frequently, for which, of course, they are not very happy. These items appear in the newspapers once or twice, that is all, and the copies are lost. The same way when we put up posters. Who cares for the replacements? As you know, a poster is only good for so long. That has been our difficulty.

Clause carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having made progress and ask leave to sit again.

Carried.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 1953":

Clause 1 and 2 carried.

Clause 3 read and carried.

Clause 4 read:

4. Section 31 of the said Act is amended by deleting paragraph (b) and substituting therefor the following:

"(b) regulations prescribing

- (i) the proposed use of land and buildings in the districts referred to in paragraph (a);
- (ii) the conditions upon which a permit may be granted for the development of land, the sub-division of land, the erection of

buildings or structures, or the change of the use of any land or building; and

- (iii) provisions for appeal to the Advisory Board against any decision of the authorized Council relating to the use of land."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, I should like to have these words added there — "May declare any area outside of the City of St. John's and outside of any area held or administered by the St. John's Municipal Council.

MR. BROWNE: The St. John's Municipal Council has jurisdiction over St. John's and for a mile outside. In the opinion of the Attorney General, does the word "administer" cover that?

MR. CURTIS: I think so. The Municipal Council of St. John's administers all building within a mile of the city. I think the word "administer" would cover that.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would tell us who is the advisory board?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Stanley Pickert, the Chief Joint Planner is Chairman of the Board. Mr. Clarence Foote of the Department of Public Works, Dr. McDermott, Department of Health and Mr. James Seymour of the Mines.

MR. BROWNE: Sir Brian Dunfield is not on that?

MR. HEFFERTON: No.

Clauses 4, 5 and 6 read and carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill with some amendment.

Carried.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Wills Act:"

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment.

Carried.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, while we are in Committee, I wonder if you would accept a motion to reconsider the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act." I do think we could dispose of the Bill now without having to refer it back.

Motion, that the Committee now consider a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act," carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That Bill was considered earlier in the day, and Clause 2 was allowed to stand. All the other clauses were read, and this clause was read:

MR. CURTIS: I would ask that the clause do pass, Mr. Chairman. I have been looking through the legislation since, and if my recollection serves me correctly, last year and the year before we passed an amendment to the Interpretations Act — where you refer to an Act the reference includes a reference back to that Act as amended. So there is no need now to say "Chapter so and so, Consolidated Statutes as amended by so and so." The reference is to the original statute. That being so the section should be passed as read:

Clause 2 carried.

Motion, that the Committee passed the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act," without amendment.

Carried.

On motion, the Committee of the Whole, rose to report progress.

Report of Committee made by Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Courage resumed the Chair.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and has passed the Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Protection of Justices and Other Public Authorities" without amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. MORGAN: The Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to it referred and has passed the Bill, "An Act Respecting the Coming Into Force of the Civil Service Commission Act, 1953" without amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to it referred and has passed the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949," without amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to it referred and has passed the Bill, "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act," without amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to it referred and has

passed the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Apprenticeship Act," without amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to it referred and has passed the Bill, "An Act Respecting the Preservation of Historic Objects" without amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to it referred and has passed the Bill, "An Act to Amend the School Attendance Act" without amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to it referred and has passed the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act," without amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to it referred and has passed the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act," without amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to it referred and has passed the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act," without amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to it referred and has passed the Bill, "An Act to Amend the Wills Act," without amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to them referred and report progress on the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act," and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received, ordered sit again on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 of the clock.

House adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, April 4 at 3:00 of the clock.

MONDAY April 4, 1955

AFTERNOON SESSION

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. S. DROVER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the people of Goose Cove in White Bay. They are requesting a road link with the town of St. Anthony. Goose Cove is a fishing community, a short distance from St. Anthony, Bonleaux Bay. The people think this little road link would mean a good sale for their fish from Goose Cove and also from other

little fishing islands and other sections of Bouleaux Bay. Quite often it has happened that people have had to spend days at Goose Cove, being unable to get around the cape to St. Anthony on account of bad weather or ice conditions. They have had to take sick people not only from Goose Cove but other parts as far south as Conche over land by stretcher. I wish also to say in support of this petition that the Americans have built a base between Goose Cove and St. Anthony and it is just fifty-five minutes walk over the bog and barrens from their base down to the settlement of Goose Cove.

This is the second time since 1949 that the people of Goose Cove have requested such a road. I believe, Sir, it is a deserving request, and I have much pleasure in supporting it, and asking that it be tabled in this House and forwarded to the Department of Public Works for consideration.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs & Supply) : Mr. Speaker, two or three days ago I presented a petition from the residents of Trouty in support of a cottage hospital near their area or some alternative arrangement. Today I beg leave to table a further petition which has just reached me from the residents of Trinity, signed by some eighty names, praying for the same thing, the erection of a Cottage Hospital in their area or some alternative arrangement whereby the residents of these particular places mentioned may become attached to some cottage hospital plan in existence.

I beg leave to table this petition, Sir, and ask that it be referred to the Department of Public Health in connection with the other petition.

MR. M. HOLLETT : Mr. Speaker, I rise to add our support to that petition from the people of Goose Cove

because we have been informed of the isolated condition of the people there relative to getting to St. Anthony and other centres. Some of the people have been in correspondence with us on this side of the House relative to that. We know they depend very largely upon the fishery and we know how essential it is that they have a road connection with St. Anthony. I have much pleasure in supporting this petition so ably presented by the Honourable member for White Bay.

MR. DROVER : Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the petition of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply. I did have the pleasure of supporting the petition from Old Bonaventure, New Bonaventure and that section of Trinity Bay a few days ago. I believe that the request of the people, Sir, is reasonable, and I sincerely hope the Government will give it their consideration.

MR. J. R. COURAGE : Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of St. Alban's in Bay d'Espoir. St. Alban's is the largest place in the district of Fortune Bay with a population of more than 1,300 people. It is completely isolated in so far as road connection is concerned. Bay d'Espoir is a part of the south coast which is growing very rapidly. There are now more than 3,000 people in Bay d'Espoir. This petition asks that a road be constructed which would link up the several settlements which comprise Bay d'Espoir. There are a number of reasons in favour of this petition. For example: It would be very much easier for the doctor if it were possible for him to travel by land instead of by water. This too is true of Bowaters workers who find it very inconvenient to get to their homes from different parts of the island.

There are certain periods of the year, during the spring and the fall before the ice is strong enough to travel over when it is practically impossible to get from one place to another in the bay. Furthermore, Sir, the construction of a road link would encourage further development of the natural resources in the area. To my mind it is absolutely imperative that such a road should be built. I may say, Sir, that I have received a great amount of support for this petition all around the bay. I have received numerous letters and telegrams and representations from the other settlements of Bay d'Espoir as well as from St. Alban's and from the community of St. Alban's. At the present time in Milltown alone there are twenty-five motor cars and trucks and only four miles of road on which to drive.

This petition, Sir, is signed by 520 citizens of St. Alban's. I have much pleasure, Sir, in lending my strong support to this petition, and ask that it be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department concerned.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance) : Mr. Speaker, in accordance with section 37 of the Revenue and Audit Act, I beg leave to table copies of special warrants.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour) : Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the following reports :

A Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

A Report on matters transacted by the Minister of Labour during 1954

under the provisions of the Labour Relations Act.

A Report of the Newfoundland Labour Relations Board.

A Report of the Proceedings of the Minimum Wage Board.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare) : Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table of the House gazetted copies of regulations made under the Dependents' Allowance Act, 1949.

Giving Notices of Motion

MR. BALLAM : Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Boiler and Pressure Vessel Act."

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works) : Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act."

Giving Notice of Questions

(33) MR. BROWNE : To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay upon the table of the House the following information :

Give the list of all persons or corporations who are indebted to the Government on account of loans for industrial purposes, as at March 31, 1955, specifying name of borrower and amount of loan outstanding, together with a list of all guaranteed loans with name of borrower, amount of Government guarantee, and amount of all payments by the Government on account of such guarantee.

(34) MR. HOLLETT : To ask the Honourable the Minister of Mines and

Resources or other appropriate Minister to lay on the table of the House the following information :

- (1) Full particulars of the Trinity Mink Ltd. Company, to include the names of the Directors, the address of the Head Office of the Company and a list of the assets against which the Government has taken a mortgage for the recent loan of \$25,000.
- (2) Table a copy of Agreements made between the Government and the various mink farmers relative to loans made to said farmers, including the Trinity Mink Ltd.
- (3) What agreement, if any, has been entered into between the Trinity Mink Ltd., against whose property the Government states it holds a mortgage, and Victor Clouston of

St. John's, Bernard Andrews of St. John's, Vera Spence of Toronto and Earle M. Maxham of Worcester in Vermont, U.S.A. Table a copy of said Agreement.

- (4) Is the Government under any obligation to supply whale or pot-head whale meat at 2 cents per pound to Mink Ranchers, either directly or through the operations of any Company to whom the Government has advanced or loaned moneys, or guaranteed same? If so, table a copy of said agreement.

Answers to Questions

Question No. 31 :

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

Current Account Revenue and Expenditure April 1, 1954, to February 28, 1955

(a) Department	Expenditure	Revenue
	\$	\$
Consolidated Fund Services	1,382,846.09	—
Legislative	57,533.24	—
Executive	94,579.45	—
Finance	1,222,983.02	23,656,327.65
Provincial Affairs	72,468.21	2,237.40
Education	6,921,702.62	390,874.62
Attorney General	1,488,620.00	133,261.25
Mines & Resources	1,126,975.31	420,959.37
Public Works	4,993,614.89	1,107,166.72
Health	7,155,727.28	1,582,496.06
Public Welfare	6,727,857.59	1,084,847.56
Board of Liquor Control	253,822.79	3,042,180.00
Municipal Affairs and Supply	575,409.70	74,757.12
Fisheries & Co-operatives	442,698.89	14,546.29
Economic Development	124,279.41	8.90
Labour	110,358.34	20,291.88
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$32,750,388.83	\$31,529,954.82

The above figures are given up to February 28th, 1955, in view of the fact that revenue figures for March are not yet complete. The expenditure figures are actual payments and do not include commitments.

- (b) The Government borrowed no money on current account during 1954-55 but, at various times during the year, operated on an overdraft at the Bank of Montreal pending the receipt of large quarterly payments from the Government of Canada on account of subsidies, tax rental agreements, etc. As at 31st March, 1955, there was a credit balance at the Bank of \$1,884,811.
- (c) 1953-54: Available from Public Accounts tabled during the present Session.
1954-55: \$152,812.49.
Funds paid into Consolidated Revenue Fund.
- (d) Information will be given in the Budget Speech.

Question No. 32: In course of preparation.

MR. SMALWOOD: I have here some answers to questions. Mr. Speaker, On the Order Paper of March 25, Question No. 3. Asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and addressed to me:

3 (1) \$1,788,648.02 construction; and for working capital \$1,961,828.47 in addition to which there is a guarantee by the Government of a loan at the Canadian Bank of Commerce for \$225,000.

3 (5) The amount is \$1,852,000 renewal coverage.

3 (9) The new operating company has two revolving credits at the Canadian Bank of Commerce in the amounts respectively of \$300,000 and \$185,000 guaranteed by the Government.

In regard to the other answers; I have asked my honourable colleague,

the Attorney General to prepare the answers and he has agreed to do so, and doubtless will table the answer just as soon as he has it.

Now Question No. 8: on the same Order Paper:

The answer to part (d) of that question is \$200,000

(e) the answer is none.

(f) the answer is 70 of whom 55 are Newfoundlanders. The others are Latvians and Germans, mostly Latvians.

Question No. 11:

11 (1) I may say, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this answer that is part (1) of that question the total is rather less than I thought and rather less than I said here. I think it is twenty-one and a half millions. I thought it was around twenty-two or twenty-three millions.

11 (3) It is a long list. I table the list.

QUESTION No. 11

COMPANY	(1) Payments to 28.2.54	(2) Payments to 28.3.55	(3) Raised under Guaranteed Bank Loans	(4) Total of Columns (1), (2) and (3)
Nfld. Hardwoods Ltd.—Old Operators	2,940,237.51	867,238.98	225,000.00	3,932,476.49
Nfld. Hardwoods Ltd.—New Operators	383,000.00	383,000.00
Atlantic Hardboards Ltd.	920,000.00	549,600.00	1,469,600.00
Atlantic Gypsum Ltd.	2,976,020.00	378,905.06	3,354,925.50
North Star Cement Co. Ltd.	4,740,000.00	4,740,000.00
Eckhardt Mills Ltd.	150,000.00	237,400.00	160,000.00	547,400.00
Nfld. Tanneries (Wm. Dorn) Ltd.	390,300.00	77,700.00	468,000.00
Atlantic Gloves Ltd.	221,648.00	271,852.00	493,500.00
Gold Sail Leather Goods Ltd.	50,000.00	135,000.00	185,000.00
Koch Shoes Ltd.	242,200.00	488,000.00	67,460.91	797,660.91
Superior Rubber Co. Ltd.	1,000,000.00	362,800.00	1,362,800.00
Hanning Electric Co. Ltd.	325,000.00	90,000.00	415,000.00
C.M.I.C. Ltd.	2,500,000.00	2,500,000.00
United Cotton Mills Ltd.	372,699.71	109,000.00	481,699.71
Atlantic Films & Electronics Ltd.	150,000.00	50,000.00	200,000.00
Terra Nova Textiles Ltd.	449,000.00	449,000.00

QUESTION NO. 11

Name of Company	Amount of Fire Insurance Carried	Name of Underwriter	Party to Whom Policy Made Payable
(i) Atlantic Films & Electronics Ltd.	\$ 299,000	Lloyd's	\$249,000: Minister of Economic Development. 50,000: Atlantic Films.
(ii) Atlantic Gloves Ltd.	280,000	Lloyd's	Government of Newfoundland.
(iii) Atlantic Hardboard Industries Ltd.	982,500	Informed by Company on 7/3/55 that renewal coverage to amount shown has been effected. Policies not yet submitted to Government.	
(iv) Canadian Machinery & Industry Construction Ltd.	1,250,000	Lloyd's	Government of Newfoundland.
(v) Eckhardt Mills Ltd.	572,000	Lloyd's	\$ 72,000: Provincial Government of Newfoundland. 500,000: Minister of Finance.
(vi) Gold Sall Leather Goods Ltd.	99,500	Informed by Company on 25/2/55 that renewal coverage to amount shown has been effected. Policies not yet been submitted to Government	
(vii) Hanning Electric Company Ltd.	325,000	Lloyd's	Minister of Economic Development.

		Lloyd's.	"	"
		Transcontinental Insurance Company.	"	"
(xi)	North Star Cement Ltd. 97,000	Lloyd's.	Government of Newfoundland.	
(xii)	Superior Rubber Company Ltd. 1,878,990	Lloyd's.	"	"
(xiii)	Terra Nova Textiles Limited 832,000	Lloyd's.	"	"
		The British America Assurance Co.	"	"
		The Ocean Accident & Guarantee Corporation Ltd.	"	"
		Newfoundland American Insurance Co., Ltd.	"	"
		General Accident, Fire and Life Assurance Corporation.	"	"
		The Canadian Fire Insurance Company.	"	"
(xiv)	United Cotton Mills Ltd..... 482,500	Nfld. American Insurance Co., Ltd.	Government of Newfoundland.	
		British American Assurance Company.	"	"
		The Canadian Fire Insurance Company.	"	"
		The Ocean Accident & Guarantee Corp., Ltd.	"	"
		General Accident, Fire & Life Assurance Corp.	"	"
		British Crown Assurance Corporation Ltd.	"	"
		Progressive Insurance Company of Canada.	"	"
		Globe Indemnity Company of Canada.	"	"

Question No. 28 :

The answer is rather long. It is three pages, and I table it. I may repeat, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vardy has done quite a lot of travelling, quite apart from his duties as Director of Tourist Development. He has done a lot of travelling at my request as Premier of Newfoundland to save me some time and undertake some work that I otherwise would have been obliged to do if I had not someone to do it for me.

"Give the names of persons appointed to the Tourist Board or the Tourist Development Loan Board during the fiscal year 1954-55. State date of appointment with salaries being paid, with name of position to which appointments have been made."

Mr. Berkley King was appointed February 25, appointment to take

effect on April 1, as Inspector of Tourist Establishments on a salary scale of \$3,500—\$100—\$4,000. Appointments to the Tourist Development Loan Board were all made on the same date, Sept. 31, 1954 :

Mr. Gordon Pushie, Chairman, Mr. R. Manning, C.B.M.; Dr. Miller, Mr. N. Short, O.B.E.; Mr. P. J. Murray, BSc; Mr. A. J. Organ, B.A.; Mr. John Foran as supervisory engineer. None of these gentlemen gets a salary, with the exception of Mr. Organ, acting as Secretary of the Loan Board. He receives an honorary amount of \$300 a year. Otherwise no one receives any salary, fees nor remuneration whatsoever. Mr. Foran, acting as supervisory engineer serves without salary for that particular work. He gets his salary from other work altogether.

QUESTION No. 23—

1.—\$3,604.68 paid to Director of Tourist Development for travelling and other expenses during fiscal year commencing April, 1954. This consisted of \$2,943.55 for travel outside the province and \$661.33 for travel within the province as follows :

April 7—9 inclusive :

Visit to Gander on departmental business :

Travelling	\$25.00	
Meals and Lodgings	25.00	
Miscellaneous	2.00	\$ 50.00

May 1—8 inclusive :

Visit to Corner Brook, Grand Falls and Port aux Basques on departmental business :

Travelling	\$103.20	
Meals and Lodgings	107.69	
Miscellaneous	6.50	\$217.38

May 26—June 19 inclusive :

Attendance at Canadian International Trade Fair at Toronto, followed by visit to New York on departmental business :

Travelling	\$422.10	
Meals and Lodgings	406.15	
Miscellaneous	67.25	\$895.50

July 4—7 inclusive:

Visit to tourist centers in Central Newfoundland:

Travelling	\$ 69.40	
Meals and Lodgings	30.50	\$ 99.90

July 27—29 inclusive:

Visit to Lewisporte to address Mayors and
Municipalities Convention:

Travelling	\$ 49.14	
Meals and Lodgings	20.25	
Miscellaneous	3.00	\$ 72.39

July 31—August 1 inclusive:

Visit to Seven Islands, Knob Lake, Goose Bay and
Gander on departmental business:

Travelling	\$ 2.00	
Meals and Lodgings	20.75	
Miscellaneous	13.75	\$ 36.50

September 9—11 inclusive:

Visit to Digby, N.S., to substitute for Premier Smallwood
and address Banquet of Maritimes Professional Meeting
of the Maritime and Newfoundland Branches of the En-
gineering Institute of Canada:

Travelling	\$106.25	
Meals and Lodging	22.90	
Miscellaneous	11.60	\$140.75

September 15—October 4 inclusive:

Visit to Windsor, Ont., to represent Newfoundland at
Canadian Tourist Association Convention, plus visits on
departmental business to Montreal, Toronto and New York:

Travelling	\$392.70	
Meals and Lodgings	404.26	
Miscellaneous	172.20	\$999.12

October 17—19 inclusive:

Visit to Burin Peninsula on departmental business:

Travelling	\$ 78.26	
Meals and Lodgings	16.56	\$ 94.82

October 22—23 inclusive:

Visit to Argentina to address Officers' Forum at Fort McAndrew:

Travelling only	\$ 25.90	
-----------------------	----------	--

November 26—December 13 inclusive:

Visit to Ottawa, Montreal and New York to represent Newfoundland at Federal-Provincial Tourist Conference and to attend to other business on behalf of his department:

Hotel and Lodgings	\$240.91	
Meals	140.75	
Transportation	322.70	
Other expenses	63.95	\$768.31

January 18—23:

Visit to New York and Montreal on departmental business on return from vacation. NOTE: No charge is made for travelling:

Hotel or Lodging	\$ 62.27	
Meals	38.00	
Transportation	36.65	
Other expenses	44.60	\$181.52

February 13—16 inclusive:

Visit to Grand Falls to meet with Grand Falls Tourist Advisory Board and to discuss acute accommodation problem in that area with interested parties:

Hotels or Lodgings	\$ 15.70	
Meals	4.99	
Transportation	39.00	
Other expenses	4.75	\$ 64.44

2.—No.

3.—Answered by No. 2 above.

4.—(a) **Tourist Development Division**

Mr. Berkley King, appointed February 25, effective April 1, Inspector of Tourist Establishments, salary scale \$600-100—4,000.

(b) **Tourist Development Loan Board**

Mr. Gordon F. Pushie, Sept. 3, 1955, Chairman. No salary for this post.

Mr. Raymond Manning, C.B.E., Sept. 3, 1955, Member. No salary for this post.

Dr. L. M. Miller, Sept. 3, 1955, Member. No salary for this post.

Mr. N. Short, O.B.E., Sept. 3, 1955, Member. No salary for this post.

Mr. P. J. Murray, B.Sc.A., Sept. 3, 1955, Member. No salary for this post.

Mr. R. J. Organ, B.A., Sept. 3, 1955, Secretary. Annual honorarium of \$300.

Mr. John Foran, Sept. 3, 1955, Supervisory Engineer. No salary for this post.

Finally Mr. Speaker, Question No. 16:

16 (1) It was \$3,354,925.50 which includes everything, working capital, losses on operations and all other expenditures by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the replies to all other questions addressed to me are in course of preparation.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table the answer to Question No. 1. Section (c).

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 28, addressed to me by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West: 3,573 desks of three sizes, small, medium and large. Total cost \$55,842.20, these desks being manufactured by recommendation of the various Superintendents of Education and were distributed according to the Department's allocations for this purpose.

Question No. 28.

3,573 desks of three sizes—small, medium, and large, at a total cost of \$55,842.20.

These desks were manufactured on the requisitions of the various Superintendents of Education in accordance with the non-discriminatory allocation of funds provided for this purpose.

Third Readings:

A Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Protection of Justices and Other Public Authorities." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Coming into Force of the Civil Service Commission Act, 1953." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Apprenticeship Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Preservation of Historic Objects." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the School Attendance Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Teachers' Association." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Education (Teachers Pensions) Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act". On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Wills Act". On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

First Readings

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Payment of Bounties on Construction of

Fishing Ships". On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Life and Accident Insurance Agents (Licensing) Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Provision of Building Standards". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Elections) Act". On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, before calling the next order. I would like to say there is a second printing of Bill No. 4, the Fisheries Assistance, and I would suggest that honourable members withdraw their old copies and replace them with the new ones.

MR. W. J. BROWNE: Could the Honourable the Attorney General give us an explanation, Mr. Speaker?

MR. CURTIS: We will discuss that when the Bill comes up. I think the draftsman made some mistake.

MR. BROWNE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, what is the situation now then? We had first reading and a motion for second reading has been made and it was adjourned on my request and with the consent of the Honourable Minister of Fisheries. How do we proceed from this forward?

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken.

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the position might be better amplified

by saying it is the possible intention of the government, in Committee, to move an amendment in connection with the new draft. At the present time the old draft is before the House. I would suggest this second copy be accepted by leave of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House give leave? I would point out we could insist that the motion being made that the bill be withdrawn and a new bill be brought in and given first reading.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I agree. I think the proper procedure would be to withdraw the old bill and give notice of a new bill. I think there would be a difference in principle involved.

MR. CURTIS: I don't agree, Mr. Speaker, that there would be a difference in principle. There is a difference in modus operandi, I don't think the principle is any different.

MR. BROWNE: I think it is completely different. I am not criticising it. The point is, I am not criticising the bill as it is now, but I do suggest that it is considerably different from the previous bill.

MR. CURTIS: I just put the bill down and had it distributed now so that my honourable friend would not waste time making a speech and an amendment which we do not intend to push. I thought as a matter of courtesy we would produce the bill now. But if anybody wants to wait until we get into committee we will amend it then.

COMMITTEE of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act."

MR. SPEAKER: Leave was given yesterday for this committee to sit again today. I do now leave the Chair.

MR. COURAGE, Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This bill has been read and all clauses passed except Clause 5 and the title.

MR. HEFFERTON: I move Mr. Chairman, certain changes in this clause. In the fifth line "the second Tuesday in November" and the following line" on the second Tuesday of November." And then in the eighth line "the second Tuesday in November." Now then if the second Tuesday in November falls on a statutory holiday the election will be held on the date first following which is not a holiday.

Clause 5 as amended carried.

On motion committee rose to report having passed the bill with some amendment.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to it referred and have passed the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act, with some amendment.

Report received. On motion report adopted. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting the Fisheries Assistance Fund."

MR. SPEAKER: The debate on second reading of this Bill was adjourned by the Honourable Member for St. John's West.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I thought we were going ahead with the "Redistribution Bill", this afternoon. Could we go ahead with that now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not now.

MR. BROWNE: I thought we were going ahead with the other one. What is the position regarding this one? Which bill are we going to talk to now, the one introduced this afternoon or the one introduced before.

MR. CURTIS: The one before the House, Mr. Speaker, certainly. The one circulated first — unless the House agrees to substitute.

MR. BROWNE: Then the day when this was here before I asked to have it deferred, second reading deferred, because it seemed to me that this was a very important bill and should be given some consideration, as it involves the power over the expenditure of something like six hundred thousand dollars, which was part of the fund inherited by this government when it came into office in 1949.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries & Co-operatives): I wonder would the honourable member let me make a suggestion. I said in introducing it the other day, I thought it was six hundred thousand dollars. On checking it subsequently I found it was five hundred and seventy thousand.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. I did not think it was six hundred thousand, but it is close enough to it as far as the principle is concerned. The whole fund, however, has been an inheritance to this government. It was established originally by the Commission of Government for the purpose of developing markets and assisting in the establishment and development of markets. There were two funds, \$150,000 in one and \$450,000 in the other. It is in the public accounts how the money is distributed. Fisheries Assistance Fund \$446,000 established for the develop-

ment of markets; \$115,000 making a total of 561,000 as at the 1st of April, 1949; that was six years ago, and the interest up to September 1953 (I don't know why the interest was added only up to September 1953 since it is an account up to the end of March) \$564,000, I think, at 2½% would come to something like \$12,000. That is why I mentioned six hundred thousand dollars. Therefore there is interest to be credited to that account, a year's interest at least to be credited if not a year and a half, since September 1953, so that it must be pretty close to \$600,000 now.

Now the purpose of the bill was, apart from the investment, this money was to be deposited in the Chartered banks in Canada or invested in such funds as a trustee is permitted by the Trustee Act to invest funds. Now the minister had power under this bill to invest the fund as he would invest trustee funds. In other words it would seem as if the intention was to make this a trust fund. Then it went on, "And may withdraw any deposit or vary or redeem any investment." I will take it any court of law would interpret that to mean that he may withdraw the deposits or vary or redeem an investment. If he did vary it, it would be from one trustee fund to another and the money therefore would have to be entrusted in a trust fund at all times. But the bill went on to say, "Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council the Minister may apply the fund or any part of it to measures for the encouragement and development of the fisheries of Newfoundland."

It is to that section that I wish to register an objection. I notice in the new bill this afternoon that the section has been taken out and another section put in which does not give the

minister authority to dispose of the fund at any time. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, since this was a fund created by the previous government for the purpose of encouraging and development of markets and assistance of the fisheries it would be kept as a trust fund and that only the interest on the fund should be used for the purpose mentioned. There are many ways in which it could be done, by scholarships, by bursaries by loans for various fishermen who wish to improve themselves and more particularly, I would suggest, that this be considered as assistance to students wishing to study marine biology. What I do not wish to see, but what the government could do under section 5 dispose of the whole amount of money, which could be spent any way which the government wishes during the next twelve months — in an election campaign — I hate to see that fund disposed of like that. It is not easy to build up a fund when we need one. Now that we have one earmarked for specific purposes it ought to be kept for such purposes. I did have some notes, as I wished to speak on this matter. But I am not prepared at the present time. I just draw the matter to the attention of the government.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain this bill, and just why it is necessary: In 1951 when the Committee on the Consolidation of the Statutes was cleaning up some old Acts they came across this Act and recommended that it be repealed. This Act was repealed and consequently this fund was more or less lying dormant. This is a large amount of money to be left on deposit in a bank. It should be earning a greater amount of interest than the interest the bank would allow. The object of this Bill

now is to have it invested advantageously. There is a committee consisting of the Minister of Finance, the Manager of the Bank of Montreal and the Chairman of the Newfoundland Government Savings Bank. All moneys that are paid into trust funds, such as the account in connection with the loans, the trust account in connection with the loans (You know we have to reduce loan account so much every year, the sinking fund, Government Savings Bank Loan investments under this account probably will all be invested under the guidance of this committee which would look for good investments which bring in a rate of interest much larger than the bank interest ordinarily paid). As I said, the Act relative to this fund has been repealed, and nothing had been put in its place. That is the reason the fund has just been lying in the Bank of Montreal.

We asked our Department of Finance to have the fund reinstated. They did draft legislation that reinstated the fund as it was under Commission of Government, (In other words the original bill) and placed this fund exactly where it would have been if there had been no repeal. In other words; the Commission of Government had a disposal account to deal with this money whereby the Minister of Fisheries or his counterpart could spend the money as he wished without the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Now we are asking today — We are just informing the House today, Mr. Speaker, that in committee, we do not want to assume responsibility as the Governor in Council for disposing of this money. We think the money ought to be voted here by the Legislature. The objects of the amendment we introduced will provide the money will only be dis-

bursed in accordance with such instructions as are given by the Legislature. The present instructions are that it will be paid by the Minister to repay any vote made by the Legislature to the Federation of Fishermen. No other Moneys can be spent out of that fund except in that manner or in accordance with directions received from this House. That is the reason I circulated the Bill, No. 4, as amended, so that my honorable friends would not feel we are asking them to debate a bill which we had no intention of amending.

On motion bill read a second time — ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow."

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages."

HON. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this bill is largely procedural. It deals with the registration of Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages.

This Bill lays down in Clause 4, Mr. Speaker, "A sale or mortgage that is not accompanied by an immediate delivery and an actual and continued change of possession of the chattels sold or mortgaged is, unless the sale or mortgage is evidenced by a registered bill of sale, void as against a creditor and as against a subsequent purchaser or mortgagee claiming from or under the grantor in good faith for valuable consideration without notice whose conveyance or mortgage has been registered or is valid without registration; and the sale or mortgage as against a creditor and such a subsequent purchaser or mortgagee takes effect only from the time of its registration."

This Bill, is entirely procedural, Mr.

Speaker, and I move the second reading.

On motion bill read a second time. Ordered referred to a committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Education (Teachers Training) Act."

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has a few minor changes. The only change in the original section is the addition in the Section 3(b) of the words "and licenses". This is necessary because boards of examiners award both certificates and licenses.

In (c) of Section 3 the addition of "licenses" is for the same purpose.

In Section 5 (5) the amendment provides that a person with a license may be employed as a teacher. This provision was omitted from the original section and we are asking to have it put in here now.

Also the amendment provides that permission to teach as an emergency teacher can be granted for longer periods than six months. Under 5, teachers holding licenses are covered by regulations as well as by holding certificates. In (d) of 5, Section 7 — the words "and licenses" are inserted so that the whole chapter may be uniform in words.

The licenses, sir, are due to the fact that the Government accepted the brief as prepared by the teachers a short while ago.

Motion is that this Bill be now read a second time.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing in the bill that I see might be perhaps explained when the minister replies. This provision that a board of examiners may in any

case exempt any teacher or candidate from compliance with all or any of such further general requirements. "In accordance with regulations made under this Act to grant certificates of grade and licenses to teachers and candidates who have complied with the requirements prescribed by the regulations and such further requirements as the Board of Examiners, with the approval of the Minister of Education may prescribe." That sounds peculiar. If there are going to be examiners and examination you would think that they would all have to take them. Perhaps when the minister replies he would address himself to that.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, from what I can gather from the Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's West it can for instance cancel the certificate or license of any teacher who is guilty of drunkenness.

MR. BROWNE: No I referred to the previous section (b).

MR. CHALKER: That is in the old Act. That is not new. Mr. Speaker, I cannot actually explain that at the present time. All the notes I have on it, Mr. Speaker, say that the only change from the original section is the addition of the words "and licenses". I assume the provision was in the original Act.

MR. BROWNE: You can look it up.

MR. CHALKER: I will yes.

On motion Bill read a second time — Ordered referred to a committee of the Whole House tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Interpretations Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of this Bill,

which is really a noncontentious bill, and which I think will find ready acceptance by the House. It is simply a bill to amend the Interpretations Act so as to provide that when legislation comes into force by proclamation the courts will take judicial notice of that proclamation instead of having to have it proceed in the usual way. Those here who are lawyers remember the difficulty we used to have every time there was a prosecution under the Prohibition Act. The proposition had to be proven before the investigators could examine and if proper examination was not proven the case was thrown out. If this becomes law every proclamation shall be judicially noticed by all magistrates and justices without being especially pleaded. I don't think we need stress the necessity of that. It is very difficult sometimes, outside St. John's, to get a copy of the "Gazette" changing a certain Act. It seems to me if an Act has been proclaimed the justices should take judicial notice of it. I move second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Motion is this Bill be now read a second time.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite clear on what the Attorney General means by "Taking judicial notice of a bill" because it does not say only bills. It may apply to regulations also, all the numerous regulations made under the various Acts both Provincial and Federal — This seems to be very wide therefore in its scope. I would assume that proclamations there refers to proclamations made by the Federal Government, and they are innumerable, constituting a volume about three inches thick every year. So it is very difficult, it seems to me, for justices and magistrates to take judicial notice of that. I have a

recollection of many years ago when it was necessary to prove some official publication, it was customary to call upon Mr. Stirling to come to the Court and bring with him a copy of the Gazette and actually give evidence. I think that has long since passed into disuse; You never see that happen now. When a lawyer produces the "Gazette" it is all that is required. But how would a magistrate or justice take judicial notice of anything. Does the Attorney General mean he has got his copy of the "Gazette" and he looks it up? Or does he assume that bills have been passed or proclamations have been made? All these regulations, it says in the Bill, shall be "Gazetted". How is the judge or magistrate or justice to know what regulations have been passed? It seems to be a little confusing. Perhaps there is something in the other clauses of the Interpretations Act which might explain it. I have not my copy here today. As it stands now, perhaps the Attorney General could explain it when he replies.

MR. CURTIS: When the House goes into committee on the bill, Mr. Speaker, I will have the Interpretations Act here and we will be able to see the context in which it is written.

In answer to my honourable friend, I think he will find the position is that if now you are proceeding to prosecute under an Act you perhaps both have to allege and to prove the issue of the proclamation. It is true that, unlike the days that I referred to, when witnesses had to be called to prove the proclamation that now a proclamation proves itself by being produced in the court. I take it the object of this amendment is to make it unnecessary for a prosecuting solicitor to actually produce the proclamation if the judge or magistrate

trying the case had a proclamation in his desk or office — that proclamation will prove itself. Every proclamation proves itself, Mr. Speaker, if it is published officially by the Kings Printer or in the Newfoundland Gazette. When it once appears it proves itself. I understand that is the position now-a-days.

MR. BROWNE: If I may just interject — with the permission of the House and the Attorney General — I remember a case where it was decided on appeal, the appeal court said if the magistrate did not have the Gazette in front of him he should have asked for a copy of the Gazette in order to prove that there was such a proclamation made. The case should not be dismissed merely because it is not produced. He should have turned around and said; "Get me the Gazette out of my office."

MR. CURTIS: The object of the bill is to provide the judge and magistrate should take jurisdictional notice of the fact the proclamation had been issued. It need not be shown in the court and it need not be proved. I think it is beyond question the object of this bill will be of assistance to magistrates and to others.

On motion bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion the House then recessed for ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act."

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, since the House rose last, this bill has been given some reconsideration by the Government, and it has been decided to suggest some alterations which

would change the bill in several important particulars.

As we all know, sir, this year we are celebrating the hundredth anniversary of Responsible Government in Newfoundland, and because of that, I suppose, everybody is more inclined to look backward toward the past and look towards our history in traditional ways. As this bill came up for consideration a suggestion arose that we should consider a revision to the bill brought in over seventy years ago, 1835, when the House as constituted by that bill consisted of thirty-six members. This seemed a very good suggestion, sir, and it is the proposal we are putting forward now. Instead of thirty-two members as in the bill as already printed that it read thirty-six, following the law which came in in Newfoundland over seventy years ago when the population was then a little more than two hundred thousand people instead of just over four hundred thousand, as it is today. I suggest that the words, "thirty-two" be stricken out and be substituted by "thirty-six."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, we are on the second reading now. Is the Honourable the Solicitor General giving an amendment in second reading.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, just acquainting the House with the fact.

MR. BROWNE: I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. It is not in order for the Solicitor General to make an amendment of that kind at this time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is not doing it. He said it was his good intention to move that at the right moment.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, in

my opinion it is out of order for the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs to make an amendment at the present time. The proper procedure should be for the Minister to withdraw the bill and substitute the new bill.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, I am not proposing an amendment, but by way of information I am outlining certain amendments which will be proposed when the bill goes into committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The honorable member was unfortunate in his choice of words there. Certainly he cannot propose an amendment on second reading. He would like however to suggest what amendment might be made to the bill.

MR. MURRAY: That is what I had in mind, Mr. Speaker, I am outlining shall I say, the Government's policy in the matter and speaking for the information of the House. On the proper occasion when the amendment to the clause can be moved I propose to move the amendment along the lines now outlined.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order — I submit this bill was introduced in second reading by the Honourable the Premier, and according to Clause 2 the whole submission was based on a membership in the House and this amendment, I should think, would alter the principle of the Bill. I think the proper way, Mr. Speaker, to proceed now would be to withdraw this bill and bring it in as a new bill and have it introduced in second reading.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker — The principle of the bill is that there shall be a redistribution of the seats of this House. The details can be handled in com-

mittee of the whole. The proper place for handling the details, such as the boundary of the districts, whether they should be this or that, as to whether there should be thirty-two or thirty-six members in the House, the details as to whether the constituencies should be represented each by one member in the House or by two or by three or by ten — the details — all the whole gambit of the matter. The principle of the bill surely is that there shall be a redistribution of the seats of the House. It is that principle that has been introduced. My honourable colleague speaking for the government in support of the bill, in support of the principle of the bill, gives it as his opinion that it ought to be thirty-six, in detail, and I daresay he would go on to five or even more details of the principle. The principle is that there should be a redistribution.

MR. HOLLETT: On that point, Mr. Speaker, if I may, — we have given considerable study to this bill on the basis introduced by the Honourable the Premier. It was then intimated there would be thirty-two members in the next House and that the redistribution would be based on one member districts etc. Certainly that is the principle of the bill, one-man districts. The honourable the Premier suggests now it might be two or it might be more. I submit we would not lose much time if we had an opportunity to see exactly what the amendments are which are being proposed by the government, and we might be then in a position to alter our opinion with regard to the principle as introduced by the Honourable the Premier. I suggest that is the only right and proper way. We are a small group and we have to study this thing and would like to have an opportunity to do so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members of the Opposition have already had considerable time to study the bill and can have as much time as they still may want and need for further study. There is no intention in the world to rush the bill. Is there any reason why the Honourable the Solicitor General should not in support of the principle indicate what in his views ought to be the case? Is there any reason why he should not suggest what in the governments view might be the case, in detail apart from the principle?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, sir, the Honourable the Premier introduced a bill giving the principle. He says it is a mere matter of distribution of seats. But, the seats may be distributed in such a way that we on this side of the House would have some disagreement. Now the Honourable the Solicitor General, according to the Premier, is also arguing the principle. He wants to speak to the principle of the bill. We have no objection to that. But we would like to know beforehand what it is all about.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to Rule 66 in Beauschene which covers the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I am reading it.

MR. BROWNE: Now then we have gone beyond that in moving second reading. I suggest it is reasonable, and I don't see what objection the Premier would have to withdrawing this bill and substituting a new bill. We have to go and study it again. I might agree with it wholeheartedly. I might find it very much better. I would appeal to the Premier — No time is going to be lost by having the Bill redistributed in what is now supposed to be its final form. After

all, this is the third one we have had now. We had one last year, one this year and now another one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on that point. We might have said nothing. We might have gone ahead with the debate on the bill as it stands at the moment, as presently printed, and then in Committee of the Whole have moved certain amendments, That would not have affected the principle of the bill — Unless your Honour holds that the principle of the bill is not only that there be a redistribution but a redistribution consisting of thirty-three members. If that is an essential part of the principle, then obviously in Committee of the Whole we could not amend it, to change that principle. That is obvious. But if the actual number and the boundaries of the districts are not a matter of principle, in short if the principle is only that there be a redistribution, then at the Committee stage these details could be changed by amendments. But if that were to be done then it is only fair at this stage to inform the House, particularly the members who have not been aware of the fact that there is a proposal to change the details from thirty-three to thirty-six, and how that detail would be brought about. Insofar as withdrawing the bill is concerned that would involve giving notice of another bill and would involve a day for first reading and possibly several days for second reading, to reach the point at which we are now—It might take us a number of days to reach this point again if the bill were withdrawn. But if it is necessary, according to the Rules of the House and according to parliamentary precedence and procedure, to withdraw it, of course, we will have no choice.

MR. SPEAKER: The only test is the validity of the argument regard-

ing the principle. The principle in this certainly is that we amend the present Act. Now the discussion on that point alone could only be confined to the advisability of amending the Act or not. But the Bill has been introduced and the motion for second reading did specifically list certain areas to constitute new districts to change the number of seats in the House of Assembly from twenty-eight to thirty-three. The Minister says in his speech that the government intend to change the bill (if I heard correctly) to make it thirty-six seats. Surely the discussion which follows will be entirely different from the discussion which would follow for a number of thirty-three seats.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, with all respect, was not that a very good reason why some member of the government who had not spoken ought to give some indication to the House of the government's intention in committee of the whole to change some of the details so that the discussion would be more realistic on second reading. If it is proper to change these details in committee of the whole then it is common sense at this stage, at second reading stage, to say that in these respects the details are to be changed.

MR. HOLLETT: On that point, Mr. Speaker, may I say, if it is the intention of the Solicitor General to introduce new maps and show the increase of districts etc, at this stage.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No — in committee.

MR. HOLLETT: These maps on what the Premier was pleased to call homogeneous areas etc, were the basis for argument as to whether or not we should agree with that at second reading. Now it is something different.

And have no idea, as my honourable colleague said, we may be in perfect accord with the new arrangement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not follow my honourable friend must speak this afternoon. If they are not ready to speak — But the point is, if the honourable the Solicitor General makes his speech and as a result my honourable friends opposite are not prepared to proceed, we will have an adjournment until they are ready. But they will be much better able to consider that when they have heard what the Honourable the Solicitor General has to suggest.

MR. HOLLETT: We have no guarantee — some other honourable gentleman might get up next day and propose some other amendment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And why not?

MR. HOLLETT: It is contrary to the rules of parliamentary procedure.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, in rising my sole idea was to provide information to the House. I wanted the members on the opposition side to know certain amendments I proposed to put forward on behalf of the government when the bill reached the committee stage. Surely amendments in committee of the whole are in order. If so I don't see how or why any member should be prevented from outlining by way of information any amendment he is proposing to make in due course. I could go along and have the bill discussed at this time and have the amendment when the occasion arises. But I don't see what is to be gained. My sole intention was that the honourable members would not be taken by surprise, and to outline briefly the amendments I propose to make. I submit, Your

Honour, such a procedure is entirely in order.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, we abide by whatever the ruling might be on your part, sir.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on one point. If we change the boundaries in committee, did the Honourable Leader of the Opposition say we should provide new maps?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, according to our own rule book it is out of order to discuss the clauses of a bill in second reading. Is not that what the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs is doing now, telling us he intends to change so and so.

MR. MURRAY: Surely when we come along in committee of the Whole to Clause 2 I could move an amendment. What I am doing now is to tell the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I have listened with great patience to the arguments on both sides. I can only be concerned with this — The principle of the Bill is certainly declared by the mover of the motion that the Bill be now read a second time, and members of the House prepare themselves for debate on the principle as propounded by the mover of the original motion. Now it is most unusual for a Government member, speaking in that debate, to announce sweeping amendments which they will be prepared to accept in Committee of the Whole. I must recognize that at this moment the honourable members on my right cannot possibly speak to this debate at all for the simple reason that they do not know enough about it and for that matter neither does the Chair. I was reading Section 66 which says — "It may become necessary before second reading of a Bill to

make considerable changes in its provisions". Surely if the present Bill provides for thirty-three seats and it is the intention of the Government to provide for thirty-six I am afraid I must agree these are sweeping changes, considerable changes, and, that can only be accomplished by discharging the order for second reading and re-introduce the Bill. I must say it is unusual too for the Government to propose amendments to their own Bill on second reading. It can very well be done in Committee of the Whole, yes. That is the usual procedure for announcing amendments they would like to see made.

Various things may be done with a Bill on second reading: If somebody is speaking to oppose a second reading of a Bill he is bound by the rules not to anticipate amendments which may be moved in Committee of the Whole. I would say the House might agree to some way of making the opposition members and the back benchers familiar with the proposed changes so that they could prepare themselves for debate and not be anticipating Committee of the Whole at this stage.

MR. SMILLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, of course it is perfectly obvious that the Government are not going to wait till Committee of the Whole stage is reached to propose amendments of their own volition in the Bill which are not admissible amendments. In short, if the principle of the Bill is not merely that there shall be a redistribution but if the details thereof constitute part of the principle then that may not be changed in Committee of the Whole stage and the Government would certainly not be prepared to go forward to that Committee of the Whole stage with the intention of introducing amendments which would not be admissible because of the fact

that they might be held by Your Honour to contravene the principle which may not be changed, of course not even debated in the Committee of the Whole stage. Therefore, unless Your Honour could assure us that in the Committee of the Whole stage we can move amendments changing the details in that way, that the total be raised from thirty-three to thirty-six and showing the details of that — unless Your Honour could assure us that we would be permitted to do that in Committee of the Whole stage we would have no course but to withdraw the Bill now and recommit it and follow the normal course and go through the normal stages with the amendments put in the Bill rather than to wait for second reading. Now I don't know if Your Honour is in a position now to acquaint us if in Committee of the Whole, Your Honour, would permit that or that on reference to Your Honour, you would agree that the Committee of the Whole had been right in accepting these amendments changing the Bill in these details? Because if Your Honour were to rule that they were inadmissible in Committee of the Whole the confusion would be worse, and we would have to begin all over again. To begin again having now gotten up to the point of second reading would be bad enough but to get up to the point of Committee of the Whole stage and have to withdraw the Bill and begin all over again would cause that much more delay.

MR. HOLLETT: If I may, Mr. Speaker, on that point — I feel that it would be tendering good advice to the Government, which is hardly ever accepted from us of course, if they gave notice of this Bill and gave notice of another one tomorrow and have it reintroduced — I think the honour-

able the Premier must admit that in order to substitute the word thirty-six for thirty-three disturbs the original principle outlined by him in many ways which I could enumerate here, but don't think it is necessary. I think it would save time if it were approached in that manner. Certainly we are not prepared to go ahead this afternoon on second reading of a Bill the contents of which we have not yet been made aware of. I submit, Sir, on behalf of the Opposition, the simplest way out, with all due respect to the Honourable the Premier's statement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The amendment, Mr. Speaker, would not amount to any more than two per cent of the whole bill. 98% of the bill would be as it is now, with 2% change in detail, and then only in Committee of the Whole, if it is proper to do so. If it is not proper then we will withdraw the bill and recommit it.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order — There is a bill before the House now. This bill deals with the redistribution of seats and sets forth some thirty-three seats and names them. Now it is seriously contended that when we get into Committee of the Whole we could not alter that to thirty-six or forty or forty-five. Because there is one word in the bill "thirty-three" surely that is not an essential part of the bill. The bill is a bill dealing with the redistribution of seats. Surely by adopting the principle in second reading we are not making it impossible for ourselves as a Committee of the Whole to revamp the entire bill if we like? If we decided in Committee of the Whole to say that instead of thirty-three or twenty-eight it be thirty-six without being bound. If we are bound in such a way we should be bound in another. That is what the Committee

of the Whole is for and not just to dot i's and cross t's, but rather to consider the bill section by section and surely if we pass the bill today in second reading as to its principle, surely there is no objection to an amendment in committee changing the sections. I submit — I don't know what authority there is, but I would like to see any authority, Mr. Speaker, for not allowing any amendment such as has been suggested.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, my authority is common sense. This bill was introduced here the other day by the Premier. We studied the bill, had conferences and went into it in detail. We are now informed by the Solicitor General that it is to be thirty-six seats instead of thirty-three. Don't you think we would look rather foolish talking on a bill we know nothing about.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In that case do not talk — wait for tomorrow or the next day.

MR. BROWNE: I am talking to a point of order; It is not our fault if the government had kept quiet and had done it in committee. Now that they have told us they are to make the alterations, we don't know what they are talking about. The government has made up its mind now to have a bill with thirty-six seats. I have not got the bill. Where is it? We are to fix it in committee — Well, I suggest seriously to the government they would lose no face over the matter by reintroducing the bill. We will do all we can to facilitate it. Give the notice this afternoon and give us a day or two to study the new bill and then go on with second reading. Surely we should see the Bill first and see what effect it is to have before going on with second reading.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In reply to that, Mr. Speaker, I have informed my honourable friends they can have all the time they want. The bill will not be changed except in a small degree, and with regard to that small degree the honourable the Solicitor General wanted to inform my honourable friends now — if after the small degree of change they want a day or two to study it again we are quite happy that they do so for the sake of the 1% or 2% change in the bill. They want the thing withdrawn, Mr. Speaker. Would Your Honour inform me of this — suppose my honourable friend the Solicitor General just sits down and does not say a word and no one else says a word except my honourable friends opposite who go ahead and debate the Bill as it is presently printed — suppose that happens — and suppose finally the bill reaches committee stage, as it is presently printed, may we in committee of the Whole move, from this side of the House, as a government motion, that the number be thirty-one or thirty-four or thirty-six and that some districts be split into two or some districts to elect two members where it now says they have the right to elect one — will such amendments be permissible in Committee of the Whole? If they are, then we don't want to talk about it in second reading at all. If they are not then we must withdraw the Bill to get these amendments in the printed form before we get second reading. If Your Honour could inform me on that I would know what course to take.

MR. HOLLETT: Before you go any further with that, I think it is highly unfair to ask the Honourable the Speaker to rule on something entirely hypothetical. Nobody knows exactly what the Government is about

to do. I don't think Mr. Speaker should be asked to rule on something of that nature. The Bill was brought in. The Honourable the Premier spoke to the principle that we had to have thirty-three seats on account of the population increase and on account of huge areas in the Labrador and this, that and the other thing. Now we are told it is to be changed. Well, if anybody can change thirty-three to thirty-six without changing some part of the principle of that Bill, sir, I am to be told something. I maintain we are on a point of order and that we can raise that point of order. I submit also to you, sir, we are perfectly satisfied with any decision which you may make on the matter, but we do maintain the present Bill should be withdrawn and a new Bill be introduced into the House.

MR. D. I. JACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, speaking to a point of order — The only thing I know about the Bill is what I read in the paper and that was concerned with the Premier's explanation of the Bill and he stated in his remarks it took almost two years to bring about the redistribution and that the Government went very slowly about it on the basis of 11, 11, 11, I believe, denominationally and everything else. Now if the Government for two years studied this Bill—

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman is not speaking to a point of order.

MR. JACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, my point of order, as far as I am concerned, I saw the map and discussed the map with other people and my constituents as well, and I say the Premier's explanation of the Bill in the paper which was thirty-three seats — I don't see now the need for an amendment. I think any amendment

which should be made should come from the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: I was hoping the House could make some compromise in the matter satisfactorily to both sides. It is not too simple to ask me what can be done in Committee. I am not well read upon Committee procedure. It is all right merely to say, change the number from 33 to 36. I have no idea what the changes are. Let us suppose it would propose a new district. That would be an entire change in the second reading or principle of the Bill. I cannot answer that question right off, because when I answer a question I must be right. If I cannot make a mistake and if I am not certain I have the right answer I cannot attempt to answer. Surely I must be guided by this — the right of members to speak, and if the members have based their studies on certain redistribution and then the redistribution is changed to thirty-six, I must agree I don't see how they could speak to the Bill. So it seems there are only alternatives (1) for the Government to inform the Opposition of what changes they propose to make and allow further time for study or (2) follow the hard rule, by which I would have to be bound, of course, as it is laid down here in Section 666.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thank you, Your Honour. We will go ahead with the Bill as it is and take our chances on amendment in Committee of the Whole.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, It is not as simple as that. How can we speak to the Bill when we don't know the contents of it? We have been informed now by a member of the Government—

MR. SMALLWOOD: But you refused to have it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, we have been informed by a member of the Government that it is the proposal of the Government to alter the redistribution by changing the number from thirty-three to thirty-six and we are not now in a position to debate that Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't debate it. We will put the motion Mr. Speaker, As Leader of the House I will say I wish now to call No. 18 on the Order Paper, that is Bill No 28 as it is printed and distributed to the House.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if you decided on the point of order which we raised? I would like to have a ruling on that before we proceed. I mean, that is all I can say on that, just ask for a ruling. If we can go ahead on that in view of what the Solicitor General has stated?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think a decision on an important matter like that should be taken hastily. That is why I dislike this position intensely, because it is sprung on me. I have had no opportunity even to look for precedents. Now I have already said that I can only stick to parliamentary procedure as laid down in paragraph 666. I must take cognizance of what an honourable member said. I called order. The honourable member began to speak to it. I have to consider this too — if we have at present 28 members and we require a Bill to make it 33,—Let us suppose the Bill were passed it would require an amendment in the following year to make it 36 or any other amendment. I have to say that these are great changes. If the Opposition is not prepared to hear the Government's amendments, which I say are offered

in a most unusual manner—as to what can be done with a Bill in Committee—I prefer not to give a ruling on that until I have had time to read the rules pertaining to Committee Stage. I have no desire to embarrass either side of the House.—If we proceed with this order now what will be the consequence? However if it is the wish of the House to proceed with the order—Item 18 on the Order Paper?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, before you call the order.

MR. SPEAKER: The order has been called.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order — I would suggest, sir, if we were given the amendments proposed and were given a reasonable time — it may not take very long — if the honourable the Solicitor General could let us have these proposed amendments there is no reason at all why the thing should not proceed. I have no objection, personally. We raised the point of order, that is all, and rather than go ahead and argue this Bill on the basis of 33 we are prepared to give way on almost anything. We must know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Bill is distributed. That is the Bill I have just called. I have asked His Honour to call that Bill. The Bill is distributed and is before the House now. The House does not want to hear of any proposed changes. Let us take the Bill as it is.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Premier is acting now as a dictator.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that expression. The Premier has heard the Solicitor General announce there are to be changes by the addition of three members, and

now wishes us to go ahead and discuss the Bill without knowing what the changes are. I don't think that is fair, Mr. Speaker. We should know what the changes are, and what the Bill as designed by the Government is supposed to be.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, we do not propose any amendment in second reading and we wish to have the Bill debated as it is. We for our part, do not propose any amendment or if so it is in Committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The order has been called. However, before I ask the Honourable the Solicitor General to resume I want to be clear on one point. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition said he would like to have from the government the proposed changes. Does he mean he would like to be informed of them in writing or to hear them from the speech?

MR. HOLLETT: Any way: I am quite prepared to have the honourable the Solicitor General give the information to us verbatim as he speaks, rather than go ahead without knowing.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member may continue his speech.

MR. MURRAY: Well, Your Honour, I got to the point where I was trying to inform the House that when this bill reaches the Committee of the Whole stage and when clause 2 is called we propose to make an amendment saying the words "thirty-three" be deleted and the words "thirty-six" be substituted therefor, for the reason I have given, sir. That was embodied as a principle, that was enacted in 1885 over seventy years ago, when the representation in this House of Assembly at that time was 36 members although the population of Newfoundland at that time was something

over two hundred thousand whereas today our population is over four hundred thousand. The second proposal, sir, has to do with the District of Port De Grave. As I have said, we are this year celebrating our hundredth anniversary of Responsible Government — and here is an old traditional district, in existence from the very year we got Responsible Government, the District of Port de Grave. Under a redistribution bill passed in the year 1855, the very first year that this House sat under responsible government the District of Port de Grave was included. Therefore, thinking traditionally, it would appear to us a most anomalous thing if the membership of this House be raised to thirty-three members and the District of Port de Grave, one of the oldest districts in Newfoundland be at the same time abolished. Therefore, sir, our proposal would be to restore it.

The next amendment, sir, has to do with the District of White Bay. As we all know, this district covers quite a stretch of territory, and it is a reasonably heavy populated district, something in the neighbourhood of fourteen thousand inhabitants. The proposal was to seek an amendment in committee that the existing district of White Bay be divided into two making White Bay North and White Bay South.

We have three new members — Now in order to maintain what the premier referred to the other day as the traditional balance in Newfoundland, a state of affairs existing, I believe, since 1853 — That is why it was required that the district of Harbour Main become a two-man district. Under the new distribution though it is proposed that Bell Island stay as it is but that Harbour Main be as outlined in the draft before us,

and an amendment would be moved that instead of representation by one member it would be represented by two. These, sir, are all the amendments which we intend to include. There is nothing particularly drastic about them, nothing particularly incomprehensible, and I really don't see how the honourable gentleman opposite would be put to any great inconvenience, sir. I have compiled purely by way of information, a list of representation in this House since 1832 when the House first started under the representative form of government. In the year 1832 there was nine districts and fifteen members, Bonavista, Ferryland, Fogo, Fortune Bay, Conception Bay (which had three members) Placentia—St. Mary's (two members) St. John's (three members) and Trinity — making fifteen members. That followed on until the year 1855 when another redistribution bill was brought in enlarging the number of districts from nine to fifteen and having them represented by thirty members. Bay de Verde, Bonavista, Burgeo and LaPoile, Buriu, Carbonear, Ferryland, Harbour Grace, Harbour Main, Placentia East, Port de Grave, St. John's East, St. John's West, Trinity, Twillingate and Fogo, making a total of fifteen districts with a total of thirty members. The next amendment came before the House in the year 1882. In that year an amendment was passed by which the District of St. George's and St. Barbe were created. Previous to this the French Shore Question was a very live issue and all the coast from Cape Bauld to Port aux Basques was unrepresented in the House. At that time the number of districts increased and the membership was 32. In 1885 we got the model I am proposing in the present amendment when a new redistribution bill

came in, when the membership in the House was made 36 and Fogo and Twillingate made separate, and Fogo was a one man district. So this bill came in creating a house of 36 members, over seventy years ago, when the population was under two hundred thousand. That, sir, was a bill with which the members of the House are familiar as it remained in effect until 1925. From then on, the Premier, the other day, outlined the various changes very clearly, and I don't propose to go over them again.

As far as an increased membership is concerned, I don't think it would be very difficult to argue, that in 1885 Newfoundland having then a population of something under two hundred thousand and could be represented in this House by thirty six members, today with a population of over four hundred thousand we should have a representation of 36 members.

As for the principle of less representation for urban districts as against rural districts, which the premier proved so conclusively the other day—

MR. BROWNE: Who did he prove it to?

MR. MURRAY: To any sensible man, and, I think, from precedent, taking in all Canada. He proved it as conclusively as anything I have ever heard. I remember he mentioned province by province and brought it out with facts and figures, which proved conclusively, I say, to any man, the principle of more representation for rural districts. It was proved as conclusively as ever I heard anything proved. That principle still applies in the measure still before us. As far as Labrador is concerned it is still unchanged. I don't think any reasonable man could argue, as the premier said, that a great sub-continent —

MR. BROWNE: Give us credit for some reason over here now.

MR. MURRAY: And as far as St. John's is concerned I can only point out this fact — I think the premier has already brought it to the notice of the House — In the bill of 1885 the St. John's area was represented by six men. St. John's East three and St. John's West three. In the present bill, sir, the representation for that area is precisely the same, as Bell Island has one member and there are five other members for the St. John's area. So going back to the bill of 1885 the St. John's area is precisely the same.

MR. BROWNE: How is the population?

MR. MURRAY: I don't think the position has altered very much. As I recall, speaking from memory, that area then would have something like forty thousand population.

MR. HOLLETT: There were not as many on Bell Island.

MR. MURRAY: Well, sir, with regard to the only other factor, the traditional balance carried on ever since 1855, the balance is quite undisturbed, in a House of thirty-six it would be 12-12 and 12.

Sir, I think the bill is one which should commend itself to both sides of the House. However we carve up Newfoundland into districts, difficulties will arise. If people of one religion happened to live on one side and people of another on another the thing would be comparatively simple for the purposes of this bill. But unfortunately that is not the case and a certain amount of compromise must take place, and I doubt if any better system can be devised.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the premier told us a few moments ago he had no wish to hurry the matter; when we had the information he would give us time — now he objects.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On that basis, yes, I would be agreeable to adjournment so that my honourable friends opposite can take more time to consider the present bill in the light of the information my honourable friend has just given. I agree on that. But I don't think my honourable friend ought to adjourn the debate. Perhaps he would allow me to adjourn it.

On motion debate adjourned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, would my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition have the support of his colleagues if I asked him to agree now that with regard to this second reading we give today that we now have committee stage so that we could go ahead with our work. It is the only thing we have left to do, if we don't debate the bill we have just stopped debating. That is to say Committee of the Whole on items 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 on the order paper, Mr. Speaker.

Motion that these various Bills be now referred to a Committee of the Whole House, carried.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair. Mr. Courage Chairman of Committee:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting the Fisheries Assistance Fund".

Clause 1 and 2 read and carried:

Clause 3 read:

3. There shall be a fund which shall be known as the Fisheries Assistance Fund into which shall be paid all moneys standing to the credit of the Fisheries Assistance Fund established by The Fishery Marketing Funds (Disposal) Act, 1948 the Act No. 10 of 1948, and which shall be administered by the Minister.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on that particular one — Is it not a fact some money was paid out of that fund a year or so ago for some purpose other than what is mentioned?

MR. KEOUGH: To my knowledge the only payments against the fund have been for pumps.

MR. HOLLETT: Was there not a loan to the Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have some recollections that we did borrow from that fund there for a month or two, two or three years ago. I believe we had a temporary shortage of funds in the Treasury while we were awaiting large and very substantial payments due us from Ottawa. I believe we did temporarily borrow something from that fund, or if not from that from several other funds, and possibly from this one as well.

MR. HOLLETT: The point is; I want to ask on what grounds the Trustees of that fund are able to loan out or advance money to the government? It is just a matter of interest. It was done, I take it, and the money paid back, that sort of thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Either we had authority to do it or we did not. If we had the authority we did borrow.

MR. CURTIS: I think the fund was probably in the name of the

Minister of Finance and we presumed the authority.

MR. HOLLETT: As I remember, it was two hundred thousand dollars.

MR. KEOUGH: In any case, as far as I know, Mr. Chairman, the fund is intact with the exception of any payments made for pumps.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister of Fisheries, where are the funds now?

MR. KEOUGH: As far as I know, in the Bank of Montreal.

MR. BROWNE: In one account?

MR. CURTIS: That is the reason for the bill. It is in a separate trust account.

MR. KEOUGH: Yes, that is why it appears separately in the public accounts.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, it must be in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I think it must be, I think it has got to be. I don't think there is any other place where it could conceivably be. All moneys from whatever source must go into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and then having gone in it may for the purpose of accounting and other purposes, be segregated into various other accounts or separate funds. But the great principle of treasury control is that all moneys coming in must be entered into Consolidated Revenue Fund. It could well be in Consolidated Revenue Fund and be earmarked for something else, for which reason, it could not be spent except for the special purpose named. But I think that all moneys must go into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, all the Queen's moneys — I don't see any human way it can be otherwise constitutionally.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on that point I am not quite sure the Honourable the Premier is correct. If it were in the Consolidated Revenue Fund by what measure of reasoning would the government have to borrow money from that particular fund?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because it might be earmarked — and I think it is earmarked.

MR. HOLLETT: Then if it is earmarked for some particular purpose it cannot be said it is in the Consolidated Revenue Fund with the moneys the government has a right to spend at any time without having to borrow money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend's reasoning is not sound.

MR. HOLLETT: In the opinion of the Honourable the Premier it is not sound.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not on that point.

MR. HOLLETT: I see. On many occasions not only my reasoning is unsound but certain members on the opposite side don't appear to use sound reasoning in regard to certain investments.

Clause 3 carried. Clause 4 read:

4. Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the Minister shall deposit the fund in any chartered bank of Canada or invest it in any investments in which a trustee is permitted by the Trustee Act to invest funds and may withdraw any deposit or vary or redeem any investment.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on that point — if this money is in the Consolidated Revenue Fund, we are taking it out of this fund now and

are giving the minister authority to invest it in certain other funds in accordance with the Trustee Act, or what are we doing? We are giving the Minister, authority to deposit this money in any chartered bank. Now surely no minister of the Crown has any right under any Act passed here to do that with any other money in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I have some doubts as to whether it is really in the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

MR. KEOUGH: I am not sufficiently versed in finance, but I do know that there is a Fisheries Assistance Fund and that fund is held apart and intact in the Bank of Montreal.

MR. HOLLETT: In what way can the minister of the Government use that fund as so deposited now? Under the present legislation what may you do with it?

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, under the old legislation the Minister or Commissioner of Natural Resources could use it, and I inherited his powers, for the establishment and development of new markets and encouraging and developing the fishing industry. But since the repeal of that Act I do not know — nobody has authority to do anything with it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think since the repeal of that Act it automatically went into the Consolidated Revenue. Originally the money as it came in went into Consolidated Revenue Fund and the Commission of Government, in their wisdom decided to set up a separate, segregated, special fund for which perhaps they took it out of Consolidated Revenue Fund, and then, subject to the provisions of an Act which then existed, which said that the Commission might spend it for

the purpose of developing markets for codfish. So long as that Act existed the money existed as a separate fund, separate from Consolidated Revenue Fund, under authority of that Act. But the Act was repealed and two things automatically had happened, it seems to me: (1) the money would go back into Consolidated Revenue Fund and (2) the particular purpose the Commissioner or Minister was authorized to spend it for, ceased, because the bill setting up this particular purpose ceased. But now, while the money would be back in Consolidated Revenue Fund, what could be done with it by the Minister? Nothing except on authority of the Governor-in-Council. What could the government do with it? Could spend it? It could borrow it. It could spend it. It could at any time, I believe, in the last few years have spent the money on any one of a number of things. But the purpose of this present bill, a thing which ought to have been said at second reading and not at this stage, as it is admittedly out of order, the purpose of this bill is to recreate a procedure, an order, a method of disposition which has not existed since the repeal of the former Act. Is that not clear?

MR. HOLLETT: No. The point I was trying to clear up in my mind was — In 1951 the Act which set up this fund was repealed. Then, the Honourable the Premier tells me, the money automatically went back into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

MR. SMALLWOOD: As I believe it had to.

MR. HOLLETT: Since that time the Government borrowed \$250,000 from that fund and in all probability paid it back. If there was no legis-

lation, and the money had gone back into the Consolidated Revenue Fund in what way did they borrow from that fund?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It might well be in the Consolidated Revenue Fund in one of two ways — it can be just part of the general amount of money or it could be in the fund earmarked for some particular purpose. Now, if because the Act was repealed that was there but was not earmarked we could have used it in the normal way, but we insisted on regarding it as a special sum of money. We always so regarded it and still do. We do not regard it as ordinary funds of the government at all.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that is all very well. How is the money now going to be used? There is nothing in the Bill to say. Perhaps I am out of order in saying it now, but we ought to be clear as to what the fund is to be used for. It says here it shall be paid out but there is no general principle laid down as to how the money should be distributed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For good reason, the good reason being we have not a general purpose, we merely provide in outline from this principle a certain type of disposition of the fund, but as for what purpose, we have nothing in mind. Every year, we would, if we voted money, we would I assume have it in the estimates, and we might spend it pending the opening of the House and then come in and ask for confirmation of what we have done. That is a commonplace thing in Governments today, to come in and ask for confirmation of what we have done. That is a commonplace thing for governments to do. To come in here and ask for confirmation of what we have done, if we do it be-

tween sessions of the House. Certainly it is the House that ought to pass it, even if we spend it temporarily before the House opens. When the House opens we should get confirmation of it. Now one thing we had in mind was to use the interest on it as a contribution annually to the Fishermen's Federation.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that would be a good idea — something like that.

MR. KEOUGH: I propose to bring that amendment in in the next session.

Clause 4 carried. Clause 5 read:

5. Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the minister may apply the fund or any part of it to measures for the encouragement and development of the fisheries of Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable minister could tell us just how much money was voted by the legislature to the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen and how much has been paid.

MR. KEOUGH: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if before dealing with that I might move that Section 5 be deleted.

MR. BROWNE: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I don't think the minister can remove an amendment to his own bill.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment that Section 5 be deleted and the following be substituted therefor: The minister shall out of the fund pay into the Consolidated Revenue Fund any amount voted by the Legislature for, and paid to the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen after April 1st, 1955.

Now the position is this Mr. Chairman, in the estimates this year there will probably be a vote, if I may so, as there was last year, to the Federation of Fishermen. If that vote is included in the estimates this year the minister under this section will be allowed to reimburse the consolidated revenue fund to the extent of such payment, and the fund will otherwise remain intact and will be left to accumulate until this House decides by amending this Act what is to be done with it.

I move that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HOLLETT: I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the minister could now give me the information?

MR. KEOUGH: Well for the year ending March 31, 1953 the House voted, as far as I remember, ten thousand dollars for the year ending March 31, 1954 — and I might just add this, Mr. Chairman, that in the amendment that I propose the government has retreated from the authority it had under the 1949 Act to dispose of that fund — because the Minister of Natural Resources could have disposed of it for much the same reason as set forth in the clause that the Attorney General moved be deleted. In other words the Commissioner of Natural Resources, and I inherited his power, could have spent all of that fund for the development and encouragement of fisheries, at least up to the time the 1949 Act was repealed. So the government today is just simply asking the House for authority to reimburse Consolidated Revenue Fund for any amounts which may be voted by way of grant to the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen, so that the House will for the future have complete control over the fund, which has

to be held intact except that in any one year, if the House passed estimates for my department and if there is a figure in there for application to the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen the House will know that Consolidated Revenue Fund will be reimbursed out of this fund, and, as I say, the House will then have complete control of the fund.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, if I may add a word to what my honourable colleague has said — We have felt very strongly as a government that any of this money which we in our circle call "The Fishermen's Money" that is spent should be spent on the authority of this House. That is why in this present legislation we have done something we did not need to do, we have deprived ourselves as a government, at least we have deprived my honourable friend the Minister of Fisheries of powers he possessed before this bill, as passed, to spend the fishermen's money. We have deprived the government as a government of the right to determine how and where it would be spent and we have put it squarely in the hands of this House to determine that. That is the meaning of this amendment which my honourable friend, the Attorney General, has just moved.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, financially I am a dunce, I know, but I do not see where the difference is. The government want to reimburse themselves out of this fund which is supposed to be devoted to the improvement of the fishery etc. They want to reimburse the Consolidated Revenue Fund out of that particular fund for any money which they paid out of it in the past.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not in the past.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to be clear on that. I was under the impression that it was.

MR. CURTIS: I might say, Mr. Speaker, this bill intentionally has been made retroactive to authorize what has been done over the past year, but not with the idea of recovering any money paid out. You will notice if you read the section it just says it may repay any moneys that shall be paid out — it is the future.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the minister read the section?

MR. CURTIS: The minister shall out of the fund pay into the Consolidated Revenue Fund any amount voted by the Legislature for and paid to the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen. Well, I think in order to make it clear we might put in the word "hereafter" because it is not the intention of the government to make it retroactive.

MR. HOLLETT: Any money spent after 1955. So we are not going to pay back the Consolidated Revenue Fund?

MR. CURTIS: Any amount hereinafter voted.

MR. BROWNE: That is all right.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the money has to be voted first before it is paid out, is that the idea? In the past the government has been in the habit of paying out certain moneys and then coming back asking for the authority to do so.

MR. CURTIS: This is a trust fund.

MR. BROWNE: I take it the meaning of this is now that there is to be a vote from the Legislature to justify the payment. There has to be a vote from the Legislature.

MR. CURTIS: Yes. And the retroactive clause is to justify the minister having put it on deposit before when it had no mother or father and was just an orphan.

Clause 5 carried. Clause 6 carried.

Motion, that the committee report having passed the bill with some amendment, carried:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Education (Teachers' Training) Act."

Clauses 1 through 4 carried. Clause 5 read:

5. Section 7 of the said Act is amended

(a) by striking out paragraphs (a) and (b) and substituting therefor the following:

(a) the number and names of grades of teachers' certificates and licenses, and the conditions under which such certificates and licenses may be granted.

(b) the validity of such certificates and licenses."

and

(b) by striking out paragraph (b) and substituting therefor the following:

"(d) the training, examining, grading, certificating and licensing of teachers.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, before the bill passes committee stage, there is a question I asked the Honourable Minister of Education. I wonder if he has the reply? Could we revert to Clause 2 of the bill for the purpose of the honourable minister's reply?

On motion committee reverted to Clause 2:

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, may I say a word to amplify the point under discussion? The section, the actual section in the Act which we are amending has this wording? "In accordance with the rules and regulations of the Council of Education made under this Act." The next amendment has to do with adding the word "Licenses" along with the word "Grades" because now the Board of Examiners, as the minister pointed out, are empowered to award licenses as well as grades. So that amendment now ratifies a procedure which has in fact been in being for some time. Now the proviso is not a new amendment. It is already in the original Act and is not as radical as it looks, because the Board of Examiners maintain, shall I say, a complete denominator up to a point and some boards go beyond that by requiring for instance foreign languages and other requirements. But in the case of certain requirements teachers who may be designated to a certain school this special requirement is not necessary any more. The Board may, in order to get that teacher, not require that further requirement.

MR. BROWNE: All general requirements — seems to be so sweeping — But the regulations say here there are further requirements.

DR. POTTLE: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the word "generally" has been inadvertently omitted — I don't see any other explanation — because otherwise the word "general" further down has no meaning.

MR. BROWNE: That is why my attention was drawn to it.

MR. CHALKER: I move that the clause stand, Mr. Chairman, Motion carried.

Motion, that the committee rise, report having considered the bill, made some progress and ask leave to sit again, carried.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, and have passed the Bill, "An Act Respecting the Fisheries Assistance Fund" with some amendment.

On motion report received. On motion report adopted. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to it referred and on the bill, "An Act to Amend the Educational (Teacher Training) Act" has made some progress and asks leave to sit again.

On motion report received. On motion committee ordered to sit again tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred. Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 of the clock there are two things I would like to say, with your permission:

(1) On Wednesday I would hope that the House could see its way clear to be ready for a debate on the report of the Royal Commission on Forestry. The report has been now in the hands of the honourable members for a week or ten days, and presumably all members have read and studied it and by Wednesday afternoon I hope we will be in a position to debate it. I believe that the technique that my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines and Resources, will follow to initiate the debate, will be to move

the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of public importance, after disposal of the first part of the Order Paper. I would hope that we could dispose of that debate on Wednesday afternoon and night perhaps. Then secondly I would hope that tomorrow my honourable friends opposite would be ready to go ahead with the debate on the Redistribution Bill. They were not ready this afternoon. They have only these few additional facts to add to their thinking, and they should be ready tomorrow afternoon — Time is passing but there is no desire to rush everyone off their feet but every desire to press forward energetically with the work of the House.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, April 5, at 3:00 of the clock.

TUESDAY, April 5, 1955

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

(Mr. Speaker and honourable members of the House proceeded to Government House to deliver the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that at 3:15 of the clock I presented to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, by order of the House, the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Presenting Petitions

MR. M. BUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Heart's Delight, Islington, Whiteway and Cavendish. This petition, sir, is signed by 101 persons.

The petitioners are requesting that a telephone connection be made from Green's Harbour to the places I have already mentioned. The distance from telephone connections is one mile exactly from Green's Harbour to Heart's Delight and almost twelve miles from Heart's Content to Heart's Delight.

Mr. Speaker, the petitioners informed me they are tired of taking the matter up with the Avalon Telephone Company, and when they did take that matter up with them they were promised that consideration would be given their request. I may say also, Mr. Speaker, I have taken the matter up with the company concerned, and the answer to me was: "we will have to do something about that telephone connection in the district mentioned." Well, Mr. Speaker, it has taken the company some five years, since I went to them and asked that this connection be made, and up to the present time there has been no action.

It is very important to the area mentioned, because after the post office is closed in the afternoon at 6:00 o'clock there is no connection whatsoever and should a person get sick a taxi must be hired to go to the nearest telephone which is twelve miles away to find out if the doctor is there. Whereas, such things could be taken care of if they had the telephone connection.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that the government should take some action in this matter, and request the company concerned to take immediate steps to keep their promise by giving the people this little service which I contend they deserve.

Sir, I take great pleasure in supporting this petition and I beg leave to have it laid on the Table of the House

to be referred to the department concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I put the motion I must say a word about petitions; I am not so sure if this petition concerns at all the Provincial Government, and then which department would be concerned with it. I think telephone connections are a matter for the Federal Government of Canada.

MR. BUTTON: Well, sir, the Commission of Public Utilities.

MR. SPEAKER: There is one other thing I must point out: Honourable members presenting petitions must not criticize any department of the government. Petitions contain a prayer and not a criticism. Honourable members will have to watch that carefully in the future.

On motion petition received. Ordered referred to the department concerned.

MR. J. R. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Seal Cove and Pass Island in the District of Fortune Bay—Hermitage.

This petition, sir, asks that a road be constructed from Seal Cove to Grole Point which is the nearest point of land to Pass Island. There has been for many years a path connecting these places but there has never been a proper road built.

This is the part of the country to which I belong. I went to Pass Island when I was a small boy about eight or nine years old, and some of my earliest recollections are of walking along this path. The people of this area, sir, could be greatly served by this road. It would be of great assistance to the fishermen of Pass Island and Seal Cove and that area who could

then send their catches of fish by land to the fish plant at Gaultois. That fish plant at Gaultois has a distributing centre at Hermitage; and fishermen could very much benefit if this road could be built.

I have much pleasure, sir, in presenting this petition. It is a road which needs to be built and one which would be very important to the economy and to the welfare of the people of Seal Cove and Pass Island. I do strongly support this petition, sir, and ask that it be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the Department of Public Works.

On motion report received for reference to the Department of Public Works.

MR. P. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from some one thousand voters of Mortier Bay. The petitioners request that a causeway with a forty foot bridge be built to connect Marystown South with Marystown North, these two being separated, sir, by some five hundred feet, and the petitioners pray that a bridge be built across, a causeway, to connect Marystown South and Marystown North. Two thousand people of Marystown South have to cross the water to avail of postal telegraph services, medical services, freight services from the Government Coastal Wharf. More important still, some 180 school children are deprived of attending the Convent of Mercy School situated on the North Side, and lastly, it would shorten the distance to the main highway by some twenty-two miles and shorten the distance to Burin Hospital, and would also mean quicker and cheaper transportation for workmen employed at Burin and the Mines at St. Lawrence. I may add here, Mr. Speaker, some eighty men work at

Burin, at St. Lawrence from Marystown area. From an educational view point some 180 children on the south side are deprived of the privilege of attending the convent school operated on the north side. By adding another 180 children to the convent school it would mean increasing the now five room school to a ten room school and it would eliminate two one room schools.

The arguments, sir, in favour of this bridge are so many that I feel that the department concerned would not be justified in turning a deaf ear. The people are not asking for an elaborate bridge, but are merely asking a causeway and bridge leaving an opening of forty feet which may be raised to allow schooners to pass up and down stream. I don't think, sir, the expenditure would be great, and I do believe the fact of the Convent of Mercy School being increased to ten rooms would justify the expenditure.

I strongly support this petition, sir, which I consider one of the most important I have ever presented to this House. I request that the petition be laid on the Table of the House and passed to the department concerned.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if I may — I would like to lend my support, and our support on this side of the House, to that petition brought in by the Honourable member for Placentia West. I know that territory very well. I was magistrate in Burin for twelve years, and monthly or sometimes oftener, I drove to Marystown North and on the north side, of course, I had to get in a boat and go across. Now if you drive to Marystown North and want to go to Marystown South, unless you want to cross the water you have to go twenty-two

miles. This causeway which is asked for by the people in Marystown is something, I think, which would add greatly to the welfare of the people and to their convenience in every way, in getting back and forth from other places like Burin and St. Lawrence. We are very happy to support this petition, and trust that when it comes to the notice of the government, particularly the notice of the Honourable Minister of Public Works, that consideration will be given it.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Giving Notice of Motion

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill "An Act to Amend the Local School Tax Act, 1954."

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Mortier Bay Development Company Limited." also a bill, "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement between the Government and Union Electric Light and Power Company, Limited, relating to a Franchise."

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the District Courts Act."

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act

to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement between the Government and Frobisher Limited."

Giving Notice of Questions

MR. W. J. BROWNE:— To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:—

The names of all contractors or contracting companies with whom contracts were made for the building of roads and bridges or other construction work during the fiscal year 1954-55, together with a description of the nature of the work to be done and the cost of same. If tenders were called for in any case give the names of parties tendering and the amount at which they tendered, in whose presence are tenders opened; what amount of work has been done on each contract and how much has been paid for same.

Answers to Questions

MR. SPEAKER: I have to call the attention of the Honourable the Minister concerned, the Honourable Minister of Finance, to the close similarity between this question and Question No. 10 already asked and not yet answered. But since there are points of difference the minister, I think, might very well answer the question, if he sees fit. It seems to me Part (1) of Question 10 might be combined in the answer.

MR. BROWNE: That is satisfactory to me, sir.

MR. CHALKER: There is a similarity there, but we will answer both of them. While I am on my feet I would like to table the answer to Question No. 18.

Question No. 18: Tabled.

Question No. 34 — In course of preparation.

BOARD OF LIQUOR CONTROL

Question asked by Mr. Hollett, #18

- #1. List the various brands of Alcoholic beverages including Beers purchased for the Board of Liquor Control between the dates of February 28th., 1954 and March 31st., 1955.
- #2. Give the names of the firms or individuals from whom these beverages were bought, the names of the local agents for each brand and the quantities purchased.

BRAND	FIRM	AGENT	Purchases
			Feb. 28/54 to Feb. 28/1955 No. Cases
Lemon Hart Rum	United Rum Merchants	J. A. McGrath	1,700
Lambs Old Navy Rum	J M Douglas & Co. Ltd.	" "	1,300
Lambs Palm Breeze	J M Douglas & Co. Ltd.	" "	50
MacKinley's Whisky	Chas MacKinley & Co. Ltd.	" "	100
Corby's Royal Reserve Whisky	H. Corby Distillery Ltd.	" "	50
Coates Plymouth Gin	Coates & Co. (Plymouth)	" "	100
Bookers Fruit and Navy Rum	Booker Rum Co.	" "	400
Benedictine	Benedictine France	" "	25
Western Pearl Rum	Southard & Co.	Wm. Petten	1,400
Old Niagara Port	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	" "	9,000
Old London Port	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	" "	700
Old London Sherry	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	" "	900
Old Niagara Sherry	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	" "	2,400
Havana Club Rum	Jose Archabala	Baine Johnston & Co.	750
Capt. Morgan B/L Rum	Capt. Morgan Rum Distillers	" " "	4,000
Kentucky Bourbon Whiskey (Peppers)	Schenley International Corp.	" " "	50
Sandersou's Vat 69 Whisky	Wm. Sanderson & Sons Ltd.	" " "	500

Harper's Bourbon Whisky	Schenley International Corp.	Baine Johnston & Co.	20	
King's Plate Whisky	Joseph E. Seagram & Sons Ltd.	" " "	50	
Seagram's V.O. Whiskey	Joseph E. Seagram & Sons Ltd.	" " "	75	
Bols Lemon Gin	E. Lucas Bols	" " "	2,710	
Bols Geneva Gin	E. Lucas Bols	" " "	75	
Bols Silver Top Gin	E. Lucas Bols	" " "	45	
Seagram's London Gin	Joseph E. Seagram & Sons Ltd.	" " "	125	
Bols Creme de Cocoa	E. Lucas Bols	" " "	190	
Bols Creme de Menthe	E. Lucas Bols	" " "	65	
Harvey's Bristol Cream Sherry	John Harvey & Sons Ltd.	" " "	50	
Harvey's Amontillado Sherry	John Harvey & Sons Ltd.	" " "	50	
Bols Cordials	E. Lucas Bols	" " "	175	
Crown Royal Whisky	Joseph E. Seagram & Sons Ltd.	" " "	125	
Hunt's Coronation Port	Hunt Ropce & Co. Ltd.	" " "	30	
Molson's Ale	Molson's Brewery Ltd.	" " "	41,550	
Barriasson's Brandy	Newman & Co.	" " "		2 Hhds.
Newman's Port Wine	Newman & Co.	" " "		7 Pipes
Hudson's Bay Rum	Hudson Bay Co.	Job Brothers & Co.	1,599	
Hudson's Bay Whisky	Hudson Bay Co.	Job Brothers & Co.	300	
Old Grog Rum	S. Davson & Co.	C. Strong	1,100	
Coronation Whisky	Gooderham & Worts	" "	25	
Bonded Stock Whisky	Gooderham & Worts	" "	25	
Collins Dry Gin	Gooderham & Worts	" "	25	
Coitreau	Contintreau S/A France	" "	20	
Martini & Rossi Vermouth	Martini & Rossi Ltd.	" "	150	
Alcohol	Gooderham & Worts	" "		1 Drum
Booths House of Lords Gin	Booths Distilleries Ltd.	Montreal Agent	200	
Black Circle Rum	(Dr.) J. G. B. Siegert & Sons	Geo Chalker	50	
Bouquet Rum	(Dr.) J. G. B. Siegert & Sons	" "	198	

Questions asked by Mr. Hollett. #1 & #2 continued.

BRAND	FIRM	AGENT	Purchases
			Feb. 28/54 to Feb. 28/1955 No. Cases
Gold Braid	(Dr.) J. G. B. Siegert & Sons	Geo Chalker	50
Angostura Bitters	(Dr.) J. G. B. Siegert & Sons	" "	10
Favell's Old Polina Rum	White Favell (Vintners) Ltd.	J. W. McGrath	200
Favell's London Dock Rum	White Favell (Vintners) Ltd.	" "	900
Favell's Royal Oak	White Favell (Vintners) Ltd.	" "	150
Glen Rossie Whisky	Glen Rossie Distillers Ltd.	" "	150
Combiar Liqueurs	White Favell (Vintners) Ltd.	" "	115
Horndale Brandy	White Favell (Vintners) Ltd.	" "	
Ron Bacardi (Cuban) Rum	Ron Bacardi S/A	Toronto Agents	1,200
Bacardi Carta Amber Rum	Bacardi Corp. of America	Toronto Agents	700
Highland Queen Whisky	McDonald Muir Ltd.	" "	400
Williams and Humbert Sherry	Williams & Humbert	" "	200
Bulmers Cyder	H. P. Bulmer & Co. Ltd.	" "	100
St. Emilion & St. Julien Claret	Schroder & Schyler & Co.	" "	200
Long John Whisky	Loug John Distillers Ltd.	Montreal Agents	100
Booths High & Dry Gin	Redpath & Co.	" "	25
Cherry Herring	Peter F. Herring	" "	10
Chianti Rosso Italian D/W	M. Caliss & Co.	" "	150
Guntrums Liebfraumilch	Louis Guntrum	" "	25
Guntrums Niersteiner	Louis Guntrum	" "	15
Noilly Prat Vermouth	Noilly Prat & Co.	" "	100
Votrix Vermouth	Vine Products Ltd.	" "	150
Mumm's Champagne	G. A. Munn & Co.	" "	50

20 Hhds.

Veuve Cliquot Champagne
 Monnet Brandy
 Fernandez Liqueur Rum
 Young's Old Sam Rum
 Calvert's Graud Reserve Whisky
 Lord Calvert Whisky
 Cluny McPherson Whisky
 Queen Ann Whisky
 Jamieson's Three Star Whisky
 Burroughs Giu
 Columbus Rum
 Adams Silver Fizz Gin
 Jordan Gold Seal Port
 Danforth Ports
 Danforth Sherries
 Gilbey's Spey Royal Whisky
 Bell's Special Reserve
 Gilbey's Gin
 Gilbey's Orange & Collins Gin
 Mcagher's Creme de Menthe
 Gilbey's Triple Sec.
 Morris Sloe Gin
 Mcagher's Cordials
 Oland's Ale
 Highland Queen Whisky
 Old Taylor Whisky
 Lock Corris Whisky
 Viscount Whisky
 Melcher's Aristocrat Whisky

B. D. Vogue & Co.
 J. G. Monnet & Co. Ltd.
 Fernandez & Co. Ltd.
 Ed. Young & Co. Ltd.
 Calvert Distillers Ltd.
 Calvert Distillers Ltd.
 John E. McPherson & Sons
 Hill Thompson & Co. Ltd.
 John Jamieson & Sons Ltd.
 Jas Burroughs Ltd.
 Christopher Columbus Rum Co.
 Thomas Adams Distillers Ltd.
 Jordan Wine Co.
 Danforth Wines Ltd.
 Danforth Wines Ltd.
 W. & A. Gilbey Ltd.
 Arthur Bell & Sons Ltd.
 W. & A. Gilbey Ltd.
 W. & A. Gilbey Ltd.
 Mcagher Brothers & Co. Ltd.
 W. & A. Gilbey Ltd.
 Meagher Brothers & Co. Ltd.
 Meagher Brothers & Co. Ltd.
 Oland & Sons Ltd.
 Wm. Teacher & Sons Ltd.
 National Distillers Products Corp.
 Marshall Talpow Ltd.
 Melchers Distilleries Ltd.
 Melchers Distilleries Ltd.

Montreal Agents	20
" "	75
Montreal Agent	500
M. D. Shears	4,800
" "	100
" "	100
Carnell Agencies	400
" "	500
" "	75
J. D. O' Driscoll	50
G. Squires	450
" "	300
" "	250
G. Squires	150
" "	325
P. J. Dobbin	50
" "	400
" "	1,000
" "	1,025
" "	40
" "	10
" "	55
" "	125
" "	5,500
J. Strang	1,100
Mrs. McNamara	100
H. Scott	102
M. J. Jones	25
" "	25

Questions asked by Mr. Hollett. #1 & #2 continued.

BRAND	FIRM	AGENT	Purchases
			Feb. 28/54 to Feb. 28/1955 No. Cases
Melcher's London Club Gin	Melchers Distilleries Ltd.	M J Jones	50
Ballantines Whisky	Geo. Ballantine & Sons Ltd.	J. J. Everard	100
Old Plaid Whisky	Hiram Walker & Sons.	" "	175
Canadian Club Whisky	Hiram Walker & Sons.	" "	2,600
Walker's Imperial Whisky	Hiram Walker & Sons.	" "	25
Royal Scott Whisky	Hiram Walker & Sons.	" "	25
Walker's London Gin	Hiram Walker & Sons.	" "	500
Walker's Cocktail	Hiram Walker & Sons.	" "	25
Brights Napoleon Port	T. G. Bright & Co.	" "	100
Brights Catawba Sherry	T. G. Bright & Co.	" "	700
Gonzalez Sherry	Gonzales Byass & Co.	" "	
Heidesieck Champagne	Charles Heidesieck	J. J. Everard	40
Hennessey's Brandy XXX	Jas Hennessey & Co.	A. Reid	50
Drambuie Liqueur Whisky	Drambuie Liqueur Co. Ltd.	Direct	50
Portuguese Brandy Three Star	S. V. P. Constantino Ltd.	"	50
Martells Brandy Three Star	Martell & Co.	"	75
Fernandez Amontillado Sherry	Manuel Fernandez & Co.	"	600
Monte Crasto Table Wines	Sociedade Commercial Senas Ltd.	"	90
Sorgrape Table Wines	Sociedade Commercial Senas Ltd.	"	160
Ouds Advocaat	Wed. G. Oud Pz. & Co.	"	100
Viceroy Port	Taylor, Fladgate & Yeaman Co.	F. Wills	50
Johnnie Walker B/L Whisky	John Walker & Sons Ltd.	C. R. Bell	200
Johnnie Walker R/L Whisky		" "	2,850

2 Butts

Black & White Whisky	Has Buchanan	C. R. Bell	2,850	
Haig & Haig Whisky	Haig & Haig Ltd.	" "	1200	
Dewar's Special Whisky	John Dewar & Sons Ltd.	" "	950	
White Horse Cellar Whisky	White Horse Distillers Ltd.	" "	800	
Gordon's Gin	T. Gordon & Co.	" "	2,950	
Brizard's Cordials	Marie Brizard & Roger Ltd.	G. Banfield	125	
Paarl S A Sherry	Co-op Wine Growers Assoc. Ltd.	J. O'Driscoll	100	
Paarl S. A. Brandy	Co-op Wine Growers Assoc. Ltd.	" "		20 Casks
Paarl S. A. Port	Co-op Wine Growers Assoc. Ltd.	" "		20 Pipes
Guinness Stout	A. Guinness & Sons Ltd.	J. V. O'Dea & Co.	3,200	
Bass Ale	Export Bottlers Ltd.	J. V. O'Dea & Co.	400	
Younger's Double Century Ale	McEwan Younger Ltd.	Carnell Agencies	300	
McEwan's Strong Ale	McEwan Younger Ltd.	Carnell Agencies	700	
Tuborg Beer	Tuborg Breweries Ltd.	D. Baird	800	
Kingsbeer	Dow Brewery Ltd.	S. Lake	18,550	
Dow Ale	Dow Brewery Ltd.	S. Lake	8,100	
Carling's Red Cap Ale	Canadian Breweries (Que.) Ltd.	A. B. Baird	24,470	
Brading's Ale	Canadian Breweries (Que.) Ltd.	" "	250	
O'Keefe's Ale	Canadian Breweries (Que.) Ltd.	" "	42,872	
Heinken's Ale	Heineken's Brewery	R. Rennie	1,000	
Labatt's Ale	John Labatt Ltd.	B. Stafford	41,000	
Konig Beer	Konig-Brauereis	Direct	100	
Becks Beer	Beck & Co.	Job Bros. Ltd.	100	
India Pale Ale etc. Local	Newfoundland Brewery	Direct	5,515	
Dominion Ale etc Local	Bennett Brewing Co. Ltd.	Direct	9,830	
Jockey Club Ale etc. Local	Bavarian Brewing Co. Ltd.	Direct	22,662	
Jamaica Rum	J. Wray & Nephew	Direct		497 Casks
Hamiltons Port	Hamilton Ewell Vinyards Ltd	Toronto Agents		20 Hhds.
Muscatel Wine	Southard & Co.	Montreal Agent		15 Hhds.

Questions asked by Mr. Hollett. #1 & #2 continued.

BRAND	FIRM	AGENT	Purchases	
			Feb. 28/54 to Feb. 28/1955	No. Cases
Lisbon Wine	Nicolai & Co.	Montreal Agent		80 Pipes
MacKenzies Port	Mackenzie & Co.	Haig Scott		8 Pipes
Fromy LaMothe Brandy	Fromy Rogee & Co.	C. Tessier		2 Hhds.

#3. Give total amount of moneys paid out for the purchase of Alcoholic Liquors, and the total amount realized by the sale of Liquors since February 28th., 1954.

Total amount of money paid out for purchases of Alcoholic Liquors period February 28/1954 to February 28/ 1955 :-	\$3,401,188.00
--	----------------

Total amount realized by the sale of liquors for period as above :-	\$5,968,554.00
---	----------------

Figures for March 1955 will not be available until late April 1955.

March 28th., 1955... #18

Q4. Give the location of all licensed Beer Parlours, Hotels, Taverns and Tourist Hotels in Newfoundland, together with the names of proprietors. Have any such licences been revoked since February 28th., 1954? And if so what was the cause?

Establishment	Address	Proprietor
BEER PARLOURS.—No License issued under such a heading.		
HOTELS—		
Airlines Hotel	Gander	Dept. of Transport
Airlines Hotel	Goose Bay	Dept. of Transport
Bradbury Mrs. Florence	Bay Roberts	Mrs. Florence Bradbury
Balmoral Hotel	Clarenville	Thornlea Properties Ltd.
Bermuda Lake Hotel	Salmonier Line	G. J. Walsh & Co.
		No application for renewal 1955
Doucette P. R.	Black Duck	Mr. P. R. Doucette
Cochrane Hotel	St. John's	Mr. R. T. Ryan
Crosbie Hotel	St. John's	Mr. W. Spurrell
Glynmill Inn	Corner Brook	Bay of Islands Hotel Co. Ltd.
Lundrigan's Hotel	Colinet	Mr. A. Lundrigan
McFatrige's Hotel	Stephenville Crossing	Mrs. C. M. McFatrige
Makinsons Hotel	Makinsons	Makinsons Ltd.
Newfoundland Hotel	St. John's	Canadian National Hotels Ltd.
Pike's Hotel	Harbour Grace	Mr. L. Pike
Power's Hotel	Salmonier	Mr. Johu Power
Power's Hotel	Dunville	Mr. Gerald Power
Woolfrey's Hotel	Notre Dame Junction	Mr. H. Smith Woolfrey

Establishment	Address	Proprietor
TAVERNS—		
Archibald Miss Rose	Harbour Grace	Miss Rose Archibald
Ash J. M.	Harbour Grace	Mr. J. M. Ash
Basha J.	Curling	Mr. John Basha
Byrne J.	St. John's	Mr. James Byrne
Boulos A.	Deer Lake	Mr. Albert Boulos
Basha Joseph S.	Corner Brook	Mr. Joseph S. Basha
Boland M. J. & Son	Stephenville	M. J. Boland & Son
Boland M. J. & Co.	Stephenville	M. J. Boland & Co.
Cahill M.	Placentia	Mrs. M. Cahill
Cameron & Penny	St. John's	Cameron & Penny
Cranford Mrs. A. B.	New Hr., T. B.	Mrs. A. B. Cranford
Corner Tavern	St. John's	Georgetown Reality Co.
Crosbie C. R.	Corner Brook	Mr. C. R. Crosbie
Crawley Wm.	Holyrood	Mr. William Crawley
Cross Keys Tavern	St. John's	Mr. V. W. Andrews
Davis Mrs. Hilda	Holyrood	Mrs. Hilda Davis
Dicks Walter	Bell Island	Mr. Walter Dicks
Didham Mrs M.	Colinet	Mrs. M. Didham
Doyle M. F.	Conception Hr.	No application for renewal 1955.
Dunne Thos Ltd.	St. John's	Mr. M. F. Doyle
Dunphy P. J.	Corner Brook	Mr. Thomas Dunne
Fewer Mrs Mary	Avondale	Mr. P. J. Dunphy
Furey Mrs Albert	Hr. Main	Mrs. Mary Fewer
Furey Mrs. W	Holyrood	Mrs. Albert Furey
Green Lantern	St. John's	Mrs. W. Furey
		Mr. C. Doyle

Geehan Miss M.	Topsail
Gill Mrs Grace	Grand Falls
Green Gordon	Bishop Falls
Hickey J. J.	Holyrood
Hutchings Max	Bell Island
Hillview Inn	St. John's
Harbour Inn Ltd	St. John's
Jim's Tavern	St. John's
James Clifford	Brigus, C. B.
Joy Mrs Susie (Hamilton Inn)	St. John's
Janes Guy	Chamberlains
Kelly Mrs B.	St. John's
Kelly Mrs Teresa	Avondale
Liddy Mrs Mary	Torbay
Lang Mrs. Jean	St. John's
McCarthy Estate of	Corner Brook
McFatrige Mrs C. M.	Stephenville Crossing
McLean J.	Makinsons
Miller Mrs G.	Curling
Murrin L.	Spaniard's Bay
Noseworthy A.	Bay Roberts
O'Toole Robert	Conception Harbour
O'Reilly Mrs. A.	Avondale
Parsons R.	Seal Cove
Parsons E.	Bell Island
Phelan F. (Cottage Gardens)	St. John's
Pearcey A.	Keiligrews
Park Inn Co.	St. John's

Miss M. Geehan
Mrs. Grace Gill
Mr. Gordon Greene
Mr. J. J. Hickey
Mr. Max Hutchings
Messrs. Cook & Greene
Harbour Inn Ltd.
Mrs. James White
Mr. Clifford James
Mrs. Susie Joy
Mr. Guy Janes
Mrs. B. Kelly
Mrs. Teresa Kelly

No application for renewal 1955.

Mrs. Mary Liddy
Mrs. Jean Lang
Mrs. R. O'Reilly
Mrs. C. M. McFatrige
Mr. J. McLean
Mrs. G. Miller
Mr. L. Murrin
Mr. A. Noseworthy
Mr. Robert O'Toole
Mr. A. O'Reilly
Mr. Richard Parsons
Mr. E. Parsons
Mr. F. Phelan
Mr. A. Pearcey
Park Inn Co.

Establishment	Address	Proprietor
TAVERNS—		
Queen Tavern	St. John's	1954 C. Truscott (Deceased) 1955 C. Truscott Estate License Pending D. A. Mercer (Trustee)
Riviera Tavern	St. John's	Mrs. A. Rowe
Rowe Mrs. A.	St. John's	Miss A. Ryall
Ryall Miss A.	Botwood	Mr. Derek Kearney
Ritz Tavern	St. John's	Estate of W. Sterling
Sterling Estate of	St. John's	Mr. W. J. Ashley
Sports Tavern	St. John's	Mr. Harry Slaney
Slaney H.	Bay Bulls	Terra Nova Taverns Ltd.
Terra Nova Taverns Ltd.	Deer Lake	Messrs LeMessurier & Cole
Veterans' Inn	Torhay	Mrs. E. M. Vail
Vail Mrs. E. M.	St. Mary's	Mrs. P. Walsh
Walsh Mrs. P.	Goulds	Mr. H. M. Williams
Williams H. M.	Corner Brook	Mrs. M. Wheeler
Wheeler Mrs M.	Curling	Messrs James & Wilfred Whelan
Whelan Brothers	Corner Brook	
TOURIST HOTELS—No License issued under such a heading.		

Orders of The Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Attorney General if any report has yet been received from the Commissioners of Public Utilities in regard to the matter of electrical rates?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had a report this morning. It is in my office. I have not had a chance to read it yet.

MR. BROWNE: Would the Honourable the Attorney General let us know tomorrow what the contents of that report are?

MR. CURTIS: I think so, yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I propose to suggest that we take the third readings and the first readings and then go into second reading on No. 7 on the Order Paper, Bill No. 28, "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act."

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act."

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting the Fisheries Assistance Fund."

On motion read a third time ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

First Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Boiler and Pressure Vessels Act."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

First Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in asking that Bill No. 28 be called I should like to make a correction in the figures I gave in introducing this Bill, when I gave the figures for the two districts of Grand Falls and Gander. I forgot the figures I gave but I think they were approximately twenty thousand for Grand Falls District and something around eight thousand for Gander District. I don't know who added the population of the two districts, but the additions were quite wrong. The actual and proper additions would show that in Grand Falls District the population is twelve thousand five hundred and ninety nine and in Gander District, the new district of Gander which is proposed, fifteen thousand six hundred and thirty nine. If the House is interested I have here the figures for the settlements that comprise the proposed District of Gander. I can give the figures for the whole of the Grand Falls District, not the new one, but by taking out of it the places that are to be put into the new Gander District what is then left is of course Grand Falls District. I am glad to pass the information along.

Adjourned Debate on Second Reading:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of opening the debate from this side of the House has been entrusted to me. While in certain circumstances it should be regarded as an honour, I am at a loss now how to fulfil this duty. It has not been made easier by the unorthodox manner in which this bill had been handled up to the present time. We are

debating a bill which we know is going to be amended when it goes into committee. We have been told of certain amendments, and there may be other amendments, according to the statements made here by the Premier yesterday. We were told that amendments could be made in committee by the government, and that is what he is going to do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order — I rise, sir, to this point of order only because the honourable gentleman saw fit to do likewise earlier. The government does not propose to make any amendment. I did not say the government proposed to make any amendment.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I do not see how that is a point of order. We were told yesterday by the Minister for Provincial Affairs — whilst I have no official report of what was told I have the statement in the "Daily News" this morning.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, is that in order?

MR. SPEAKER: That would not be in order — it is a newspaper comment.

MR. BROWNE: That is not a comment. This is supposed to be a verbatim account. I don't know whether it was given by the Minister of Provincial Affairs for the "Daily News."

MR. SPEAKER: The House would have no cognizance of it, and it could not be regarded as an official account.

MR. BROWNE: At any rate we were told yesterday by the Honourable Minister for Provincial Affairs that the government intended to make changes in the bill as it stands at the present time when they go into committee.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order — Must we be misrepresented in this fashion by the honourable member. The government said no such thing. The honourable the Solicitor General said no such thing. It was only yesterday — I have a vivid recollection of what was said. What was said was that the government would move for the House's consideration certain amendments. It was never said that the government would make these amendments.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, when the government expresses a wish that is what is going to be done. I will conform to the Premier's interpretation of what was said here yesterday, and will say this, we now know the government intends to make certain suggestions when the bill gets into committee, which will make changes in the bill as it is before us at the present time, and we do not know to what extent the government will make suggestions when it goes into committee. That makes it very difficult for this side of the House to deal with a measure of this kind. I can say it is most unorthodox, and, in my experience, I have never known of any case of a bill being handled in that fashion. I hope therefore that the honourable members will appreciate how difficult it is to deal with a bill when we are told that the government are going to make suggestions for amendments when it goes into committee. We have nothing before us to indicate how these amendments are going to be carried out. The District of White Bay, for example, is to be divided into two districts, White Bay North and White Bay South. Now I think I heard the Minister of Provincial Affairs say that Partridge Point is going to be the dividing line. Who knows but when we get into

committee something else will be proposed?

Now we are supposed to debate the principle of a bill which is to provide for the representation of the people of this country in this House of Assembly. This is a difficult task to deal with at the present time, and I have very much misgiving about the responsibility which I have now. I would have liked to have seen the bill printed as the government wants to have it. But we cannot have that now. This is a Bill to Amend the House of Assembly Act in two respects. The Act itself is a long Act and deals with a number of different functions, but the bill before us only deals with two items, one is the question of how many members should constitute a quorum. At the present time there is some doubt as I believe the Act in the Revised Statutes calls for a quorum of ten members and the Rule Book says twelve. While I feel that the Act is paramount yet I feel there has been some doubt on the point. I presume that the increase in membership from thirty-three to thirty-six has not affected the quorum which the government inserted into the bill before us at the present time. Twelve members out of thirty-six, one-third, I think is a fair number. Some deliberative bodies like the House of Commons at Ottawa have a very much smaller percentage as a quorum twenty-five out of two hundred and seven and in Westminster it is forty out of six hundred. But this is not a very serious matter and I do not propose to say anything further about it. The other subject is a very much more important matter because of its effect. When this bill was introduced into the House I presume it was introduced because there was some problem to be solved. What is the prob-

lem? Has anyone complained about the representation that existed in the House of Assembly as it is at the present time? I have not heard of any complaint. The only complaint I have heard is that there were complaints made because the District of Harbour Grace was amalgamated with the District of Port de Grave, and these complaints were so powerful that on Monday they were able to get the Minister of Provincial Affairs to stand up here and say that since Port de Grave has been a district since 1855 the Government had reconsidered the position and is going to put it back into the bill again.

We have been given no reason why the bill was introduced last year. What was wrong with the representation last year? What is wrong with the representation at the present time? Acting upon the figures that were supplied here by the Premier I thought there were certain anomalies in Corner Brook, Grand Falls and St. John's where the population had increased considerably. At Grand Falls, the large district of Grand Falls, the population is supposed to have increased by over ten thousand, and at Corner Brook there is another increase of twelve thousand six hundred — no, excuse me, that is St. John's — at Corner Brook the increase is six thousand eight hundred. These were the only substantial increases in the districts as they stand at the present time, and one would think these would be the only things with which we would be concerned. What else? I don't know of any complaint. I don't know of anybody complaining about the House of Assembly. I feel however, Mr. Speaker, that people have lost interest in the House of Assembly, I feel today that the House of Assembly does not occupy the same place in

the lives of the people of this country as it did years ago. Now we are asked to increase the membership from twenty-eight to thirty-six. This is going to be an expensive proposition, certainly not an economy. Why is it necessary? Why is it being done? Honourable members will remember perhaps, or perhaps they will not notice it as much as I did, the manner in which this Bill was introduced. The Premier the other day wrote on a slip of paper and passed it to the Clerk saying tomorrow I will give notice I will introduce a Bill to bring about a redistribution of membership in the House of Assembly. When he introduced the Bill he gave us fifteen minutes or so of his valuable time and told us it was a bill to increase the membership to thirty-three. Then within a week he has to get his Minister of Provincial Affairs to get up and tells us it is to be increased to thirty-six. Does that show deliberation and preparation? The bill has been in the Government's files since last year. What have they been doing during the last twelve months? One would have thought (as the Premier said when speaking of the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition at another time) one would have thought the Premier, in this year in which we celebrate the centenary of responsible government, would have looked upon this as a glorious opportunity to give us a panegyric on the value of representative and responsible government in this country. Those of us who had the privilege and pleasure of hearing him express himself on the mutations of mink recently will wonder why mink are so important as to take up an hour and a half of the time of the House but that the membership of the House of Assembly could have been disposed

of in fifteen minutes. After all, which is the more important? Is it the question of membership of the House of Assembly or the deal which he had made in regard to the establishment of mink ranches in this country?

Which is the most important to the people of this country? The haste with which alteration was made yesterday indicated that even the Cabinet did not even have a meeting on the matter. Did the Cabinet meet to consider the question? If they did, when did they meet? I wonder if they all knew about the change which was being made to increase the number in that sudden manner. When the Premier was introducing this second reading his printer's proof of the bill had a few notes jotted down and today he tells us he has to make a correction. Some one, however, added up the figures and made a mistake and had given the revised district of Grand Falls twenty thousand and Gander only eight thousand, whereas it should have been almost the other way around with Gander having fifteen or sixteen thousand and the new district of Grand Falls with only twelve thousand. I seem to me, sir, this is not the way this important subject should be approached. This is a matter which should be referred to a select committee, and that committee should be provided with all the necessary information. This should almost be treated as if it were not a party matter at all. This is a matter for the welfare of the people, the welfare of the country. A select committee should sit around the table, especially those of the districts concerned, and examine the population figures and the voter's lists. That reminds me, sir, the government has prepared a new voters' list. They have been at it for the last six months

preparing a voters' list of the whole country and they have these latest figures as the number of voters in the different districts. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the House or a committee of the House should sit down with all these figures, most recent figures, in order to enable it to bring about a fair representation in the House of Assembly. I remember being on the committee in the House of Commons when the Redistribution Act came up in the House of Commons. It came up there every ten years, and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration provides all the members of the committee with a file of documents which would assist them to come to a correct conclusion as to the proper manner in which that redistribution should be brought about, giving the latest figures from the previous election, the census figures, and any other information that is necessary to come to a sensible conclusion. This bill should be approached in the same way.

In 1925 the Redistribution Bill was up here after forty years for the first time, the bill was referred to a committee. At that time the government had no hesitation at all and had the matter passed over to a committee. I do not know what happened in 1932 when under financial stringencies of the time the government was forced to reduce the number from forty to twenty-seven. I am not sure if it was referred to a select committee at the time. Then, too, the committee should have before it the plans and maps. Now these have been prepared all in advance, they are all settled, and I will wager now that except for the changes that the government wishes to make, there is very likely to be no change whatsoever. They are all drawn and sealed. The time table

must not be interfered with. The Premier got to be there at a certain date, and we have to get certain things done. I will wager that the lines that have been drawn are drawn for the next election and drawn with the next election in mind. It seems to me that that is not the way a bill dealing with the representation of members in the House of Assembly should be handled. We do not know who compiled the figures. I made a check on one figure. I do not know how many other members made a check on these figures supplied by the Premier and what they are supposed to be. Does anybody know what they are supposed to be? The figures given, were they the census of 1945?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The last Census.

MR. BROWNE: That is the Federal census of 1951. I don't know who compiled them from that, because from the examination I made I found it very difficult to get the census. They should be supplied to all members and the Committee of the House. I did check on one and found out it was from the census of 1951. But since 1951 the population of this country has increased, in fact it has increased almost as much since 1951 as it increased from 1921, and the reasons the changes are made are because of the increase in 1951 over 1945. The Newfoundland census taken in 1954—We have those figures. I have them here. Since then the population has increased by forty thousand between that and 1951, but since 1951 the population has increased thirty-seven thousand again, and that has not been taken into consideration at the present time. According to the estimate made by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics the population has increased from 1951 up to last year by thirty-

seven thousand, in three years. Therefore it is reasonable to assume it would not be far off fifty thousand in four years. If it is necessary to make a change because of the increase since 1945, I submit, also it is necessary to take into consideration any increase since 1951 of fifty thousand people. Where are those fifty thousand people? Perhaps an examination of these figures will show St. John's or Grand Falls or Humber much greater than we are told here today. The figures we are using now are out of date by fifty thousand and therefore are going to give us a wrong idea of the representation which we should have in the House.

Now I don't know how much attention the honourable members on the opposite side of the House have given to this matter, but it is a matter deserving a lot of consideration, a lot of attention, it is not a thing to be passed over in a few moments as a matter of routine. They have far-reaching effects upon our future. I hope, therefore, that honourable members will understand why I feel a great deal of time ought to be taken up with the discussion of this subject. We are dealing with the representation in this House of Assembly of the people of Newfoundland, nearly four hundred thousand people. What is the best way in which that four hundred thousand people should be split up into electoral districts so that they would be properly represented here? The duties and responsibilities of a member today are very different from what they were when I was first elected to this House back in 1924. I believe it is still usual for a member to visit his constituency and meet his constituents once a year, which in most cases is very simple. It is very seldom that a member lives in a dis-

trict. But there have been so many developments in the last thirty years that the position of a member of the House of Assembly today is not nearly as important in some respects as it used to be in so far as his constituents are concerned. The modern tendency is not to make an election depend on local issues but some bigger issue. All members here remember the election of 1951 when the Premier went to the country looking to the people for a mandate for new industries, guaranteed loans, etc. We have a fairly good idea that the Premier, sometime this summer, is going to the country with a "Mill on the Gander." Of course, it will be the second time that a premier went to the country promising a mill on the Gander. But it is on some big issue like that an election is supposed to turn and not that the honourable member for so-and-so will get the telephone extended, or get the lights extended, or get somebody into hospital, or a road built to somebody's back garden, or get the wells cleaned out, as they had to do so much of in the years gone by.

The classical example of a member's position after he was elected was given by the great Irish orator and member of the House of Commons, Edmund Burke. Edmund Burke was invited in 1747, at short notice, to stand as a member of Parliament in the city of Bristol. There was another candidate who was a native of Bristol, a person of very ingratiating manner — "Oh sure! Anything I can do to help you I will do. I will only be too glad to do it." Burke was a different temperament and character. However, both were elected. When they were elected the member who belonged to the place repeated his assurance to do everything he had promised to do — "Anything I can do to please

you." "Everything you want." But Burke said: "Certainly gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence and the most reserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions his high respect; their business unremitting attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions to theirs, and above all, ever and in all cases to prefer their interest to his own. But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience he ought not to sacrifice to you nor to any man nor to any city of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure nor from the law nor the country, they are a trust from Providence for the abuse he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you not his industry, only but his judgment, and he betrays instead of serves you if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order — I dislike having to make this point of order because I am interested in the quotation, the very famous quotation from the "Great Burke." If we are now debating the qualifications of members of the House of Assembly, the qualifications of persons who have ambitions to be representatives of the people, in short if we are now debating another bill altogether or a proposed amendment to another bill — it seems to me the honourable member's remarks would be strictly in order. It seems to me he is now addressing himself to another bill altogether, which is not presently before the House.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it is necessary for me to answer that point of order

raised by the Premier, but we are certainly dealing with the question of representation of members to this House of Assembly. The Premier stated yesterday that it was not a question of principle how many members we had. Well, if that was not a question of principle surely the question of representation at all is the principle and how the country should be divided, whether we should have an election for the whole country as a block or whether it should be divided up into districts. This bill deals with Section 4 which says, there shall be twenty-seven or twenty-eight districts, (I forget the exact number). Why should there be any districts? Should it not all be done as a whole? So Mr. Speaker, what I am saying I feel is quite appropriate, because it should concern every member of this House of Assembly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Concern, yes, but that is hardly the criterion.

MR. SPEAKER: I had some doubt myself whether the honourable member's remarks at the moment are quite pertinent. I did not want to interrupt the quotation of a very fine definition of honourable members duties.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Bill does not deal with that.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think the Bill really deals with the qualifications for members.

MR. BROWNE: But surely Mr. Speaker, it is a very fine distinction, and a very fine point for the Premier to raise, when we are discussing this question of representation in the House of Assembly, to say a classical statement such as that of Edmund Burke, English Parliamentarian, upon the duties and responsibilities of members is not pertinent to the sub-

ject. Does Your Honour rule that? Am I therefore precluded from using this quotation which has been called a classical quotation, and according to which every member ought to be elected to this House of Assembly or any other democratic parliament and should guide his conduct?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If we were debating the qualifications of members, yes, but we are not. It is distribution we are debating.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the selection which I proposed to read is rather lengthy. I trust that I have been forgiven for reading the last paragraph. When we elect members of the House of Assembly they become not a member for any particular district but members of the House of Assembly who have to deal with the affairs of Newfoundland as a whole, and who must consider their paramount duty the welfare of Newfoundland and their people rather than the welfare of their constituency alone. I stated a few moments ago that the ties that existed between a member and his constituents in 1924 were much closer than they are today. At that time the members knew nearly every family in their districts. There are still some members of this House who could probably say the same thing for one reason or another. But for those who have not had the pleasure and privilege of living there, or of being able to spend a long part of their time visiting their district, it is very unusual. The reason for the distinction between the relationship between a member and his constituents today and in former years is easy to discover. I think on reflection members will agree with me when I draw attention as I propose to do, to the development and expansion of various social agencies which were never

thought of years ago, unemployment insurance —

Now take a question like unemployment insurance. Would you think that has any effect on a member's duties? I think it has a tremendous effect on a member's duty because through the development of unemployment insurance and the establishment of the unemployment commission, an agency has been established which provides the citizens who are out of work with funds to carry on during that period, so that they do not need to go to their member at all but go to the office of the Unemployment Insurance Commission. If they are looking for a job they do not have to go to the member to the same extent as they used to do. The unemployment insurance also handles the employment in any great quantity over the country. That has relieved members of the House of Assembly from what used to be the principal part of their work. I think a lot of us here will agree that the unemployment insurance not only did a good thing, but probably a good thing better than it used to be done by the members. Those of us who remember the diversion of the railway around the Topsails, undertaken, I believe, in 1923, will remember the number of people who descended upon members, looking for jobs on that railway and how many of them were unsuitable for the work and had to be sent home.

MR. SPEAKER: I fail to see how the honourable member's remarks on unemployment or unemployment insurance is pertinent to the subject under debate.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I hoped that you would be able to see that.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot.

MR. BROWNE: It is this way Your Honour — I am trying to draw a distinction between the duties and obligations of members of the House of Assembly today and what they were thirty years ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to that point — I find in the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1912 Consolidations—the Revised Interpretations Act, then the House of Assembly Act. That is the one we are now proposing to amend. Then there is the Elections Act which has all to do with qualifications of electors, the qualifications of members of the House of Assembly, the qualifications and duties of members of the House of Assembly. They are set forth here in the Election Act, which is not now under debate. The one now under debate happens to be the House of Assembly Act. Now Mr. Speaker, how widely can a member speak on a proposal to amend the House of Assembly Act? How widely can he discuss the political issues, third paper mills and the like; and the functions of a member, when the functions of a member are set forth in another Bill which is not being amended?

MR. BROWNE: Am I discussing the proposal of a third paper mill because I made a reference. That is not discussion, only making a reference. A discussion is a different thing altogether. My ambition this afternoon, Your Honour, is to try and show the members of this House that the duties and obligations of a member of the House of Assembly today are insignificant in comparison with what he had to do years ago, and therefore there is no need for the enlargement of the House of Assembly, which the Govern-

ment proposes. There is no need to increase the number of members from twenty-eight to thirty-three. After all that is the purpose of the Bill, to increase the number of members. If I can show it is not necessary to increase them surely I am in order when doing that. How can I show that except by showing that a large part of the duties that devolved upon members of the House of Assembly years ago have been taken away from their shoulders.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not apparent, however, how the honourable member was going to link that. He had given a rather interesting dissertation on the duties of members.

MR. BROWNE: But, Your Honour I was a member here in 1934 and I know what a member had to do then and I have a little idea of how much less in comparison he has to do today, that is as far as his duties outside the House are concerned. His duties in the House remain of the same nature. But I will show that even his duties in the House are less today than they were. Unless there is some compensating factor introduced by the Government to reduce salaries there is no justification in increasing the number from twenty-eight to thirty-six in fact no justification for increasing the number at all. I could mention the factors and show that they have lessened the duties and responsibilities of members of the House of Assembly; old age pensions—all done automatically now, the members having nothing to do with it. Years ago one had to get on a list to get an old age pension and the person making an application had to go to his member and very often it was a favour when he got it. Now I mention in passing other social benefits; family allowances; mothers' allowances, de-

pendent's allowances, which have improved, and which have been an improvement, indirectly, as a result of Confederation which improved the economic standard of the people so that they have been set up, like the Public Utilities Board, the Workmen's Compensation Board, even the cottage hospitals and nursing stations and district welfare and non-Government social agencies like the Child Welfare, all these social changes which have taken place in the last thirty years have affected the quality and quantity of the obligations of the members of the House of Assembly.

Then again, Your Honour is familiar with the great increase in the number of civil servants. The number of civil servants today is far greater, I would say it must be three or four times as great as—even in the Provincial Administration, the number of civil servants has increased tremendously in the past thirty years. Now I feel that these are important considerations. Perhaps honourable members who did not reflect on the subject would not think about that. If they would stop and think, and pause and consider, they will see that years ago we had a lot more to contend with than we have today.

Now there is another consideration which I think every one will admit—The Federal Government since Confederation has taken over the big departments, Customs, Marine Works, light houses, the Post Office and Telegraph Service, which are now being handled by the central Government, and the railway which was a big undertaking and gave a lot of responsibility to the members of this House. The work of the Minister of Finance is less onerous. Then there are certain departments in which the duties are divided. Fisheries, Public Health

and Welfare, and Assistance for Education and Research. Another very important factor is the development of local self-government. I do not know how many municipal councils we have at the present time, but it must be perfectly obvious to everyone, and I am sure to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, that people today are paying more attention to their affairs than they used to do years ago. The Minister of Provincial Affairs nods his head and agrees with me. Well, if the people are taking more interest in their own affairs in dozens of communities throughout the country then there is less for the member of the House of Assembly to do. The increase in local responsibility is a desirable thing, and it has come about with increasing acceleration during the past few years. My honourable friend from St. John's East who sits here on my left is much more respected in the community today as Deputy Mayor than he is as a member of the House of Assembly for St. John's East. As a member for the House of Assembly for St. John's East he rates no higher than the member for St. John's West, but as Deputy Mayor he deputizes for the mayor at important functions and is invited to nearly all the hockey and baseball dinners which take place in St. John's.

I remember an incident which took place in this House over 25 years ago. I think it will illustrate what I have in mind very effectively: A very distinguished member of this House rose in his place and criticized the Government because they had refused to accede to a request from him, which he had put forward on behalf of his constituents, to remove a rock which had rolled down over the mountain and blocked a public well. He said: "Mr. Speaker, for three days the pro-

ple of that community went without water because the Government would not spend a miserable ten dollar bill to take that rock out of the well! Now I know that sounds ridiculous today. That could not possibly arise as the question of local responsibility has grown so much. Nobody would think of calling on the House of Assembly to take a rock out of a well today. They would take the rock out of the well themselves and would not have gone an hour waiting until the House of Assembly or the Minister of Public Works decided that ten dollars should be allocated to remove the rock from the well. If honourable members think that is fantastic, let me tell them it was quite commonplace for votes to be allocated for the cleaning of public wells in different settlements all over this country. How many times have honourable members been approached in the old days about a request that a little grant be given to build a road to a potato garden. Many, many and many a road was built with public funds in that fashion and many and many a well cleaned out by the allocation of funds. The difference therefore in that respect has certainly lessened the responsibility of a member. Today a great many of the people are privileged to have electric pumps and reservoirs beside their homes, and that is something which should be encouraged and increased. We are living in a different world today from 1885 and even from 1885 when the membership of the House was raised to thirty-six members. There was no cross-country railway then, there were no great steamship services going around the country, no air plane services, no helicopter service, the number of roads were very much less than we have today; there was no telephones, no radio communications, look at the districts today, look at the

services that have been given by my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition in connection with Gerald Doyle's News, that everyone in the outports listens for every night and gets the latest news about everyone sick in the hospitals. That is a service performed gratuitously by a great company doing business in this country. These things formerly devolved upon the member who had to visit his constituents in the hospitals.

MR. HOLLETT: If my honourable friend would allow me — I think he is under a little misapprehension about the Gerald Doyle News. I would like to correct him about that. I have nothing to do with the news.

MR. BROWNE: I am sorry! It is something I would like to take credit for if I were responsible for it. It is a wonderful service performed today to enlighten people by radio as to what is going on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So we do not need so many members since we have the Doyle's News?

MR. BROWNE: Now the Premier, usually so generous towards members on this side of the House, is not being true to form when he makes that cynical remark.

I remember the Public Welfare Office and the Public Health Office. I remember the officials of the Public Health Office, there was Mr. Reddy who was the Secretary of the Board of Health, and Mr. White-way, a one-armed gentleman, his brother was a member of the House of Assembly for years representing Bay de Verde district, this gentleman used to meet patients at the railway station in a cab and take them to various institutions to which they had been assigned. There was a Miss

Tobin — And I remember at one time going to see Mr. Reddy, the Secretary of the Board of Public Health and he went through one pocket after another looking for a letter. All his pockets were stuffed with letters, and he had to empty them to take it out. What do we find today in contrast; magnificent streamlined files and the Department of Health separated from the Department of Welfare, with dozens of clerks, and clinics and hospitals, the General Hospital and Mental Hospital and Sanatorium all with large staffs doing clerical work and secretarial work which in the old days was performed by two or three officials. Even in England, the foundation and origin of Responsible Government, changes have been made since 1885, and it has been recognized that the purpose of a Re-distribution Bill is only for the convenience of dividing up the country into districts for the best manner of holding elections because the duties of a representative have been lessened to such a great extent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this does not say that there are not duties that should be performed by the House of Assembly. I would like to see the House of Assembly come back to its rightful position in the affairs of the country. This is the forum in which public questions should be discussed and honourable members on both sides of the House should get up in their places and give their opinions, their own conscientious opinions, on every matter that is discussed here. This session we have not had very many important matters, but we have had some, and how many members availed of the opportunity to get up in their places and give their honest opinions, their convictions on the subject? What are we here for if they don't do that?

Are they here to bring in petitions only?

MR. COURAGE: Oh no! but they are here to bring in petitions.

MR. BROWNE: They are here to deliberate on this country, to make the laws of the country. That is their duty, to make the laws of this country. Unless they give their opinions on these questions how can the laws be properly formulated? I would like to see the galleries filled with people every day, coming here to hear great orators we have here in the House of Assembly — I am looking at one now. The Honourable the Premier ranks second to none as a very convincing speaker. To sit and listen to him as he expounds his various theories —

MR. SMALLWOOD: On mink?

MR. BROWNE: On mink and on the fisheries. Why last year he spent five days, five afternoons one after the other, five afternoons, talking on one subject alone — What an example to his colleagues on the other side of the House. Would it not be a wonderful House if all his colleagues got up and spoke even for five minutes. Not everyone could get up here and speak for five days, in fact I think it must be a record. I feel that the Honourable the Premier has earned the title of record holder of the marathon speaker of the House of Assembly. He spoke on a subject that is one of the most important that could be discussed. I would like to see the debates in this House conducted on the highest level, that every subject should be properly considered, fully discussed. Then I think he himself would enjoy debates more than he would listening to himself for five days.

I remember one day in Ottawa two

educated people asked me if the House was in session. They did not even know if the House of Commons was in session although they were living in Ottawa. How many people in St. John's know whether the House is in session or not? How many people here show much interest in it? How many people today come down here to listen to debates?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are too prosperous, too busy.

MR. BROWNE: That may be the answer. The Premier may be right. They are probably too prosperous and are not concerned with the affairs of this country. But I would like to see them more concerned with the affairs of this country than they have shown in the past. I think it is a great pity, a tragedy for this country if the people of this country do not take more interest in the affairs of the Government and the affairs of the House of Assembly, then our work could be important, could be much more important than it has been in the past.

We are concerned here with the question of the general good. Has no member of the House of Assembly any proposal of his own to bring forward? The Government brings in its little scheme of legislation, this year all the different Bills, a few lines in this one, a couple of sections in this one and a couple of sections in that one. But there must be other things crying out for members to bring in, to remedy — these are not the things that we are discussing however — The important thing to remember in connection with this Bill is, is it going to be for the general good, is it going to be for the general welfare of the people of this country that the number of representatives should be increased from twenty-eight to thirty-eight to thirty-

six? Is that a good thing or is it a bad thing? I know you could argue it is a good thing we should have thirty-six or even to go back to forty or to fifty-two as they have in New Brunswick. We could increase it much more. But is it going to be a good thing? Judging by what has happened here in the last two sessions that I have been here, it certainly does not seem to me to be necessary. Now what is it going to do? I hope I have this right — Humber is going to be made into two districts. We are going to have two districts now. The district of Humber is going to be divided by a line which runs straight through the town of Corner Brook, right down the river; and the people on one side of the river will have one member and the people on the other side of Corner Brook will have another member. Now on what principle the line is drawn through the river at Corner Brook I do know. We heard something about "homogeneity" the other day, but it does not look like that — I will come back to that in a few moments. Grand Falls is to have two districts, the District of Grand Falls and the District of Gander, but the only reason it can be called Gander is because a circle has been made outside the present district of Grand Falls, or rather a semi-circle which takes in the airport of Gander, takes it out of Bonavista North and puts it in the new district which is now Gander, where the eastern part of Grand Falls is at the present time.

Labrador is going to be divided into two districts, Labrador North and Labrador South. I have that division here. That is very instructive. We were told that the District of Labrador was too much for one man, 110,000 square miles after all it could not be expected that one man could cover one hun-

dred and ten thousand square miles, so the district has been made into two. Now the district of Labrador South has a lesser area by, I would say, roughly about one-sixth, and its population is less. The big population is centered around the airport of Goose and around the mines at Knob Lake. I think it will be quite obvious to anyone the principles that were announced here recently have been followed.

Then, St. John's, the biggest district in the country, in Newfoundland, with nearly ninety thousand people. I would say between the Goulds, Big Pond and Pouch Cove, Capt St. Francis there are 90,000 people, which have to be divided up into five districts. It presently has four. It is to be enlarged to take in some of the territory of my honourable friend the member for Ferryland, who has such an enormous district of five thousand people that he had to have some put into St. John's.

MR. MURRAY: It is a good long stretch.

MR. BROWNE: Long stretch — My honourable friend, the Minister for Provincial Affairs, has been in every house in the district, I am quite sure, during the year preceding the by-election, when he had the privilege of visiting each house and an excellent opportunity of getting to know everybody. I hope they always admire him as much as today.

MR. HIGGINS: That is a pious thought.

MR. BROWNE: Placentia East has been divided into two districts. Why? It has only nine or ten thousand people. Placentia East, I think, according to the figures submitted here by the honourable the Premier the other

day has eleven thousand three hundred and twenty-three. It has been divided into two districts, 5,411 and 5,912.

White Bay is divided into two districts. I don't know the relative populations there, but since the whole population given is at thirteen thousand, I presume some effort was made to split it into about six thousand five hundred in each.

Harbour Main which has been associated with Bell Island since 1932 is now, according to the Bill, separated from Bell Island, but Harbour Main is to have two members although it has a lesser population than Bell Island. I wonder what principle was adopted in connection with giving two seats to the district of Harbour Main.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does not the honourable gentleman know?

MR. BROWNE: Yes I know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not be fair?

MR. BROWNE: I will be fair, perfectly fair, but the Government has not been fair in giving two men to the district of nine thousand people and where we have seventeen thousand in St. John's has only given one to nearly twice the number of people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman knows that Harbour Main district is the only one there is, and the only one there can be.

MR. BROWNE: The honourable the Premier says it is the only district that can be — Can be what? I don't know what the honourable gentleman is referring to now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There was no other way.

MR. BROWNE: There was, but the results that the Premier desired —

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is not.

MR. BROWNE: Oh yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tell us what there is.

MR. BROWNE: I have not gotten to that yet. Sometime tonight I will get to that. Oh yes, I can do it and do it easily.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, you cannot do it.

MR. BROWNE: The first redistribution in forty years took place in 1925. Now I have here the debates of 1925. The Bill was introduced by the Prime Minister of the day, Mr. Monroe. During his speech he laid down certain fundamental considerations which he thought desirable to bear in mind in connection with any plan for redistribution, and if they were applicable then —

MR. SPEAKER: Before the honourable member carries on with that I want to be clear in one thing — As I see it the honourable member made reference to tonight. I am wondering what he has in mind.

MR. BROWNE: Your Honour, I understand the person speaking next after an honourable member of the Government, in second reading, has the privilege of speaking without limit.

MR. SPEAKER: Quite so, but another honourable gentleman spoke immediately afterwards.

MR. BROWNE: I see — that was the purpose — the Government has now blocked criticism of their Bill. Was that their intention?

MR. MURRAY: You should study the rules.

MR. BROWNE: I did study them, but I did not expect anything of this kind. I submit the Honourable Minister for Provincial Affairs is a member of the Government and was continuing the remarks made by the Premier, for the purpose of explaining certain points, and was not carrying on the debate. He was giving an explanation of what the Premier said could be given in Committee. Mr. Speaker, if I have to spend the rest of my time arguing that principle I am doing it. I wish to know now from Your Honour if I am to be permitted to speak further than 90 minutes, usually allotted to members on this side?

MR. SPEAKER: That is why I mentioned it. I did not want the honourable member to reach a point where he could not conclude his speech. I had that in mind.

MR. BROWNE: Has Your Honour decided I can only speak for ninety minutes?

MR. SPEAKER: I have not decided — I am just reminding the honourable member — according to the rules.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to devote a little time to that question: Here we are debating a second reading. The Premier spoke and then the Minister of Provincial Affairs gets up to give an explanation of what the Government intends to do. Surely he is not debating the measure. I take it that the person speaking from the Opposition in reply to the Government is the first speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I quite agree with the honourable member — That is why I mentioned it. If the House will leave it to the Chair to rule, or may I have an expression from the House?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask if there is a point of order being discussed.

MR. SPEAKER: Raised by the Chair itself.

MR. HOLLETT: On that point, Mr. Speaker, may I speak?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member may make a comment, yes.

MR. HOLLETT: The comment I wish to make is this: The Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs spoke yesterday to make certain changes in the Bill. It was maintained by the Honourable Minister and the Honourable the Premier that he was not speaking to the principle of the Bill. If not, I maintain he was not speaking on second reading, therefore the Chair could not rule my honourable friend out of order in speaking as long as he pleases. I would make that point, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if Your Honour needs any comment from me, but, I spoke and I introduced the Bill and I was followed by the Honourable the Minister for Provincial Affairs who spoke for some ten or fifteen or twenty minutes generally in support of the Bill, but not introducing it. I introduced it. I was followed by him. I don't think there is any doubt of that. I don't think there is any argument, nor that there is anything to show that the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs did not speak — he did.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, nobody said the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs did not speak. I maintain the Honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs was not speaking to the principle of the Bill, and

It was so said by the Honourable the Premier. I maintain, therefore, he was not speaking on second reading.

MR. MURRAY: That is exactly what I was speaking to —

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion — I do not feel happy about this — I personally should have seen it. I don't think the honourable member should be limited in his time because of what happened yesterday. The House may appeal — it has that right.

MR. BROWNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was going to read the position laid down by Mr. Monroe, Prime Minister of the day in 1925, but I am afraid that during this discussion I lost the page, so I don't think I will take long enough to find it.

That Bill was probably the most important of that session because it increased the membership of the House then in 1925 from thirty-six to forty. In my opinion it was a very unwise procedure. I spoke on the Bill at that time, and my speech is here in the Hansard, in which I opposed the idea of increasing the number of members. I remember being followed by Mr. Ashbourne who said the same thing and went much further than I did. I thought that twenty members at that time could have administered the affairs of the country as well as forty. He went much further again and said that in his opinion the country should revert to a Crown Colony. It was prophetic, sort of, because before many years had passed we were back in that position. That is one of the reasons I advance to this Government to show the desirability of giving this matter more serious consideration. The time to economize is not when hard up, but when making money, when you can save money. Anyway, Mr. Monroe said: "In any

plan for redistribution it is desirable to bear in mind certain almost fundamental considerations, as for instance:

- "(a) the religious denominations to which the people of the various sections belong;
- (b) the great extent of certain existing districts and the need of divisions;
- (c) the trade and social intercourse between localities, so as not to needly disturb them;
- (d) the occupations of the people, and the importance of securing representation of various industries; and finally
- (e) the history of existing constituencies, so as to preserve their historical continuity as far as convenience will permit."

Then he went on to give some of the dates when the various districts were created. The District of St. George's and St. Barbe's being on the French Shore were not created until 1878.

MR. MURRAY: 1882, I think.

MR. BROWNE: That is the figure given here. No change has been made in representation between 1885 and 1925. Before 1925 the districts were as follows: 36 members: Bay de Verde with a population of some 10,213 had two members; Bonavista with 22,874 had three members; Burgeo and LaPoile had one member for 7,793; Burin had two members for 11,616; Carbonear one member for 5,114; Ferryland had two members for 5,793; Fogo one member for 8,257; Fortune Bay one member for 9,989; Harbour Grace three members for 11,925; Harbour Main two members for 9,471; These figures were for 1911, and Harbour Main has only four hundred

more today, according to figures tabled here by the Premier, yet it is to get two members, although the population of St. John's is over double what it was in 1911, and it had six members then. Placentia and St. Mary's had over 16,099 with three members; Port de Grave 6,986; St. Barbe was included with White Bay and had one member for 10,400; St. George's 11,861; St. John's West 20,550; St. John's East 25,135, each place returned three members; Trinity had three members with 21,788 and Twillingate had one member with 22,705 — 36 members and a population of over 242,000. Now the population is nearly 400,000 and on the surface it seems not an unreasonable thing to have the membership back at thirty-six.

As I said a moment ago, in 1925 I considered it unwise to increase the membership to forty. Why? Because in the first place you have more members and therefore you have more expenses. It is going to cost more to have the House of Assembly with eight members more, getting salaries and all the incidental things, the different districts holding elections etc. One wonders looking back if the increase of membership from thirty-six to forty had some effect on bringing us down. I know we were probably too far advanced on the road to insolvency at the time for the change to effect us very much, nevertheless it was one of the straws that broke the camel's back. Many years ago the late, Honourable E. M. Jackman, who was Minister of Finance of this country for eight years, said: "Newfoundland has the trappings of an elephant on the back of a cat." That is an old saying and it was very descriptive and not appreciated. We did not appreciate how our expenditure was rising as we tried

to keep up with the Jones's. We were a Dominion in 1931, the year that we failed to get a loan, when the Minister of Finance went out in the market and looked for a loan for eight million dollars and did not get a single bid. That is the year we petitioned the King to grant us Dominion Status and within the year asked that it be suspended because I don't suppose we could quite keep up with the position of a Dominion. (It has been drawn to my attention that there is no quorum in the House, Mr. Speaker).

I was asking how far the increased number of members contributed to our final collapse. To go a little further we should go back the road from 1934 when the Commission of Government was appointed, and see where we went wrong. How much influence did honourable members of the Government bring to bear upon the Government from time to time to build branch railways and do other things that helped to bring about the final collapse? It has been stated that branch railways were built in certain areas in order to please certain members. The country was involved in millions of dollars of expenditure to please certain members. So you will see the question of getting more members is not a simple thing. The lesson of these days should be well known to this extent: the way of economy must always be taken, and we are never justified in spending money without good reason to do so. I remember in 1931—it was very late then—learning that it was very unlikely that the Government would get any bids for their loans. A couple of months before I remember speaking at Rotary Club and appealing to the Government of the day, a very vain, and useless thing to do, asking them to become friends of economy. I do the same thing today, and I

imagine it is going to be just as useless. I ask the Government to be friends of economy, to save money where they can. Here is an opportunity for them to save in this matter, and not wait until the country gets into financial difficulties. At the rate we are going, it won't be long before we are in financial difficulty. I remember reading a speech, I believe it was a speech given by the Premier in this House of Assembly in 1952 in which he stated:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, is it in order for the honourable gentleman to discuss the financial conditions of the Province — when we are on debate on the Address in Reply or on the Budget that may be done, but may a member range all over the financial situation or quote statements on that?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the point of order raised and put forward so eloquently by the Premier. Sir, the Premier raised the point of order that I am ranging all over the place and should have spoken in the Address in Reply in regard to these matters.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say that. His Honour knows —

MR. BROWNE: As I understood, the Premier objected to my making any reference to a speech by the Premier in which he said —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am being misrepresented.

MR. BROWNE: If he is, I would not wish to offend the Premier for anything, nor would I wish to misrepresent him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member speaking might confine his remarks more closely to the principle of the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: The principle is that we are going to increase the membership of the House, and I say that is an expense which is not justified, and later on I wish to propose a motion that we have this section read to the effect that we should not have an increase. How justify proposing that motion except by stating some principle which I deem should be followed in contradiction to the principle of the Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on that, do I understand it is proper in this debate, provided a member argues it will add an expense to the Treasury to increase the representation of the House of Assembly and that because therefore he proposes to show it will, and explains, he is therefore entitled to enter into the field of public finance, anticipating the budget and repeating what would have been proper to say in the debate on the Address in Reply — just ranging widely over the whole field of public finance and the economics of Newfoundland. Is a member in order to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I answered the point of order by asking the honourable member if he would speak a little more closely to the matter under debate. It is often difficult to settle a point of order as to what is relevant or not, it is a matter of degree. Certainly the honourable member knows he cannot anticipate the budget speech in a debate such as this.

MR. BROWNE: Your Honour, I am not anticipating the budget speech. I expect to have other remarks to make which I reserve for that happy occasion. But I want now to point

out, the object of this Bill will have the effect of increasing cost and the Government is not justified in doing it, and I propose to introduce an amendment to the effect of reducing the members, if necessary, rather than increasing — That is what I am proposing to do in speaking to the second reading — I know the Premier would like me to make a reference to a speech he made in 1952.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have no objection to any honourable member referring to my speeches here. They are always pretty good and can bear repetition. The point is the honourable gentleman is arguing pretty clearly now that it will add cost to the treasury to increase the representation, and therefore he is entitled to prove that Newfoundland can't afford it, being entitled to prove that Newfoundland can't afford it, he can go into the whole field of public finance on this amendment to a Bill. The fact that the membership of this House will increase the cost to the Treasury is the magic key which opens the door for him to enter the big broad field of public finance. Now, Mr. Speaker, is it not perfectly obvious that he is entirely out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: As I said just now, it is entirely a matter of degree. The honourable member is entitled to make some remark, he is entitled to make a broad statement that the country cannot afford it, but he is not entitled certainly to go into the public finances so deeply on a debate such as this. I have already given the ruling. I cannot anticipate what the honourable member is about to say —

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I trust you will not agree with the accusation just levelled at me, that I propose to range over the field of finance.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot agree with any accusations. I can only trust the honourable member is not going to do that.

MR. BROWNE: No, I had only two or three words to say in regard to this subject. I just want to remind the Premier what he said in this magnificent speech in which he said: "We don't intend to borrow any money." Remember that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is the honourable gentleman being honest to this House and honest to you? Is that an honest reply to my point of order? Is it in order in this particular debate on this particular subject, as it will be on the debate in the budget and would have been in the debate on the Address in Reply. Is it now in order to raise the question of borrowing?

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think it is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Must I now, from this moment on, rise every time that the honourable gentleman is out of order and say the honourable member is out of order? Is that my duty and mine alone?

MR. BROWNE: The honourable the Premier has so many other honourable members sitting behind him any of these can rise to a point of order. They are well versed in parliamentary procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think this belongs to the debate or to the point of order.

MR. BROWNE: Well, the question was put by the honourable the Premier, I don't know whether it was put to you or me.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the honourable member speaking to con-

clude the debate, and to confine his remarks to the Bill which is now before the House. I don't think the honourable member should go into the question of public finance or talk about borrowing or such matters, I think that is likely to anticipate a debate in which the honourable member will have opportunity of sharing.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I was really trying to emphasize the desirability of the Government being economical. That is all that I was trying to do. I just wanted to mention a few facts to show how important that is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on that point, may I inquire of Your Honour if the honourable gentleman is entitled just to raise the general question of the Government's economy beyond making a sentence or two of it. Has he a right to go into a long dissertation on the necessity for economy on the debate in second reading of this Bill? Let us not forget the Bill we are debating.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already given my ruling on that exact point and asked the honourable member not to debate the state of the country at this time. I think he may say that the country cannot afford it. Apart from making some general observations I don't think the honourable gentleman is entitled at this time to go into the public finances. I have already given a ruling on that point.

MR. BROWNE: Your Honour I am not going over the whole field of public finance. However, I will consider now the five principles laid down by Mr. Monroe, the first principle is the religious denominations to which the people of the precincts belong. In 1885 there were fifteen

Catholics in a House of thirty-six, and five of these were in St. John's where there were six members.

MR. MURRAY: That is not right, Sir, there were thirteen members.

MR. BROWNE: Sometimes fifteen and after that sixteen because sometimes there were six Catholics for St. John's. But at that time, in 1885 there were five. Now that was not because the population was five to one but to compensate for minorities, because if you go through the various districts you find pockets of minorities. Fogo and Fortune Bay. In fact Fortune Bay was one of the places where Bishop Howley was parish priest for a number of years first when he came back to the country. As you go around the country you find, such as in White Bay for instance, in the northern sections and other places throughout the country where they do not constitute a majority but do constitute a very strong section of the population. For instance Grand Falls has five or six thousand right in the town of Grand Falls alone, yet they are a minority in comparison to others. So to compensate, Catholics over the country are given a large proportion of the number of members in St. John's than they would be entitled to judging by the population alone. Now we are to have three out of five, but it was five to one in 1855.

MR. SMALLWOOD: St. John's is a Protestant City. It has a majority of Protestants.

DR. ROWE: And it was not in 1855.

MR. BROWNE: I don't dispute that. I also draw to your attention that the division in Harbour Main is not very different from what it is in

St. John's. Harbour Main is to have two Catholic representatives, and the number of Catholics in Harbour Main are 5,404, Church of England 3,600 and other denominations amount to about eight hundred odd, so that the Catholic population is 5,400 and others are 4,500, and they now have two Catholic members. Here in St. John's, even if the majority of the people are Protestant, I feel sure there must be close to forty-five thousand Catholics — There is not a very great distinction when taking in the outlying places. That is another reason why the matter should be referred to a Select Committee, because we have not the figures available to add up all the different settlements in the different districts which have been made.

MR. MURRAY: The figures are available.

MR. BROWNE: They are available to us?

MR. MURRAY: To the public.

MR. BROWNE: But it is not much good their being available to the public if not to us.

MR. MURRAY: Why not get them.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, speaking on that point, let me draw the attention of the Minister of Provincial Affairs to the fact we are here every night until 11:00 o'clock and it is not much use having figures stored in the libraries or archives of the country if we have not the time to examine them. We should have the figures prepared.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did I not do exactly that. The honourable gentleman referred to documents I sent over, I gave all the figures there are. The Opposition now have these very fig-

nres even to the exclusion of my having them myself. Now can I do more than that? The honourable gentleman has the figures and is complaining that we did not give them to him when in fact I did give them. They are there.

MR. BROWNE: My statement has made the honourable the Premier a little indignant. What I refer to is that we should have the figures for all settlements in the different sections into which St. John's is now being divided.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nobody in the world has that.

MR. BROWNE: Oh yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No they do not exist.

MR. BROWNE: They existed in 1945. We are still using the figures of 1945. They would be very helpful.

MR. CURTIS: They would not be very accurate now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They would be misleading.

MR. BROWNE: Does the Premier mean the census of 1945, there was no special record kept of religious denominations.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For the city of St. John's that is right. They were taken but not compiled. The figures do not exist. They do not exist as a combination. They cannot be gotten. We attempted to get them.

MR. BROWNE: I think you have the figures for places outside St. John's. Certainly the 1945 census is available for St. John's and the larger sections. That would have to be examined. The Honourable the Premier, I understand — has he given the

religious figures for each settlement in the districts, for instance, take the district of St. John's South?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If my honourable friend wants those I will see they are passed to him before the day is over. I will give him my own set right now. This is my folder here. Here are the whole lot, except the city of St. John's within the boundaries of the municipality. Nobody in the world has these.

MR. BROWNE: Shall I read these out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, read them out. That will take another couple of hours.

MR. BROWNE: That is exactly what I was talking about in the beginning how much time would have been saved this House of Assembly if these had been put before a joint committee of members of both sides of the House. They could have sat down in a sort of friendly discussion and examined them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, very friendly.

MR. BROWNE: Yes. I am sure the Premier would be delighted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A love feast.

MR. BROWNE: I am sure he would be delighted to sit down — However, he has passed them over to me now to examine.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are public and not secret figures. The Government has compiled them as booklets and has sent them around to all M.H.A.'s.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, my name must be off the mailing list. I am sure the Premier realizes how dif-

difficult it is for us to discuss this subject without having the proper figures, etc. Bell Island was included in the district of St. John's East from 1855 to 1928, when it became a separate district. But in 1932 it was joined to Harbour Main, and I had the honour then of being one of the members for the district of Harbour Main. Mr. Charles Furey of Harbour Main and I were the members for Harbour Main-Bell Island. In 1926 St. John's East became a district with four members, i.e. that is one was given to Bell Island, and St. John's became two districts, or it would be better to say it had two members for the city and one for the extern, St. John's East.

St. John's East extern consisted in that area between Quidi Vidi and Bauline in the east end of St. John's where there were also two members — So St. John's then in 1932, under the stringency which then prevailed, was given six members.

MR. MURRAY: Six out of forty.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, the honourable member is right. In the 1928 election St. John's was given six and Bell Island was added to Harbour Main and had two. The district of St. John's West extern took in the southside of the Harbour of St. John's and went around and included St. Phillips and Portugal Cove. In 1932 St. John's West had two members, St. John's East had two. That was only for the city, and Bell Island was put back with Harbour Main again. Now in 1925 the population of St. John's with Bell Island was forty five thousand, without Bell Island the five districts now have ninety thousand, and have only five members. In 1925, according to the figures that were compiled then, and I remember the Colonial Secretary supplied us with a little

white book giving us the denominations for each settlement throughout the country. As far as St. John's was concerned it had a little less than fifty per cent Catholics at that time. I think they were just about half and half in St. John's East.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman, when he uses the word "Catholic" undoubtedly means "Roman Catholic."

MR. BROWNE: I am sure the honourable gentleman knows we generally refer to ourselves as "Catholics."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Other people do too.

MR. BROWNE: I am glad to know it. The wider the group the better. The second principle, "The great extent of certain existing districts and the need of divisions." Well that is a principle which was more obvious then, than it is today, because then we had these three-men districts in the outports, such as Twillingate, Bonavista, Trinity, Harbour Grace, which of course returned three men but not a very great district. Its population had been declining for many years, but in Bonavista, Twillingate and Placentia Bay, these were very extensive districts. I had the privilege of standing as a candidate in the district of Placentia-St. Mary's in 1928. It was a very bad spring, and the election was on the third of May, and it was very hard getting around that year, the ice was in, and it was impossible to visit all places. So Placentia and St. Mary's was divided into Placentia East and Placentia West — St. John's was divided too, as I pointed out, but there was no handicap in a district like St. John's East or West, but districts like

St. Barbe were very difficult to get around, because you had that long peninsula, and to get from Bonne Bay around there right down to the Straits and around into White Bay was impossible. I don't believe that in any election it was possible for a member to do it.

The districts of the South Coast are not up. Their populations have not increased in proportion to some other districts. Now a good deal is to be said for having small districts. I drew attention a few moments ago to the map in regard to Labrador. But I cannot agree that a district like Labrador, with a hundred and ten thousand square miles and with a small population, which has been given here as somewhere around eight thousand, should have two members. Because two members will make as much impression on Labrador as one. It is impossible for two or twenty-two to give personal attention to all settlements of Labrador. It is too vast a territory, a sub-continent we are told, with eight thousand people.

DR. ROWE: Why have one at all?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, I think it should have one. But if we are to have members in accordance with the territory, why, there ought to be three times as many members in Labrador as in Newfoundland. That is not the principle that should be the guiding factor in regard to our distribution. Then there is the third principle: Now I want to make a reference to the present Bill in relation to Grand Falls. Now Grand Falls, an extensive territory is divided into two. I do not think it is on account of the territory there, it is on account of the population. The population has grown to twenty-eight thousand in Grand Falls now I believe. That cer-

tainly entitled Grand Falls to two members. Humber has also increased considerably, and seems to be entitled to two members as well. But the point about Labrador to be remembered is that it is not divided either according to the population nor the territory. The southern section of Labrador has less territory by far and less population, I would also say, by far than the northern section. Therefore no principle at all seems to be involved in the division of Labrador into two districts.

The third principle enunciated by Mr. Monroe was: "The trade and social intercourse between localities, so as not to unduly disturb them." One would think, if that were being followed today, it would be very desirable to have Grand Falls and Bishop's Falls and Botwood in the same district. But they are separated by a line drawn north and south, east of Windsor, a short distance from Windsor, so that Botwood is put in with the Gander district. Now what relationship is there between the airport of Gander and Botwood? Is there constant social intercourse and trade between Botwood and Grand Falls? Yes. And I referred earlier in my remarks to the division between east and west of the Humber formed by a line coming down through Corner Brook River. Surely all the people at Corner Brook whether Corner Brook West or East all have trade and social intercourse, and it is desirable they should all be part of the one district.

MR. GURTIS: And I suppose St. John's should not be divided at all.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, I would suggest that it would be on a constituency. I was going to make a reference to that — I am glad the honourable the Attorney General reminded me.

MR. COURAGE: Nobody agreed with it for the last fifty years.

MR. BROWNE: I don't know what everybody thought during the last fifty years, but that does not prevent us giving consideration to your suggestion.

MR. CURTIS: It is not my suggestion.

MR. BROWNE: You made the suggestion that St. John's should be one district. Now when the Premier was speaking the other day and giving the proportions of the rural people and rural representation in the various legislatures throughout Canada, I drew to his attention that in the Legislature of New Brunswick there were constituencies that returned five members. If honourable members would go through all the legislatures excepting Quebec and Ontario they would find that there were many places where this dual and treble and four and five member constituencies exist. In Winnipeg there are twelve members, four for each constituency. British Columbia has, I believe, five three member constituencies, and in the Province of Alberta in the city of Calgary they return five members for one constituency and the city of Edmonton returns five members to the Legislature.

Now I know honourable members may have been a little shocked when the Attorney General brought up this question, but will see, I think, that even in this country I have not heard there are any movements afoot to do that. What is wrong with having five or six members at large elected in St. John's? Let them all be elected, don't make any attempt, as has been attempted in this fantastic division to divide St. John's with a fretsaw.

MR. MURRAY: Would you make such an amendment, that five members sit for St. John's?

MR. BROWNE: I have an amendment to make.

MR. CURTIS: Another speech?

MR. BROWNE: I have an amendment to make in this speech. The Honourable the Attorney General seems to be in a bit of a hurry for me to finish, but I have not really gotten near to finishing yet I hope that he will learn something from my remarks.

MR. CURTIS: I am sorry I have not.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 6:00 o'clock.

MR. CURTIS: Thanks be to God.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 of the clock, I do leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock tonight.

TUESDAY April 5, 1955

NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at 6:00 o'clock I was dealing with the third principle enunciated by the Prime Minister of the day in 1925 when the first Redistribution Bill was introduced in that year. That third principle dealt with the trade and social intercourse between localities, so as not to unduly disrupt them: I would like to draw attention now, Sir, to this map of St. John's, showing the peninsula of St. John's divided into five districts, St. John's North, South, East, Centre and

West. Now I am sure it must appear to anyone that someone who is an adept with the freisaw had used it to develop such a monstrosity as this. This, without doubt, shows St. John's North to be south of St. John's West and St. John's East to be east of St. John's North, and St. John's Centre to be east of St. John's West. It is such a curious creation, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think it can be justified at all. Now on the principle of social intercourse and trade between the different places I would like to ask the Premier when he is replying to tell me what the trade and social intercourse is that takes place between the people who live in Mount Pearl Park, which is down here at the toe of this strange boot, or whatever it is, and the people of Bauline and Pouch Cove? They have nothing in common with each other. The only thing they have in common is their dealings with the city or municipality of St. John's. The people who live in Bauline or Pouch Cove were formerly fishermen, but today very few of them are fishermen. There are very few fishermen left anywhere around St. John's, and hardly any at all in Pouch Cove, Flat Rock or Torbay. Most of the men there work at the Base. I believe there are some few fishermen who stay at the fishery in Portugal Cove. But they all trade with the city of St. John's.

The people in Mount Pearl work in St. John's in the trade, clerks and businessmen of one kind or another and have their suburban residences in Glendale and Mount Pearl Park. Whilst dealing with that subject I want to draw attention to a point mentioned earlier in my remarks, i.e. the 1951 census is not good enough on which to base a division according to population, because during the last four years there has been a great

trend out of the city for residence. I am sure there must be hundreds of residences outside the city, built during that time, in Mount Pearl and part of Kilbride and in that area around there, and especially, what is now St. John's North area. Besides that many people are living along the Topsail Road and between the western boundary of St. John's North where the road runs along to Topsail there are many people who live in St. John's or rather work in St. John's and have their permanent residence out there. People are living out as far as Holyrood. Only tonight I read an article in the press to that effect. Land sells at a high price even as far west as Holyrood to people working in St. John's because the housing situation is so acute here. But I do draw attention to the violation of that principle, there is no trade or social intercourse between the people living in the Mount Pearl Park and residents of the district of Pouch Cove, Portugal Cove, Bauline and Broad Cove. They have nothing in common on that basis of social intercourse and trade with the people of Mount Pearl Park and the residents of St. John's North for that matter.

Now, Sir, take another district, the district of Placentia-St. Mary's, presently represented by my honourable friend, the Minister of Finance. It is not a very large district, but a very nice district that has been very kind to him. That district is now being divided into two parts. The arrangement contemplated in the Bill before the House this year is somewhat different than the arrangement last year. Last year the honourable Minister of Finance must have been in a very weary mood, otherwise I feel quite sure he would be consulted in any carving of that district. The boundaries

last year were drawn one mile north of Point Verde. In other words about a mile or so outside Placentia. This year he feels more vigorous and instructed or requested the Premier, his great friend, to extend the district a little further. So that now the district of Placentia East has been extended along the Cape Shore as far as St. Brides.

HON. G. R. POWER (Minister of Finance): What is wrong with that?

MR. BROWNE: Nothing wrong. Was it right last year? Why not do it last year?

MR. POWER: What are you worrying about last year for now? This is 1955.

MR. BROWNE: I am not worrying at all. I just want to show something. My honourable friend, the Minister of Finance can explain in a few minutes, why the boundary is made at St. Brides?

MR. POWER: Do you want me to explain now?

MR. BROWNE: No. You can give it later on. I would like to show the division first of all. Honourable members who see that map will see the District of Ferryland comes as far as a little west of St. Shotts. The district of St. Mary's begins then and goes up around St. Mary's Bay. Anyone familiar with St. Mary's knows the road goes up to the head of Salmonier and then down the other shore through Mount Carmel and down along the shore there, and stops a couple of miles below Mount Carmel. Then you have to go across the barrens to Harricot and to Colinet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, is this in order, to be tracing every detail of every district at second reading?

MR. SPEAKER: It is bordering very closely on anticipating the Committee Stage.

MR. BROWNE: Your Honour, I am speaking on the division of the districts, and I am going to point out that it is contrary to the principles laid down. Surely the Minister introducing the Redistribution Bill in 1925 had as much knowledge and gave as much attention to the subject as, and I would say gave far more — and I am pointing out that it is contrary to the principles he enunciated of trade and social intercourse between people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On that point, Mr. Speaker, are we bound by any principle laid down in 1925 by somebody, or by any principle my honourable friend may lay down? Will there be any need of the Committee of the Whole stage if this keeps on, or will not the Committee of the Whole stage be merely a duplication of this? Is not this a duplication of the Committee of the Whole stage? I am asking Your Honour.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I enunciated five principles which govern the Redistribution Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, does any thing the honourable gentleman enunciated give him the right at second reading to go into the Committee of the Whole stage, because he or somebody else enunciated?

MR. BROWNE: I can deal with the same subject when I come to the principles given by the Premier, it amounts to the same thing, the representation by the broad principle of like-minded people, the homogeneous population; let us call it that.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable

member can discuss this principle, yes, but ought not to go into great detail on the delineation of boundaries. Surely that would be anticipating the Committee Stage.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, if I may respectfully point out, on second reading where we are asked to create new districts, the broad principles upon which redistribution actually should work are not being followed. And if you would wait just a moment or two I was just about to come to the particular point I want to make, i.e., any division between Placentia East and St. Mary's in which the parishes of St. Brides and Branch are cut in two —

MR. POWER: What has the parish got to do with it?

MR. BROWNE: What has the parish got to do with it? Where is the homogeneity, the people who have social intercourse — Is there anybody in this House has been asked by anybody to speak about this subject?

MR. POWER: I don't know. Have you been asked to make an issue of this by the people out there?

MR. BROWNE: The honourable gentleman is quite serious now of course. I know what I am talking about — Have I been asked? But let me have the results of the 1953 Federal Election and let us see how the people voted in those days.

MR. SPEAKER: Would that be pertinent to the question, the election results?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down when the Speaker is speaking. Mr. Speaker, I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that not once on one single occasion in the last five minutes when Your Honour spoke

did the honourable gentleman take his seat but kept on and talked Your Honour down, raising his voice so we could not hear Your Honour speak but could only hear his voice.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, his own colleague, the Minister of Finance sat there and argued with me while sitting in his seat. Is there any difference in what the Minister of Finance did and what I did? Mr. Speaker, I do assure you it was not with any intent, but if Your Honour is making a ruling now?

MR. SPEAKER: I only point out that I don't think it is pertinent to the debate — In an argument and exchange of personalities across the floor of the House I was interrupted.

MR. BROWNE: How they vote, Your Honour, I submit is the most pertinent argument of the whole lot. I submit that is the way the districts are divided up.

MR. POWER: The honourable gentleman asked us to introduce the results of the vote for the Federal Election of 1953. What has that to do with provincial distribution?

MR. BROWNE: I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if he expects me to argue that or you. I am prepared to answer. I say the honourable members of the Government had in their possession the results of the election of 1953, and I know what I am speaking about; I know that they studied these, because they told me they studied them. They could tell me how many votes I got in St. John's West less than Mr. Power (not the Honourable Minister of Finance but my opponent) and how much I got here and how much I got there. How was the district divided last year when they introduced the Redistribution Bill of

last year? When it was introduced, the line between St. John's North, I think it was called then, and St. John's East was drawn at Torbay North, and when the number of votes was counted that we or rather that the Liberals got and what their opponents got there was 690 on one side and a thousand on the Liberal side. It is a fighting chance in any election, but now in this district the line is circled in such a way from Torbay around in a circle to a place north of Shoe Cove, so that the only districts we have now are Pouch Cove, Bauline, Portugal Cove. St. Phillips and Mount Pearl Park — The Honourable Minister of Finance must be aware that some consideration at least was given in the political colour of the people who live in that district.

MR. POWER: What district are you talking about now?

MR. BROWNE: St. John's North.

MR. POWER: I am not interested in St. John's North.

MR. BROWNE: It violates the principle I mentioned this afternoon. But he is not interested in St. John's North, and why not? Why is not the Minister of Finance interested in St. John's North? Is he not?

MR. POWER: In this Distribution Bill, I left that to the people competent to do it.

MR. BROWNE: I must congratulate the Honourable Minister of Finance on his modesty and on his admission of incompetency to deal with this question of the boundaries of St. John's North.

MR. POWER: I don't go out around as much as the honourable member you know, that is why I don't know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman opposite is anything but.

MR. BROWNE: I am not using any offensive expressions. I think the Honourable Minister of Finance has made a most extraordinary admission for a Minister of the Crown; to say he is not interested in St. John's North but left it to the people competent.

MR. POWER: I know nothing about the redistribution in the city of St. John's. No, I leave it to the people who studied it.

MR. BROWNE: Therefore coming in here as a "Rubber Stamp."

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, to a point or order: He has given motives to my words. I said I was not interested in St. John's North in this respect, I know nothing about the redistribution in St. John's or any part of it, and I left the distribution to people who had made a study of it and knew about it. Is there anything wrong with that?

MR. BROWNE: If that question is to me, I would say there is everything wrong with it. The whole thing is wrong.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I ask that he take that back. I put up with a lot of impertinences, behind the scenes, and if you will let me have the opportunity now I will describe some of them to you.

MR. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with the point of order.

MR. POWER: He has insulted me, and I ask that it be taken back.

MR. SPEAKER: For the honourable member's information, the use of the word "Rubber Stamp" was ruled out as unparliamentary here in 1953,

and I would ask the honourable member to retract the statement which has offended the Honourable Minister of Finance, and ought not to have been used.

MR. BROWNE: I am sorry — But when the Honourable Minister of Finance —

MR. POWER: Now you are going into that again.

MR. BROWNE: One of the most important Ministers of the Crown in this country, and representing a district which now is to be divided into two to give the Catholic districts seats, sits here and says he knows nothing about the religious denominations in St. John's and he leaves that to the people who are more competent.

MR. POWER: And who have made a study of it?

MR. BROWNE: And admitted having given the matter no study, Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Opposition, and my duty is to criticize the Government and I am criticizing the Minister of Finance for words that he expressed here himself. What are we to do? Are we to keep quiet when Government members make statements like that? Is it the correct principle for the Honourable Minister of Finance to say he was not interested in the division in St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER: This took place, as I said just now, in an exchange of personalities across the floor of the House, and had nothing whatsoever to do with the debate, and is therefore out of order.

MR. BROWNE: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I get back to the point I was making in regard to the division of the Parish of St. Brides. The settlement of St. Brides is ten miles from

the settlement of Branch and it is about five miles from the settlement of Point Lance. Point Lance and Branch are both in St. Mary's Bay although it would take you by road forty miles to Placentia and twenty-two miles to the district of St. Mary's, Branch or Point Lance, it would take about three hours to go to the other part, and it is only five or ten miles distance from part of Placentia East. Now is there any logic in that division?

MR. POWER: Would you tell me what bay Point Lance and Branch are in?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Honourable Minister of Finance may be encouraged by my remarks to rise later on and explain to us. Of course they are in St. Mary's Bay, but have never been in St. Mary's district.

MR. POWER: They are in St. Mary's Bay. They are in St. Mary's District — You are the only one finding anything wrong with it.

MR. BROWNE: And I hope others will see the logic of my remarks. It is necessary to go from one part of the district at least sixty-two miles.

MR. POWER: Go by water.

MR. BROWNE: On what basis are Branch and Point Lance put in St. Mary's District when it is five or ten miles across the country to St. Brides — the parish is there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order — I would like to make my point of order. I think that parliamentary rules are being flouted and outraged completely by the honourable gentleman opposite. I think that he is now and since the House sat tonight almost continuously making

a speech that is proper to be made only in committee of the whole, I submit to Your Honour — I submit to Your Honour that it ought to be stopped and that the honourable gentleman ought to be ordered by Your Honour to make a speech that is proper to be made at second reading and not make one permissible only in Committee of the Whole.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, whilst I have respect for the position the gentleman holds, I feel he is going too far in raising a point of order in the manner in which he has done. He is practically dictating to you, to tell you what you should do, and it is out of order for him to speak to you in that fashion. You, Sir, are the arbiter of this difficulty between us and this argument taking place, and if the Honourable the Premier or anybody else tells you what you should do and whom to order to sit down, then, Sir, I think he is usurping the privileges that you have as Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It is unfortunate that the honourable member on my left took the point of order when he did because I was already speaking to the honourable member, and I may say I did not have the ability nor the desire to shout my ruling from the Chair. I speak to be listened to. Making a ruling under conditions like that does seem that the ruling is being made to favour a certain member. I am not sure that the Hausard reporter heard what I started to say when the Honourable the Premier rose to his feet. I give, and I will continue to give every speaking member an opportunity to get back to the point. I was about to say that I cannot see that the House can have the slightest interest in how many miles it is from one settlement to another in a given district, nor what it has to

do with the principle of the Bill. I was about to rule that section of the debate out of order as merely a conversation between the Minister of Finance and the member who is speaking. It could not have been of any interest whatsoever to the House. So will the honourable member in continuing his speech confine himself to a discussion of the principle of the Bill. The principle, as enunciated by the Premier when he made his opening speech. These details certainly are properly discussed in Committee of the Whole, and ought not to be discussed here now.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, to proceed with the line of argument in regard to other districts which were divided, a district for example like St. George's was taken and divided into two — well now, there must be some principle involved in the Government's decision to divide St. Georges into two. It is not merely a question of population. Then, does it not seem to Your Honour that if there is going to be a division it should be done on a certain basis, the basis of population or similarity of occupations of the people and so on like that. I find it very difficult, when I see a line which cuts off a section of the people without any apparent reason from another section of the people who have the same interests, who are of the same denomination, and have the same type of occupation. That is why I find it hard to feel there is any main principle involved when it comes to make arbitrary divisions like that. It looks like someone almost closed his eyes and drew a line down and said: "this should be a division, and that should be a division." Now in regard to the occupations of people I draw attention to the division in Grand Falls, the creation of the new

district of Gander to the east of the town of Grand Falls, a mile or so to the east of Grand Falls. The line is drawn north and south cutting off Botwood and Bishop's Falls which have had so much in common with the town of Grand Falls all through the years, and the people who live along that road all down to Botwood all come to Grand Falls and work in the town of Grand Falls or in Windsor. It seems to me when I compare the Redistribution Bill introduced by the Government last year (I have it here) with the Bill introduced this year and make a comparison — that is a Government measure and the one under discussion today is a Government measure — it seems to me at this particular time I should ask them why they make the changes so that the Honourable Minister when replying could justify them. I presume that any changes which have been made are made on some basis. But for what? Why is it done? What is the principle involved in changing the district?

I did refer to Torbay North which was in the district of St. John's last year — That is where we got off the track — It is now removed and put into St. John's East. Anyway the last principle of the five principles that Mr. Monroe gave for his alterations and increase in constituencies. Now as we apply that to this Bill what do we find? It seems to me that that principle is being completely ignored as far as the city of St. John's is concerned, because all the divisions that have existed in St. John's since 1832 to the present time, certainly from 1855, all respected the division between St. John's East and St. John's West as a line roughly about where Carter's Hill and Freshwater Road lie. That is the boundary line be-

tween St. John's East and St. John's West. Now, then, that is being ignored and a new district of St. John's Centre is being put in, between Springdale Street and Prescott Street, and going as far north as Elizabeth Avenue.

Yesterday my honourable and learned friend, the Minister of Provincial Affairs said how desirable it was to restore the integrity of the district of Harbour Grace and Port de Grave, especially Port de Grave which traced its history back to 1855. How true then is it of St. John's. If it is good for one it is just as good for the other. St. John's East and West were there since 1855, and I think must have had almost as many members as they had at any time afterwards, six members. There is a very unpleasant word used in connection with the redistribution that has been used by some persons, although not by me in connection with that Act, the word "Gerrymander." The word "Gerrymander" means to manipulate the constituencies for political advantages. When we look at the districts of St. John's as they are in five parts, is there anyone on the other side of the House will say it was not done with the intention of making St. John's West and St. John's North Liberal districts?

MR. POWER: Of course it was not.

MR. BROWNE: The Honourable Minister of Finance says so. The Honourable Minister of Finance hasn't paid very much attention to this Bill. He has admitted that he is not too familiar with it. He left it to somebody else, and it is a pity he should have.

MR. POWER: It is enough for

you — You are wearing your heart out over it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I am not wearing my heart out over it, but I feel I have a responsibility in connection with it, and I should like to think the Honourable Minister of Finance took his share of responsibility in the matter. St. John's North and St. John's West were deliberately made districts which the Premier thought would return supporters of his party.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think the honourable member ought to say that, it could be interpreted as imputing motives other than those enunciated by the Premier in his opening speech.

MR. BROWNE: Very good, Mr. Speaker, if I heard the Premier right when he described this monstrosity, I think he said that the religious denominations of the people in St. John's Centre and St. John's South were about fifty-fifty, fifty per cent Catholic, fifty per cent Protestant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: I have not used the word "Protestant" and I have not used the word "Catholic" nor have I used the word "Roman Catholic" in my speech except once here this afternoon, when I said St. John's was a Protestant City. I said that because the honourable gentleman was referring to how many Catholics, by which I knew he meant "Roman Catholics" there were in the City of St. John's. I pointed out that St. John's was a Protestant City. I did not use the word "Catholic" nor "Roman Catholic." I contented myself completely by using the word "Traditional" and "Traditional Balance" I don't believe in bandying the words of religious denominations around in this House, I think it is indecent.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think it is, and —

MR. SMALLWOOD: And I don't want now to be quoted as having done what I did not do.

MR. BROWNE: I would be the last one to misquote the Honourable the Premier. And I am quite satisfied with the words he used, quite satisfied from him that the words were the "Denominational Balance in St. John's Centre and St. John's South was fifty-fifty."

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said no such thing. I did not deal with it, did not refer to it. The honourable gentleman must have me mixed up with someone else.

MR. BROWNE: Well sometimes I wonder if I hear right, because I gathered the impression from something the Premier said and he gets up almost immediately afterwards and says he did not, and I have to take his word — it was not fifty-fifty.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I did not mention it. I did not comment on it. I did not speak of it.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps when replying later on he might tell us how the traditional —

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will tell the honourable gentleman now — in one sense in the five constituencies into which St. John's is to be divided, if you were to count the people denominationally it would turn out to be three constituencies where people are of the "Roman Catholic Faith" and two of them are constituencies in which the overwhelming majority are people of the "Protestant Faiths," three to two.

MR. BROWNE: That is plain enough now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not like bandying these terms around in the House. These things amongst gentlemen generally can be understood without being announced on the radio and bandied about on the air. I don't like it. It is no good. It is not good for Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I should be using expressions that the Premier does not like. I am afraid I have to do it. It appears to me to be required to be done. I was talking a few minutes ago about the expression "Gerrymander," an American word taking root in the English language for manipulating constituencies and I could not help, but come to the conclusion it was not entirely absent from whoever used a fret saw to carve up St. John's. It did not accidentally come out that way. Now the Honourable the Premier tells us that the intentions were not political; apparently they were denominational. I now come to the principles mentioned by the Premier (I hope I heard him right and report him right). He gave us three. I made notes of them. Unfortunately it will be too long before Hansard will be available, and we will have to wait five years to find out exactly what he said. It will be five years time before we get Hansard published — It is published every five years afterwards. The notes that I took down showed that he mentioned three principles; traditional representation by way of division according to denominations. To preserve the traditional denominational balance the two small districts of St. Mary's and Placentia East are created, which have a population between them of eleven thousand, according to the census of 1951. We do not know what the figures are today; 11,323. Placentia East is to have

one member, with 5,400 people and St. Mary's with 5,900, one member.

MR. POWER: There are far more people in Placentia East now than at this time.

MR. BROWNE: I believe there are more than that there. Nobody can tell us with assurance. We have no figures to go by. That is why I suggested a little while ago that it would be very appropriate if we could have sat around in Committee and used the voters' lists and see how the voters' lists compared with the voters' list say of 1949. Then of course the Government has been taking a voters' list for the last six months, and should have some recent figures on that. The number of people in Placentia West is almost exactly ten thousand, almost twice as many as Placentia East, according to these figures, and they have only one member. So insofar as traditional representation is concerned we can see there is great discrepancy from one particular district to another, Placentia East and Placentia West. Or if we take St. John's the large number of people living in St. John's belonging to the same denominations and are very much greater in proportion and are therefore entitled to much more representation.

"Like-minded people or homogeneous populations." Now we had a little bit of fun when we were listening to the Premier's difficulty in pronouncing "homogeneous." Of course the Premier knows perfectly well how to pronounce it, and knows perfectly well now he means "homogeneous population." If you wanted homogeneous populations why draw the line between Humber East and West? Surely the people on one side of the bank, in Coruer Brook, are the same as the people on the other side of the

bank; and surely the people on the one side of the line at Windsor are the same as the people on the other side of the line. As for this monstrosity of St. John's division, surely the people who live on the east side of Springdale Street are no different from the people who live on the other side of the street.

MR. MURRAY: Where do you put the line — Do you suggest no line at all?

MR. BROWNE: If you carried out the principle you would have no lines at all, but have one district returning five members.

MR. MURRAY: However, for all over Newfoundland?

MR. BROWNE: No, the district of St. John's. Surely if you are going to unite the two main principles one would be the traditional boundaries which have been in existence for so long. That can hardly be ignored.

Then the third principle laid down by the Premier was that rural areas should have more representation. He gave, as I said earlier this afternoon, examples in Canada and comparisons between the other Provinces. That is a proposition that has been generally accepted although it may be carried too far. Would it be right for two or three thousand people in one district to have as much influence in electing a representative as seventeen thousand in another district? How far can you bring that?

DR. ROWE: It is done all over the democratic world.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, it seems to be, and the honourable member has that much on his side. But where are you going to draw the line? How far should we go with that? Is seven-

teen to one not too large a proportion?

DR. ROWE: I could cite an example of a much greater ratio than that.

MR. BROWNE: Supposing the honourable member can, is it not the case that in a great, a rapidly growing city like Toronto that it grows so fast that your population there grows more rapidly than in other districts? There were some districts in Ontario just as small or almost as small at distribution as Labrador South, almost as small up until the last redistribution, whereas Toronto has one district there, South York. I think, or I am not quite sure which district it was, east of Humber at any rate, which had grown to 175,000 population in the previous ten years, since the previous distribution.

Well, the honourable gentleman knows that in a city the rate of expansion is very much more rapid than it is in rural areas. For example if we were to look here at some of the districts since 1945 we would find that Trinity North had decreased in population; Trinity South decreased in population, Carboncar, Bay de Verde and Harbour Grace and Port de Grave combined have decreased in population; Ferryland is not much greater than it was in 1951, when it returned two members; whereas the urban districts have grown. Humber has grown by an increase of six thousand eight hundred, therefore it is split and given two members; Grand Falls gained by ten thousand seven hundred and is now split into two districts; St. John's has increased, according to the figures given to us, and are only estimates, in round numbers of St. John's West 18,000, South 15,000, North 14,000 and Centre 17,000

and East 15,000; that shows an increase over 1945 of, I believe, 12,744. But as the Honourable Minister of Finance believes, there was a great increase in his district of Placentia East since 1951, and I feel quite confident there has been a corresponding increase in population in St. John's since 1951. The Honourable Minister of Finance shakes his head, but as he has suggested, he has very little knowledge about the subject we are discussing.

MR. POWER: I happen to know that the population has doubled in my district in many places.

MR. BROWNE: Well, the population in my honourable friend's district began to increase around 1941 when the American Base started, or in 1940. I suppose the ideal thing would be that one vote wherever it is given should be as good as another, but it is not, and in some districts one vote is as good as five in another and six or seven in another. In the Co-operative Movement, as my honourable friend knows, no matter how much money a person may have as shares he only has one vote, but in rural areas a representative is by a lesser number of people. I think the reason for that is that rural areas in the past were generally more difficult to get around and generally more difficult to represent. I don't think the difficulty is as great today as it was formerly, for the reasons I gave earlier in my talk this afternoon. Anyway, the effect now is that one half of the population will elect about eleven members and the other half will elect about twenty-five members. That is the effect of it. If you add all the small districts together you will find them electing most of the members. In the Bill, as we had it up to yesterday, all constituencies were supposed to be single constituencies returning

one member. But yesterday we were informed that Harbour Main was to have two. Well that is certainly contradicting the statement which was made by the Premier the other day, that they were going to be all single constituencies. I don't see anything wrong with having dual constituencies, nothing at all. I would like to see some more.

Now, Sir, the fundamental question in this matter seems to me to be, why should we have an increase in membership? Why does the Government bring in this Bill to increase the membership at all? I did not notice in the Honourable the Premier's talk the other day any comprehensible reason why the membership should be increased. Certainly the honourable gentleman who spoke yesterday, the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs, gave us no reason why the membership should be increased. Now I have already stated that in my opinion it would have been preferable if this Bill when it was introduced had been referred to a special Committee. I think the reasons for that are obvious enough. It would have enabled us to sit down together and go over all the problems in a more informal manner than is possible since the Bill has been introduced to the House. I hope, however that the arguments which I have advanced will help the Government to feel that it is not too late yet to do this, and that the matter will be placed before a Committee who would be in a position then to examine the figures which have been prepared and to bring about a much more sensible arrangement than I think is to be found in the Bill as it is before us tonight. We naturally are without all the information we should have to make the proper study of the Bill. Honourable members will

see that lines can be drawn here or drawn where and you have only just got to move the lines back and forth to get new divisions, new arrangements. It is a matter of arbitrary arrangement. You can do it in that fashion, but that would not give you a very desirable or suitable redistribution.

On these grounds that I have mentioned, on all these grounds, in accordance with the principles which I quoted as given by Mr. Monroe in 1925, and by the Premier here, it seems to me that from the point of view of economy and business interest of the country and the general good, it would be much preferable if we had an arrangement that did not increase the membership at all. There is no need of it. The work of the members had decreased during the years, and as we saw here in the House this session and last session, the members do not participate to any great extent in the debates, and since they have been selected to make the laws of the country why bring more members here to be spectators to what is going on.

I beg to propose the following amendment, seconded by the honourable member for St. John's East: "All the words after the word 'that' be deleted and the following substituted — "That this Bill be not now read a second time, but the subject matter thereof be referred to a Committee of the House."

MR. SPEAKER: On the question that this Bill be now read a second time the following amendment has been proposed and seconded — All the words after the word "that" in the main question be struck out and the following be substituted therefor: "That this Bill be not now read a second time but the subject matter

thereof be referred to a Select Committee of the House with instructions to prepare a plan of Redistribution which would provide a more equitable representation, including the establishment of Districts returning two or more members, if necessary."

I would ask that the debate on the amendment be strictly relevant.

MR. HOLLITT: Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to delay the House very much on the amendment, I think my honourable friend on my right has made it perfectly clear to the House why an important matter such as this is, should be studied by a Committee of the Whole House before it is brought before the members for their consideration.

We will remember, Sir, that we were reminded by the Honourable the Premier that this year represented the hundredth anniversary of Responsible Government in this country, and we will remember that at this time there was a Distribution Bill which set down for that era certain districts. I have here (if it is not out of order to quote from it, as it is a matter of history, really, I think I might be allowed to quote) the first members of responsible Government sworn in by Commissioners, the Commissioners at that time were Archibald, Crowdy, Noad, O'Brien, Job, Grieve and Law. I don't know the population of St. John's East in 1855. There were three representatives elected on May 22, 1955, and everybody knows the battle that was fought by that famous Newfoundlander, John Kent, who became, after that same election, the first Premier under Responsible Government. At any rate, St. John's East at that time had three members elected, John Kent, Robert J. Parsons and Peter Windsor. St. John's West also had three mem-

bers elected into that first House under Responsible Government; John Fox, Ambrose Shea and Philip Little, all famous names Sir, in the history of this country, and names, I think it would be well for us to think of in this Centenary of Responsible Government.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think the honourable members is speaking at all to the amendment.

MR. HOLLETT: Not to the amendment? May I go on to say, Sir, in Harbour Grace there were two members elected that year and in Carbonear one, at Port de Grave one, Harbour Main two, Ferryland two and Placentia and St. Mary's at that time had three members elected.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. I think the honourable gentleman will agree himself this speech he is making would be very appropriate to the main motion but not to the amendment.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, that being the case, I suppose one could make any remarks to the motions before the Chair?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anyone knows that they should be absolutely pertinent to the amendment.

MR. HOLLETT: I am quite sure I heard the Honourable the Premier making remarks to certain motions which in my opinion were not exactly pertinent to the matter under discussion, and if I for a moment ramble.

MR. SPEAKER: What that has to do with the amendment I am completely at a loss to see. However, the House must hear with me a bit. It is usual when amendments are given like this it is proper to have notice given of them and give the Speaker a

chance to scan them. I am supposed to pick up an amendment and listen to an honourable member speaking and to others making points of order, and make a decision at the same time. I am very grateful to the House for the high opinion of me, but I assure honourable members I am nothing more than human — It does make a reference here to provide more equitable distribution — However I do not see that gives the honourable member the right to cite these facts, interesting though they might be, as to which members were elected in 1855 or any other year. I think the remarks ought to be as to some reason why this Bill, in the honourable member's opinion, ought to be referred to a Select Committee. The subject matter is restricted. The honourable member may continue his speech, and keep to the amendment.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour to keep to the amendment, and shall read the amendment:

"That this Bill be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to a Select Committee of the House with instructions to prepare a plan of Redistribution which would provide a more equitable representation, including the establishment of districts returning two or more members, if necessary."

If I brought in a little bit of history in connection with the redistribution, which left me out of order, then I apologize to the Chair; but I thought I would have the right to do that. If the Honourable the Premier asks that I desist and if I am ordered by the Speaker certainly I shall do so.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I spoke before the Honourable the Premier.

MR. HOLLETT: I feel, Sir, and I think the composition of this House, if it is to be representative of the people of this country, involves two separate things, that is to say, the electors and the constituencies. Now the electors; of course we all know we have the right to vote, both male and female in this country, and I don't want to go into that question at the present time. The constituencies return men to this House and this is a subject I think into which we have to go very carefully. Now it is not every day that a Redistribution Bill is brought into this House. As a matter of fact if one were allowed to be brought in every election certainly, then somebody could use the word my honourable friend mentioned, "gerrymander." But Redistribution Bills are brought in on very few occasions both here, in England and in other countries; and it behoves us therefore as those who are here representative of the people to give that Bill every consideration before we pass it. We have to be sure that each part of the country, each section of the country will be adequately represented. The methods therefore which are to be employed to re-arrange the electors into groups which are to send members here to represent this country are methods which have to be based on very sound and reasonable lines; and not as we are afraid in a good many cases have been drawn, merely by chance.

We know, Sir, that it is not possible to divide the country up into areas that have the same number of people. That is certainly not at all possible particularly in this country where most of our people or a good many of them live along wide stretches of coast. There are many ways in which it could be divided: By occupation; people could be divided by the

industries in which they are engaged, and they could be divided on a percentage of population. All these things taken together would, I think, indicate to any House which would give the matter some thought, a sound method of redistribution. Our contention, Sir, is (and that is why we have made this amendment) that nothing, no plan of action has been worked out. As a matter of fact, Sir, it is common knowledge to everybody in this country tonight that a Bill brought in one day was very broadly amended the day following. That does not indicate to us, Sir, that very much attention was given to it. Certainly we of the Opposition have had no opportunity whatsoever to study any figures relative to populations, and relative to the different other aspects. We have been given no opportunity whatsoever, and I fear Sir, a good many members on the Government side of the House have certainly not had an opportunity. Take for instance the case of Port de Grave: Port de Grave, Sir, as I pointed out in my opening remarks, was one of the first districts, in the first Redistribution Bill brought in here. Port de Grave was one of these districts, and returned one member. And here the original Bill brought in two or three days ago, introduced by the Honourable the Premier, decided to scrap that arrangement and throw it in with Harbour Grace and make one district. I believe, or so I am informed, Sir, after strong protest from the electors in these areas, the Honourable the Premier, or the Government, shall I say, decided that they must do something about it — The very idea, Sir, of taking an ancient district like Port de Grave, with the number of people still living there, and saying: "Well we are not going to have this district

any more. We are going to put it into Harbour Grace and call it one district." One of the honourable members who represents one of the districts was told the other day that he would have to find another district. We don't think, Sir, that is a very good thing on the part of the Government nor any Government. The people in this area, I think, might very well have been consulted or some of the representatives. I have grave doubt if any of the representatives of these two districts were consulted before it was decided to lump them together and call them one district. Certainly, Sir, however it is arranged, I think it ought to be possible that one major section of this country would have as much to say in this House on legislation brought in here as any other particular section. Why should one man's vote on, say, Labrador South have the same effect as to representation in this House, as five men's votes here in St. John's or five men anywhere else or four in Corner Brook or Grand Falls? Why does it take five voters here in St. John's East or in St. John's West to do the same work with regard to sending a man into this House as it does one man in Southern Labrador or White Bay or Green Bay? Does the Government think they are offering us something wonderful when they are offering us that? The very idea of three thousand two hundred men in Southern Labrador sending one representative in here and seven thousand voters in the district which I have the honour to represent sending one man in here — the very idea to me is absolutely ridiculous, and any Government which brings in such legislation ought to be highly criticized not only by the members on this side but by the people at large. There are good people, I know on Southern Labrador

and Northern Labrador but I do not think that these good people would expect that they would have the same representation in this House which makes the laws of the whole country as would seventeen thousand voters in St. John's West or a like number in St. John's East. Does the Government think it is doing a masterly job by doing that? In my opinion, they are not. If they are to bring in a Redistribution Bill that is to be just, let us get together and see if we can't bring in one better than that.

In St. Barbe, the district, Sir, which you represent — it takes two and a half men here, (if you can divide a man in half) to equal one man in St. Barbe. Three men here in St. John's have only the same representation in this House as one man in Labrador North, and five men in Labrador South; so it goes on all down the line. Here we have Grand Falls — the original Bill was brought in here the other day and we were told there were twenty thousand people in the district of Grand Falls, and we were told they were to have one representative. Here, Sir, is the greatest industrial area in Newfoundland with twenty thousand people, and they have the same representation in this House as three thousand people in Labrador South, and the same representation as five thousand people in White Bay — so it goes. The Government were quite convinced when they brought in that twenty thousand figure that it was correct for Grand Falls. Now it is discovered somebody made a mistake in the additions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman would allow me — The error occurred, not in our consideration of Grand Falls being divided into the proposed two new constituencies.

cies — the error occurred long after that when someone, a clerk — it was not a Government error, but a clerical error when adding up the figures to hand to me.

MR. HOLLETT: I take the Honourable the Premier's word for it — It was brought in and introduced to us, and the figures handed across to us —

MR. SMALLWOOD: And corrected as soon as the mistake was discovered.

MR. HOLLETT: Corrected today — Certainly, Sir, the Honourable the Premier and the House knew that the figures of seventeen thousand for St. John's West and St. John's Centre were correct — I suppose they knew that — Yet they gave these seventeen thousand one representative whereas they are giving three, four or five thousand people in other parts of the country one representative.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, can I deal with this matter in rebuttal, in speaking on this amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: Any matter raised on this debate on second reading on the amendment may be rebutted or upheld by any other speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the first speaker is out of order that automatically gives me the right to deal with the point.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, am I out of order? The Honourable the Premier is trying to attribute to me motives I don't possess in regard to this thing — I am trying to speak reasonably and rationally — I may not be able to do as well as the Premier — I will abide by the Honourable the Speaker's ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: For the guidance of the honourable member let me

point out what I have already said — the debate is to be confined to the subject matter of the amendment as strictly as possible. Now what is said on my right hand may equally well be said of my left hand — I cannot say any more than that.

MR. HOLLETT: The amendment, Sir, is that we move this into a Select Committee in order to make a further study and try to make it a little more appropriate. I can assure the Government that as at present set up they are going to be accused of "gerrymandering," on the face of it nobody could deny, that is what it looks like. For instance under this part of Labrador which under this Bill will constitute Labrador South, only 1603 people marked their ballots in the last election, and practically every man registered his vote. So it is safe to say the people who were registered voted in that part of the district at that time — 1603 in the last election. In Grand Falls, as it is to be constituted there are 6,716 on the list of electors. In other words that list of electors has the same power only as the 1603 electors in Labrador South. In Labrador North there were 550 voters on the list, apart from Goose Airport, and these 550 were found in thirteen settlements — and they have the same right to send a man here to decide the laws of the country, decide how much taxes to put on and all that sort of thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You say apart from "Goose Bay." They are not apart.

MR. HOLLETT: Aside.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why "aside?" They are not aside.

MR. HOLLETT: Goose Bay is only a small area, and an honourable

member can go in there and cover it all in a few days.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not the other thirteen — How long will it take to cover these?

MR. HOLLETT: A nice little trip in a boat.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How long a trip?

MR. HOLLETT: I suppose the Honourable the Premier knows.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not even get one quarter of the ways down, and I travelled many hundreds of miles.

MR. HOLLETT: Were you seasick?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: You do not get seasick?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am a little seasick right now.

MR. HOLLETT: I say too, Sir, these figures presumably in 1951 were based on the census taken at that time, putting the population of this country at 365,000 people — these figures are based on a population of 365,000. Now the Honourable the Premier stated yesterday that the present population of this country is four hundred thousand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: More.

MR. HOLLETT: Surely we cannot use the figures taken in 1951 and use them for a basis for redistribution, surely we must take into consideration the populations of various areas which you are going to cut out. If we take that 365,000 figure, Sir, that would, for thirty-three seats, give an average of eleven thousand per district, if we went by population and

try to do as nearly as we can according to the number of people — I maintain, Sir, no attempt whatsoever has been made by the Government to do that, to make any approach to equality with regard to population. Then, Sir, I really do think that some consideration ought to be given — and I say this with all due respect to all people in this country — I really do think that some consideration ought to be given to the so-called industrial areas of this country — I don't mean that they should have an overwhelming representation here, but they ought to be dealt with fairly. Take Grand Falls and Corner Brook — These two areas that include Buchans, produced in 1951, (the year this census was taken), ninety million dollars of the income of this country; and I believe that was 44% of the whole income of this Province, which was forthcoming from these areas, Grand Falls and Corner Brook. Yet, what do we find? It is the intention of the Government to have three men from that great industrial area as their representation here in this House of thirty-six members, one twelfth. They produce 44% of the income and they get 1/12 of the representation here. So we find the cards are stacked, so to speak, against these industrial areas of Grand Falls and Corner Brook, and they can only elect three men to send in here to this House of thirty-six, which is to make the laws which shall determine how everybody should live and move and have their being, what taxes we are to have and everything else — yet these great industrial centres of our country produce 44% of the national income of the Province. I put it to the House, Mr. Speaker, that is highly unfair, and I think the Government must agree with me.

Now I also had a note here that Grand Falls and Corner Brook have a combined population altogether equal to Labrador South, Labrador North, St. Mary's, Placentia East, Ferryland, St. Barbe, Port au Port and Gander. Now, how many men will they send? These two industrial centres of Grand Falls and Corner Brook will have three members in this House and these eight other districts will have eight men in this House.

MR. CURTIS: Does my honourable friend realize how many men we would have on this side of the House if that were so.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know whether the Honourable the Premier would say that is pertinent to the issue or not. If the Honourable the Attorney General would like for me to tell him how many men they are going to have there after the thirty-six, I would probably be out of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tell us.

MR. HOLLETT: I know the Honourable the Premier would like to know. I don't suppose you are greatly worried, when you take a district like White Bay and divide it up into two districts, well, if you multiply one by two you will get two, I suppose, or take Harbour Main where, now if you put in two, you have one man there, and I take it he will bring along another so you have two—twice one is two.

MR. MURRAY: Don't be so pessimistic.

MR. HOLLETT: I am only just speaking the thoughts going through your minds on the opposite side of the House — It is all figured out — we had one in Harbour Main last time, now we have two.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What has this got to do with the amendment.

MR. HOLLETT: You asked for it and you are going to get it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Order or no order.

MR. HOLLETT: Order or no order, until ordered to sit down, unlike some people who do not obey orders.

MR. SPEAKER: I would say the honourable member was provoked.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it takes a lot to provoke me at times, I have another note here. If we add St. John's to Grand Falls and Corner Brook, in a straight line across the country —

MR. COURAGE: If the honourable member will allow me — Have you consulted Grand Falls and Corner Brook before you add St. John's?

MR. HOLLETT: I have not consulted anybody, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the honourable member for Fortune Bay consulted anybody.

MR. MURRAY: He does not have to — He had 98%

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if we could have ten minutes recess, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will recess to the call of the bell.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I was making some remarks with regard to St. John's and Corner Brook, and I was about to state that they represent the bulk of the industrial areas of the country, these three great sections of Newfoundland which have a combined population of over 130,

000 people, and who will under the present scheme return eight members or nine members to this House, the remaining number of the four hundred thousand people, if there are four hundred thousand people here — I would say there are more than 130,000 now as that was when the population was 365,000 — but let it go at that, 130,000 or 140,000 people in these particular industrial areas, St. John's, Corner Brook and Grand Falls will return eight members while the balance will return twenty-eight. To me, sir, that violates the principle, one of the main principles at any rate, which should be kept in mind in formulating any redistribution bill, i.e. it ought to provide that it is not possible for one part of the community or country, or that one set of opinions in that country, one set of opinions or interests should be over-represented at the expense of any other part. That is exactly what we have here in the facts that have been presented to the House on this amendment. There are certain areas of the country which have not, by a long shot, the percentage of representation which they should have either by reason of their population or industrial importance to the income of the whole country, nor by their historical alignment in the country. Take St. John's area, where the government tells us now there are eighty thousand people. They have divided that up into five districts. We maintain that is not a sufficient number of districts. We maintain, too, sir, that the way in which the division has been made is slipshod, pure guesswork, and St. John's has been ripped up with a hacksaw, but with design. They did not do it blindfold, in a blindfolded manner exactly. They took this rip-saw and ripped it up. It is worth while, Mr.

Speaker, to look at the present St. John's West. They even put into it the long strip going out here where nobody lived in 1951 and put it into what they call St. John's West. Now so far as I am concerned personally, it is immaterial how the constituencies are divided or how St. John's is divided up. But I do think some explanation is forthcoming from the government as to why they have abandoned the old boundary, there for generations, and why they divided it into single constituencies, whereas before it was divided into two constituencies with two members each. Why has the departure been made from that? Why may they retain a two man constituency in Harbour Main and give them five or six thousand a piece and then cut up St. John's into five separate districts with seventeen thousand, fifteen thousand, fourteen thousand etc. as the case may be? Personally, Sir, I can see no rhyme nor reason in the present Redistribution Bill. It put it to the Government on this hundredth anniversary of Responsible Government that it ought to be up to them as a responsible body of men to make a fair and equitable distribution of seats in this country.

My honourable and learned friend on my left spoke of the expense of increasing the number of candidates. He pointed out how nonsensical it is at the present moment to increase the number, because of the small amount of work which has to be done by each member of this House compared with what had to be done in the old days, when they had to handle road money and all sorts of things. He referred to the great expense which would have to be incurred, and I put it to the members of the government, Sir, and to this House, that we ought not to increase the membership in this House

unless there is some reason given for it. I submit, Sir, the government has offered us no reason whatsoever. As a matter of fact one day they come in and say they have to have thirty-three and then because the people from Port de Grave and Harbour Grace made some objection to losing their individual constituencies, they suddenly changed it and made three more — All honour to these people, I say, particularly in Port de Grave for making a kick. The government said: "Well all right, we will put you back again. But now where will we get the rest? We will put two in Harbour Main and chop up White Bay." Now, Mr. Speaker, I am appealing to the government — I am not criticising — I think it is unfortunate that the Bill has been brought in, I was going to say in haste, but they were at it last year and apparently did not like it because they did not go ahead with it. Certainly we did not like it, and I am quite sure, Sir, we dislike this one more — If the government decided it was necessary to have two men on the Labrador surely there is no reason why they should not be there, but if they are only doing it, as has been hinted, for reasons other than absolute necessity then I think they are doing something which is wrong. I am appealing to the government, Mr. Speaker, to reconsider this Bill, to think it over and give us a Redistribution Bill which the people can be proud of. I can assure the government they have injured and hurt the sensibilities of any people who cared to think about the way the country has been divided up now.

I don't wish to take up any more time, Sir, I dare say the government will ignore the remarks I have made, and will go ahead and carry it out. But we made the amendment in good

faith and we want the government to think we did it in good faith. If we said one or two things that sounded a little sarcastic I hope they will forget it and will look at this Bill again in the light of what we have said and see if it cannot be done in a better manner. We are only asking that it be committed to a Select Committee of the House. I submit we might have been given more particulars before this. The Bill has been on the boards since last year, yet we were given no particulars as regard to areas, denominational, industrial, national income, all these things should be taken into consideration, Sir, before any government in this country should split up the country into constituencies the way it has been split up at the present time. Once again, Sir, in supporting this amendment, I ask the government to think twice before passing this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. JANES: Mr. Speaker, when all the gerrymandering and politics which the Opposition accuses us have been taken out of this there still remains one fact, that is, Sir, the physical capacity of any man to adequately represent a number of districts in Newfoundland. Speaking for Fogo District, and taking it as a typical example of many of the districts; we have some ten thousand people in the district, six thousand of them living in communities. We have six thousand of them living in communities, or we have six communities rather, with a population of over a thousand, but the other four thousand people are living in some thirty-four communities. That means for me to visit the district of Fogo and spend one night in each community takes forty days. If you compare that sort of thing, that type of travelling, by boat most of it, with the easy representation

that you have in such communities as Grand Falls or in such a community as St. John's or Corner Brook, it is not too difficult to see why it is so essential and so necessary to have the rural districts representatives spread out. It is not the fault of the government. It is not the fault of the people. It is just as I said before, clearly impossible for any one man to cover the area geographically in which people are living. That is the trouble with this Bill, if there is any trouble with it. We can take this Bill out and bring in another and we will end up with what we have now, because we are trying to think about geographic areas where it is impossible for any one man to get, and even the cost of visiting the districts. I would think right now for me to visit Fogo District would cost me eight hundred dollars for forty days. Just one visit would cost me eight hundred dollars. So also it is with Twillingate and White Bay and Green Bay and St. Barbe and all the other districts; and the honourable member here for Fortune and Hermitage, it would probably cost him even more to visit the district just once. So we have to approach the thing in a practical sense and divide the Province up in such a geographical way that it is possible for a member to adequately represent the districts. Any district on Avalon or in St. John's can be covered in one day quite adequately, and the member does not need to walk. I could walk, I think, any district in St. John's in twenty-four hours.

MR. BROWNE: You made a big mistake — it takes time to do that.

MR. JAMES: I am not talking in the sense of campaigning, actual campaigning, I am talking about being able to cover a district here compared to what it is to cover Fogo or any other

district on the Northeast Coast — geographical areas.

There is one other point, Sir, that is the point the Honourable Leader of the Opposition made when he said one third of the population, or probably a greater part, I don't know, he used some fraction or other of wealth and income of the Province of Newfoundland which is earned right here in the city of St. John's and in Corner Brook and Grand Falls — That is only partly true — it only comes here indirectly, it does not come here directly — Grand Falls and Corner Brook are only possible because there are loggers living in Gander Bay and over in Carmanville and in Springdale. The money might be paid out through the banks in Grand Falls and Corner Brook but don't forget it is the people living in those other districts which also require representation which make this result possible. In St. John's the Capital City, with its commercial life, its banks, and centre of commerce, these things are only possible because we have people fishing in Joe Batts Arm and it is time we started to realize these things, and realize these people living in these areas, primary producers, contributing all the way along the line to the commercial life of St. John's, and that the mill at Grand Falls and the mill at Corner Brook is made possible only because these people do exist and are primary producers and live in very scattered areas. It would not do for us to bring in all the fishermen on the Northeast Coast and concentrate them in St. John's and all the loggers on the northeast coast and concentrate them in Gander, Grand Falls or Corner Brook; you would have quite a different Province than we have today if you did that. So that it is a matter, Sir, of being able to divide up the Province from a

geographical point of view so that the districts would be adequately represented, not on the basis of population. It is impossible, Sir, impossible to do so; and not on the basis of wealth because all of the people in Newfoundland contribute to all of the wealth produced in Newfoundland — that is nonsense, sheer nonsense — And if you start this Bill all over again and start from Quirpon and up the shore to re-distribute it would be exactly the same problem that you have now, you would be no better off and no worse off — I think the government has done a very good job therefore, I am voting against the amendment.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the amendment, and I am going to outdo the honourable member for Fogo, and am not going to talk as long as he did, because we might as well face the fact that this is a Government measure and is going to go through. But I do admit, Sir, that this amendment is sound and that the history of this Bill itself justifies the motion and justifies those who are going to support it. It is a matter of record that in the last session of the House a Redistribution Bill was prepared, and due to circumstances which we need not discuss that Bill died aborning. Then a new Bill was brought in providing for thirty-three seats, although the boundaries of these districts were to be altered from those originally suggested in the Redistribution Bill. Now after that Bill had been brought in, and presumably after it had received careful study, after it had been, one would assume, the subject of discussion in the Cabinet if not of all members of the government side of the House. Yet we were told it was found necessary to change that. Thirty-three members are not good enough, we are told. Port de Grave's

historical right to representation must be recognized. With that I have no quarrel. But, in order to balance the additional seat for Port de Grave some fancy juggling had to be done, and two seats have to be allocated. White Bay is dignified with an additional district. It is split in half, Harbour Main is not split in half but it is given an additional member. Now, Sir, if these changes can take place after consideration by the government and after mature consideration, I think we can assume it was given that; after the historical balance has been assessed and maintained, and it had to be then reshuffled in a matter of forty-eight hours, I submit, Mr. Speaker, there is every reason for the suggestion that a Select Committee should give the matter a fuller and more complete discussion. It may or may not be that such discussion would be friendly, I don't know. There seems to be a difference of opinion as to whether it would be. But certain it is, Mr. Speaker, that a Select Committee could give to this matter the concentrated attention that I submit it apparently has not received, when we find last minute alternations made. I am prepared to go along with the Honourable Minister of Finance, and say, quite truthfully, I cannot speak with any knowledge on all the changes proposed by this amendment. I can, however, speak on the obvious inconsistencies that the history of its passage so far has shown. In the light of that, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the amendment is justified and is deserving of support, little though I feel it is going to get.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the amendment. I am going to vote against it. I would also like to explain my part, if I played any part, in the division of Placentia and St. Mary's. I think the

honourable gentleman from St. John's West understands quite well why the division was made in Placentia and St. Mary's and I have not asked any member of this House or in the government to make any division in my district. That division was made to keep the proper denominational balance. I was told that the division would be made. I accepted it. As far as the geographical boundaries of this district is concerned I think it is positively correct. The two settlements that the honourable gentleman mentioned Branch and Point Lance are in St. Mary's Bay, and they are in St. Mary's District—I do not see anything wrong with that. He claims that we divided up a parish by doing that. How is a parish divided by making a political line. We are not building a fence around them. I have no doubt that the people of Branch and St. Brides can mingle just as freely as ever. Because there is a line now dividing Branch and St. Brides into two districts, I would say is not of the slightest interest to the people who live there. It is not of the slightest interest to me politically, I might say, because I was perfectly ready to go back to the present district of Placentia, St. Mary's, and I have no doubt that they would give me a majority again as they did in two elections there, in which the honourable gentleman opposite was interested.

MR. BROWNE: In St. Brides and Branch?

MR. POWER: I would say in the two settlements of Branch and Point Lance too I received a substantial vote in the Federal Election.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order — I maintain, Sir, a reference to any vote received in these various areas is not strictly relevant to this particular amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I will have to uphold that point of order. I can hardly see what bearing they would have.

MR. POWER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I am not being irrelevant, because I have listened to so much irrelevancy here since I came into this House that I may say I am heartily sick of them. I would be the last one to continue that.

Anyway, the honourable gentleman complains that I have done something sinister, politically, in the division of Placentia and St. Mary's. I maintain that I don't care where the line is drawn in that district. I suppose it must be drawn somewhere, and for it to be drawn geographically, I suppose is as good a way as any other. I informed the honourable gentleman that as far as the District of St. John's was concerned and as far as the division there was concerned I did not take any part in that.—Certain people made a study of the denominational division in that district and I think they drew the line as fairly as they could.—It would make no difference. I am quite sure, as we could not please the honourable gentleman on the other side of the House. I am also quite sure that no matter what kind of bill or what kind of redistribution it would be, it would be far from perfect, because, I suppose, it would be impossible to draw up such a bill and make a perfect distribution of the different districts in Newfoundland, there are so many things to complicate that. First of all there is the denominational balance which must be kept. Secondly there is the geographical difficulties, and I would say this: If Grand Falls now elected two members instead of one they must be better off than they were in the old bill, and if Corner Brook can now

elect two members to the House of Assembly instead of one they must also be better off. So I don't know why all the talk of the injustices that have been done. Harbour Main has two representatives, because of reasons that we all understand. I know the honourable gentleman opposite would be the first one to raise the roof if the balance in that particular was not maintained.

Now, Sir, I have never picked a fight with anyone in this House. I am not given to insulting people. I like to be on good terms with everyone, and I am sorry if I have made remarks in this House that were ungentlemanly, in the heat of argument. But I will say this: whatever I said was not half enough if I were to pay back the honourable gentleman for all that he has said and done to me over a period of years.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: I don't remember having done anything injurious to the honourable gentleman except to have defeated him in one election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How about the tape measure?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BROWNE: I don't know what you are talking about.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How about the eggs?

MR. BROWNE: Oh the eggs! I thought they were your eggs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable the Minister of Finance has the floor.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, during the past year and a half or two years I have been engaged in building a house on Portugal Cove Road.

I think a good many other people in St. John's have been building houses—that is quite popular—

MR. HOLLETT: In what district?

MR. POWER: I don't know. For the sake of this argument I don't mind too much, it won't make any difference. Anyway in the process of building a house.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable gentleman in order, telling us about house construction?

MR. SPEAKER: I think it is difficult to see how the honourable member's domicile problems can affect this amendment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is possibly leading up to a point—Possibly he could be allowed to lay the foundation of his argument.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member does not know what district his house is in, therefore I don't see how he could possibly make a point.

MR. POWER: I assume my house is in St. John's North. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I attended a luncheon at Government House and was seated beside the honourable gentleman from St. John's West, and he said to me:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the honourable gentleman—I know what he is going to say—I would give him the opportunity on some other occasion—But I was interrupted so frequently by the Premier this afternoon when speaking—Anytime when he got a chance he pointed out I was not in order—Now the honourable gentleman speaking is not in order by bringing in those remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. It has nothing whatever to do with the bill and the

subject under debate. The remarks might be interesting but certainly have nothing to do with the amendment.

MR. POWER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, most interesting. Anyway, Sir, I won't bother about that—you know about it anyway. The honourable member for St. John's West seems to have a particular reason, I don't know what it is, for attending to my affairs. Some people think that that is "nosy" on his part. I don't know if it is or not. It is probably just his public spiritedness. If that is it I am prepared to accept that may be it. Then he should not let it stop there. I think he should go out on the highways and byways and see where bad curves should be straightened out. That would be a fine pastime for the honourable gentleman if he is interested in the public.

MR. BROWNE: It might take the Minister of Public Works to do that—That is some of his duties.

MR. POWER: Anyway, Sir, I believe if the honourable gentleman is as public spirited as he would have us believe, he would go out on the highways and byways and do something about these curves. That would be a fine thing, and would remove some monuments there that are quite undesirable.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, it is funny for the Premier, to hear disparaging remarks about members on this side of the House. But I suggest, Sir, this is entirely out of order. I have no objections, on a suitable occasion, to debate the matter, but I would not be allowed, Mr. Speaker, to debate the point he is raising now.

MR. POWER: At any rate this redistribution bill has been consid-

ered carefully by the members of the government who were entrusted with drafting it. I know that there will be something wrong with any redistribution bill. Nothing could be perfect, above all a Redistribution Bill. If the House feels that the District of Placentia and St. Mary's should not be split up, I have not the slightest interest one way or the other. I am against the amendment. I think it was the Honourable Leader of the Opposition who said that it was ridiculous to have several thousand urban voters elect a member and so few rural voters, or words to that effect.

MR. HOLLETT: I never used the words at all.

MR. POWER: Anyway, you were arguing to that—you were arguing, too, against it. Anyway, that is what he was trying to argue. If that is ridiculous, well then the Redistribution Bills that have been introduced all across the Dominion must be ridiculous because the same thing applies in every Province, and if we are ridiculous among all the other ten provinces, then, Sir, we are only in style. I am sorry that I have to speak at all in this matter. I would much rather sit down and —

MR. SMALLWOOD: And listen to the oratory.

MR. POWER: That is right! I want to say I am voting against the amendment.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, what I have to say will be very brief. As the House can well imagine, I have listened with some interest to the remarks made by the honourable members on the other side with reference to the District of Labrador being proposed as two districts. I will not in any way be personal. But I cannot

help expressing the feeling that the honourable member who spoke first knows absolutely nothing about Labrador, and the honourable gentleman who succeeded him knows very little more. They have chosen to lay some stress on the almost casual remarks the honourable the Premier made a few days ago when introducing the bill when he spoke of the Territory of Labrador being one hundred and twelve thousand square miles, and drew a contrast between the two, and said Labrador South, which the honourable gentleman assumed to be my district, by what means I am at a loss to know. I hope it is. I am getting older and the southern district involves a little less travel—but they chose to lay some stress on the disparity between the areas—Labrador South is about one-sixth of the whole area of Labrador, but actually the man most competent in all the Province, A. B. Turner, put it at ten thousand square miles. I also have the area of the five largest districts of the island of Newfoundland, and I find the largest one, according to the proposed redistribution is just over five thousand. Grand Falls is just over five thousand and White Bay, Burgeo and LaPoile, St. Barbe and St. George's in that order go down to three thousand square miles. However, the point the Honourable the Premier meant to lay stress on, as I think the honourable the Premier would recollect, is the fact that Labrador has a tremendous coastline and all the settlements are stretched along that coastline. It is so vast that nobody in the world today, at this very moment, knows how long it is. Therefore I did again get the people most competent to do so and take off the coastline in proposed districts of Labrador South and that coastline, includ-

ing the major indentation (remember the settlements are in the headland outside and in the bottom of some of these bays) and that coastline is 1,778 miles and that is the coastline which, whoever is the member for that half has to travel. Here again might be an enlightening fact, in that coastline of 1,778 miles there are seventy-three settlements by the last Federal census.

MR. BROWNE: Speaking of Labrador South?

DR. ROWE: Yes, 1,178 miles and 73 settlements.

MR. BROWNE: How far up the river do you go?

DR. ROWE: As a matter of fact I have them listed, but time does not allow me—I hope we shall have the opportunity of hearing the honourable the Premier summarize this debate before 11:00 o'clock, but if time permits I could read out a list of some fifty settlements.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the honourable member could leave that for committee.

DR. ROWE: If honourable members care to look at the map they will see Port Hope Simpson is probably the deepest, apart from the settlements in Sandwich Bay. There are 73 settlements, big and small, which incidentally can only be conveniently visited during four or five months of the year. Perhaps I could even narrow it down still more. All the world knows Labrador is afflicted by ice in the spring and has a very stormy winter and fall, and has probably the roughest coastline in the world, the Straits of Belle Isle. But every one of these 73 settlements want to have a visit from their member. I have made four visits to Labrador, and to

my infinite regret, there are three or four small settlements, and three or four small ones in the south I have not as yet been able to visit. There is hardly a mail passes that I do not get a letter from some of these asking: "When are you going to visit us?" And, Mr. Speaker, they are entitled to visits. When the honourable member speaks of seventeen thousand in St. John's and speaks of Corner Brook and Grand Falls—there is not a day or hardly a day within the district here in St. John's area when any man in the district cannot have access to the citizens and constituents. But the people of Labrador do not have that access. And when the honourable gentleman speaks about the need, the work, the duties, the responsibilities of the members today no longer being equal to what they were fifty, sixty or a hundred years ago, that, in my opinion, is a lot of eye-wash. The honourable member knows that every member in the House here, including himself, if he represented an area outside St. John's, never a mail passed but he receives letters in great quantity dealing with old age pensions—I wonder if my honourable friend from Fortune Bay ever received any letters dealing with old age pensions, unemployment insurance, dependent allowances? I wonder if the honourable gentleman reads the papers or not, if so, he would recollect that last year, owing to intervention on the part of the member for Labrador, a case closed by the Federal Department was re-opened and as a result the largest retroactive payment ever made in all Canada, eight hundred dollars to one old man and \$760 to his wife.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the honourable gentleman allow me? As to who receives letters about welfare matters, I would point out to the

honourable gentleman, one time Deputy Minister of Public Welfare, time after time the member told these people to write him.

DR. ROWE: Yes, and received a good deal of criticism, Mr. Speaker, for the time I was on the air. But it is a pity there was not more radio information given to our people. But time is going, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say once more, there are 73 settlements, big and small, on Labrador South. In Labrador North there are not so many settlements there, but fifteen, and as somebody has already indicated, half of the population is concentrated in Goose Bay area, and the others in seven or eight settlements. It is pointed out this division of Labrador, Mr. Speaker, is in accord with the great democratic principle and traditions which has been established and recognized in every part of the free world today, and that is the principle that where you have people scattered over a great stretch of territory these people will have greater influence on a per capita basis than people in congested areas. If that were not so—in fact, what I take to be the recommendation of the Opposition, if that were put into effect across Canada then the City of Montreal would run the great Province of Quebec and the City of Toronto would run Ontario. If it were in effect in the United States, four states of the union would govern the forty-eight states of the union. That is one of the principles which guided the government in making up the present Redistribution Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am against this amendment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is much need for me to speak at any length to this

amendment. But I should like to begin by offering a word of congratulation, if I may, without opening myself to the suspicion of wishing to cause mischief, to the honourable and learned member for St. John's East who addressed himself very briefly and very assertively (if that is the correct word) to the subject of the amendment.

The main argument of the Opposition, it seems to me, in opposing this bill is that there is no reason for this Redistribution Bill. That is their main argument. They have a lot of detail to fill out that framework, but that is the main argument they have put forward, i.e. that there is no reason for it. Now the fact of the matter is that no reason needs to be given, it is the norm. We are merely restoring the norm, the normal, the conventional, the tradition. Before any person on the floor of this Chamber was born the people of Newfoundland were represented in this House by thirty-six members, before you were born, your Honour, and before the oldest member of this House was born, i.e., beginning in 1885, the representation in this House of the people of Newfoundland, not counting Labrador because Labrador was not represented, was thirty-six members. So it continued until 1925, forty years.

In 1925 it was changed upward. It was raised not lowered. It was raised from thirty-six to forty. But it remained at forty for only a few years, a very few years indeed. In 1928 forty members were elected, and in 1932, four years later, the number had been reduced to twenty-seven. Why? The honourable and learned member for St. John's West told us why, and I took down his words. I do not write shorthand but I got it pretty exact. He said: "Under the stringency of

1931 the government was forced to reduce the number to twenty-seven." Precisely! Precisely! In the desperation of those desperate days the number was reduced to twenty-seven, and one election only was fought and won under that bill. So that from 1885 to 1932, forty-seven years, out of that forty seven years this House consisted of thirty-six members for forty years. So all we are doing is to restore the normal. That is all! That is all, we are restoring what is conventional, what is normal, and we are handsomely justified in doing it, because if there was any justification in the eyes of the world for having two hundred thousand people, and fewer than two hundred thousand people, represented here by thirty-six members, there is ample reason, surely, surely, surely there is ample reason why four hundred thousand people should be represented at least by as many as represented the two hundred thousand and fewer than two hundred thousand. But what debate can do! How you can be led away in debate from the reality, from realism, into a cockeyed world where everything is like Alice in Wonderland; getting away from the simple, common truth, the common realities. Indeed in such a debate as that all sorts of dark and sinister shadows begin to appear that appear to be ominous and sinister, just from talk—talk, talk, talk.

Now my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West brought out the fantastic argument, the most fantastic I have ever heard on a matter such as this, when he spent one hour this afternoon showing the changes that have occurred, socially, economically, constitutionally and politically in Newfoundland in recent years. He showed that old age pensions have now become a vast thing

running into millions of dollars, he showed that many government boards have been created, workmen's compensation and Public Utilities, etc. He tells of the great increase in the civil service and of the growth of local self-government, etc., etc. Then having cited these changes using them as a piece of evidence that he lays before us to prove his point that the membership in this House has become unimportant or has become far less important than it was. That is his Ottawa background. It must have been a fearful wrench to step down from being a statesman to being a little parish politician.—What indignity.—Shades of Jimmy Durante—Mr. Speaker, he went on to tell us that nowadays—frankly I did not see the connection but I took down the words.—Nowadays people have hand pumps and electric pumps, and he gave that as another reason, and he mentioned the "Doyle News." He mentioned all these and many more points of that type he piled up one by one, one on top of the other, until he had a "leaning Tower of Pisa," of reasons why we ought not to have thirty-six members.

But, Sir, whilst the civil service has been growing in Newfoundland in these last twenty-five or thirty years—I take the period he mentioned. He mentioned twenty-five or thirty years as the period of his reviewal—and while more and more hand-pumps and electric pumps have been coming into use and the news broadcasts on the radio stations have been increasing and old age pensions and government boards have been increased in Newfoundland and local government has been increasing and expanding; all of which, remember, he cited as reasons why we ought not to have this bill. But have not the same things been happening in every Province of

Canada? Is all this unique to Newfoundland? Have these changes occurred only here and not elsewhere across this great nation? And in this great nation, in these various legislatures in the past twenty-five or thirty years have there not been redistribution bills, and have not these redistribution bills called for increased representation of the people in the Peoples' Houses? The answer is these changes have occurred in other provinces, and notwithstanding these changes which were used here as arguments for no redistribution they in the other provinces have used as reason for redistributions.

MR. COURAGE: They have television too.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, they have television now. Mr. Speaker, I was very careful on opening day and in this debate to remind the House of a fact which is well known—I did not acquaint the House of the fact but merely reminded it that universally it takes more people in urban areas to elect a member to the Peoples' House than it does in rural areas, or outport areas, not because the people of the urban areas are less intelligent, not because of any natural disability on their part, but by deliberate policy, by deliberate decision of the Legislatures of the world. It is almost universally admitted, except by the Opposition here, that it ought to take more people, it ought to take large groups or units of people in urban areas to elect a member to a Peoples' House than in rural areas. Now I reminded the House of that fact. Then I cited the actual situation right across Canada, and I reminded the House of the fact that in the Province of New Brunswick it takes one and a half persons to one, i.e. 150% as many persons to elect a member to the Legislature

of New Brunswick in urban as in rural areas. In Nova Scotia the ratio is 1¾%, i.e. 175 persons in an urban area where it takes one hundred in a rural area. In Ontario it is two to one. It takes two hundred to elect a member in urban areas where it takes 100 in rural areas. In Saskatchewan it takes two-and-a-quarter to one; in Quebec two-and-a-third to one; in British Columbia three to one; in Manitoba four to one; in Alberta seven to one.

Now we most closely resemble, I believe the Province of New Brunswick and the Province of Nova Scotia in this regard. We did not introduce this principle. This principle was introduced elsewhere and introduced before we were born, and for excellent reasons. It is recognized throughout the world that the people of the countryside, what we call the outports, are socially sounder than the people of the cities and urban areas. I did not discover that fact. I did not make that fact. But it is almost universally agreed that the great yeomanry, the great peasantry, the great farming class, the great countryside class, the great outport class, put whatever name you like on it, and there are many other names that could be used, are socially and politically the soundest people of any country. That is why representation of such people, people of that type, of that class, is admittedly something that ought to be greater and bigger in a House than from the urban areas. Now that is universal. That is not just Newfoundland. But my honourable friends opposite have not once referred to that principle. Instead they have contented themselves with taking this district and comparing it with that, and that community and comparing it with this, taking as a basis, St. John's. St. John's

to them is the norm. That is the basis, the yardstick, St. John's is the criterion.

MR. HOLLETT: Grand Falls.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Grand Falls was mentioned once or twice, and St. John's was mentioned "ad nauseum" by the Opposition. That was their only dealing with this great principle. That was the only thing they had to say about it.

Now Mr. Speaker, there are one or two points: — Why does the line separating Humber District, Humber East from Humber West, run down through Corner Brook, i.e. the brook itself, the river, the brook that gives the place its name. Why it is being taken as the line, Well, I will tell the honourable gentleman, and satisfy him on that point at least if I do not on anything else. It was necessary to split Humber District into two because it had nearly thirty thousand population and so had to be represented by not one but two members. We had adopted the principle and we have followed it through although we have been forced at the last moment to qualify that principle in one instance, and one only, namely, in the district of Harbour Main. But we had adopted the principle of single constituencies. So we decided to make Humber District two separate constituencies, each represented in this House by one member. We had to make a boundary. Now, if you take the District of Humber and count the people of each settlement in the towns and settlements in Humber District and try to get it roughly half and half, and you cannot have it precisely so unless you take people up bodily and move them from one part of the district to another, otherwise you cannot get an exact half of the people of a district. The first thing we discovered

there was that if we took all of Corner Brook and put it in either one or the other of these two districts we made it ridiculously lopsided and top-heavy, so that we could not put Corner Brook in either one or the other. Now that is from the standpoint of population. But, there is another standpoint, the standpoint of prestige. So a sensible thing was done by running the line where it was run. Now we could not run the line west and east. It now runs north and south. We could not run it east and west. We could not find a line you could cross east and west in Humber District to get half and half, it had to be drawn in the direction in which it was drawn. Now if you run a line down, what my honourable friend calls "Corner Brook River," in Humber West you put all of Corner Brook West and all of Curling and on up the bay and in Corner Brook East you put Corner Brook Townsite and Corner Brook East and Humbermouth. So that each member that will come into this House from what is now Humber District will come in representing Corner Brook, each of them. One will not be inferior to the other, one will not be able to look down his nose at the other, and the people in each of these two constituencies have part of Corner Brook. It is a very sensible arrangement.

There are other little details of that type which are much better discussed in Committee of the Whole, I hold. When these points are raised I will be glad, and I am quite certain my honourable colleague, the Solicitor General, who is not in the Chamber at the moment, will be glad to give the House any information.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, will the Premier allow me? The honourable the Premier mentioned the principle

on which Corner Brook is divided. Would he tell me on what principle St. John's is divided?

MR. SMALLWOOD: On that, if you begin with the principle that it ought to take more people in an urban area to elect a member than in a rural area — if you begin with that — then you are led inevitably to the conclusion that the eighty or ninety thousand people of the Capital, not only the actual municipality of St. John's but the immediate surrounding suburban areas, all of which is one homogeneous area, and should be represented by fewer people per thousand of population than elsewhere in the island. We were led to that conclusion, and so must do so. We have given to St. John's in this Bill, and to Bell Island, which used to be the old St. John's East and St. John's West electing each of them three members, that is six — In all we have given to that area six members.

MR. BROWNE: The population has doubled.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The population has increased very considerably. We have nevertheless stuck to that principle. Now if we were going to have a House of forty or forty-five or forty-six, then that area would have to be represented by more than six members. Although St. John's has grown, so also has the great District of Humber and the great District of Grand Falls and St. Georges' Port au Port. Some of these have grown even more and at a much greater rate than St. John's has grown.

Now I will admit to the House quite frankly that we ought to have made it thirty-six, quite boldly, at the beginning and not thirty-three. We thought of making a sort of compromise between twenty-eight and thirty-six.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the Honourable the Premier allow me? I have yet to learn on what principle the St. John's boundaries were drawn up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right, I will explain that. We determined, we never wavered, never had any hesitation nor doubt in our minds in this, we determined that we would follow the old traditional principle of representation. If it was to be thirty-six that would mean three twelves, if it was to be thirty-three that would mean three elevens. Now with regard to one great section of our population exactly a third of it, not saying who they are, you will find it is next to impossible, indeed it is impossible, quite impossible, to divide them up so they will elect either the eleven or the twelve members, as the case may be, in the way that you could divide up the other twenty-two or twenty-four. Where they are, they are there in great numbers but where they are not, they are present in large minorities. But you cannot have a constituency represented by the minority. It has to be represented by the majority. These people are in large minorities in a number of districts, so they do not count in those constituencies by way of determining the compilation of the members for that district — if the honourable gentleman follows me and I am sure he does — Therefore, where they are in a clear majority you are driven to this expediency, and it is an expediency in making up that twelve, of giving over representation where there is over population because you are not giving any representation at all where there are big minorities — I am speaking of the traditional balance now and not the number at all — Consequently when we decided to raise the total from thirty-three to thirty-six we had to find one each, three

new constituencies, and had to raise the total of each to twelve so that we would have three twelves instead of three elevens. Now where are we going to get them?

MR. HOLLETT: St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, St. John's, the Opposition would say, that. But that involves abandoning the principle that we had adopted in common with every Province in Canada and in common with legislatures throughout the world. It would mean our abandoning a principle universally accepted, the principle of taking far more people in an urban area to elect a member than people in a rural area.

MR. BROWNE: But could I not draw to the Honourable the Premier's attention that in the last, say, forty-five years the district of Harbour Main has only increased four hundred whereas the District of St. John's has doubled.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. My honourable friend refuses to face the fact, refuses point blank to face my argument. I admit quite candidly that two members for the District of Harbour Main is high. There is no doubt about that. But if you are to take our people as being made up of three great divisions, the House knows what they are, and one of these segments is so distributed geographically that you cannot get twelve constituencies that would be normal and conventional, in number and geographical areas. We can do that with the other two great groups, but we cannot do it with this one particular group. We cannot do it. It is not my fault. Don't blame me. I did not put a big minority of them, up in Fortune Bay. I did not put a big minority of them in Humber nor did I put a big minority of them, as there is, in Bonavista

North. But they are there. They are all over this island. A very considerable and important and highly respected minority, and they can't be represented in this House by people of their own traditional beliefs.

MR. HOLLETT: Why?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If you follow the traditional division, in Newfoundland, and I did not establish that, and take one third, for all of Newfoundland, one third of the membership of this House, where are we going to get that one-third if we cannot get it by electing — minority candidates. We must get it by getting over-representation from a geographical standpoint for certain constituencies, hence two members for Harbour Main — Everyone knows that. That is what makes me angry. Honourable gentleman who know it won't admit it. I am trying to be fair. I am trying to be honest in this thing, and I know that to be honest in this and to be fair means necessarily an appearance of inconsistency. I know it does, but I cannot help that. My duty as political leader is to see that our people are to have that opportunity. Now if the people in Ferryland District wanted to elect me, personally, I believe they would, and I believe I would give my honourable friend, the Solicitor General a hard run for it in Ferryland District, and as for my honourable and learned friend opposite, I would trim the socks off him in Ferryland District.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps you would.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not perhaps. I am sure I would.

MR. BROWNE: There was a time —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but they

have seen the light. They have seen the light there — You cannot keep a good man down.

MR. SPEAKER: I might remind the honourable members that at 11:00 o'clock I shall have to see 11:00 o'clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, could we have an extension of ten minutes? Would the House agree to that? Ten minutes beyond 11:00 o'clock? Your Honour would not mind that.

Agreed that the time extend ten minutes beyond 11:00 o'clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have tried in this matter to be fair to the great traditional balance we have in Newfoundland. Now a lot of people don't agree with that tradition. I do. I agree with it and try to carry it out. It is my duty. I feel bound in fairness and common sense as well as in honour to carry it out. Well it is carried out now. But that does not stop any people in any constituency electing any one they like. That is their business. But we must provide opportunity for them to be properly represented in this House. If this Bill passes, each of these three groups can be represented here now by twelve members. That is the way we have arranged it. It will take a lot more people in St. John's to elect a member than in rural areas, as for instance Labrador, a lot more. I don't think there is any hardship in that. The people in St. John's are right here in the Capital City. The House is here. The newspapers are here, the two "Dailies." Unconsciously every Cabinet Minister is influenced by the sentiments of St. John's, therefore it had an enormously important position in comparison, and my honourable friends ought to recognize it and admit it, an enormously important point —

St. John's exercises an influence over the affairs of this House and over the conduct of the government, an influence far out of proportion, because the House is located in the city of St. John's, the members of the House live in St. John's, the members of the Crown live and do their work in St. John's, and if St. John's had only one member—

MR. HIGGINS: Don't — Don't make it as bad as that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, that is going to extremes. We will say if St. John's had only two, we will say two in case if one were sick, he could second a motion — If St. John's were represented in this Chamber by just two members the St. John's viewpoint would still be handsomely represented here and could be voiced and championed.

MR. BROWNE: I was going to say, you have given two members to Harbour Main with only nine thousand people while St. John's North have people along the same road, with fifteen thousand people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But the District of St. John's North could not elect one of the twelve I have in mind, just as my honourable friend cannot be the mother of his children but can only be the father. My honourable friend knows full well what I mean when I say St. John's North cannot elect one of these twelve. Of course it can if it wants to but won't in all probability. Therefore to make absolutely sure that one third of our population shall have at least the opportunity if it wishes to exercise it, they may not, but if they do, they may exercise the opportunity of electing twelve of their own people to represent them in this Chamber. But don't

look to St. John's North to do that. Look to Harbour Main to do it, and they will. Now is not that reasonable?

Now there is another point, and this is much more delicate and a little difficult to explain. The people I am talking about are themselves subdivided into three places, and Harbour Main happens to be the only opportunity that that great number who, for the most part are minorities — they are minorities in the districts of Port de Grave, Harbour Grace, Carbonear, Bay de Verde, Trinity South, Trinity North, Bonavista South, Bonavista North, Gander, Grand Falls, Fogo, Twillingate, Green Bay, White Bay, Labrador, and the only opportunity they have of being represented directly in this House is through the District of Harbour Main. Now does my honourable friend see the exact reason— To make up and find that twelve, you must have two in Harbour Main. But if the Honourable gentleman does not want to see it, of course he will not see it.

MR. HOLLETT: On that point, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how the Honourable the Premier would explain Grand Falls away in that particular instance?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Grand Falls is included in that very thing. There is only one district in that whole area, only one.

MR. HOLLETT: Grand Falls?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would some of my honourable friend's, colleagues, explain it to him in words of one syllable.

MR. HOLLETT: Look up the denominational aspect of the District of Grand Falls.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You can't make one there. It cannot be done, because although it is a large minority scattered through a very large area — if they will move — Oh sure, if they will move from where they are and come all together, sure, then instead of two in Harbour Main we could have one in Harbour Main and one in Grand Falls — but they are scattered. Mr. Speaker, this is distasteful and I do not want to be dragged any further into it. I say that while this Bill is not perfect it is sound, it is good. There are some flaws in it. Some of these can be ironed out in Committee of the Whole, but on balance the Bill is a good one, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, the amendment should be defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: The main question is that this Bill be now read a second time. The amendment is to the effect that all the words after "that" be deleted. This motion is now put in the form that the words deleted do stand part of the question. Therefore the motion I shall put to the House is, "That the words this Bill be now read a second time" do stand part of the question:

MR. SPEAKER: The "Ayes" have it.

MR. BROWNE: Divide.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Divide.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that the words "this Bill be now read a second time" do stand part of the question: The "Ayes" please stand and resume their seats at the call of the Clerk.

Honourable the Premier, Honourable the Attorney General, Honourable the Minister of Education, Honourable the Minister of Finance, Hon-

ourable Mr. Lewis, Honourable Minister of Labour, Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, Honourable the Minister of Public Works, Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, Mr. Button, Mr. Janes, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Brown, Mr. Courage, Mr. Canning, (15).

MR. SPEAKER: The "Nayes" please stand.

Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. W. J. Browne, Mr. J. Higgins, Mr. E. Fogwill (4).

MR. SPEAKER: The "Ayes" have it, 15 to 4, which disposes of the amendment, and the Bill, "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act" is thereby read a second time.

On motion bill ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand we are not allowed to speak on second reading?

MR. SPEAKER: The Bill is automatically read a second time when the amendment is disposed of.—The House has voted that "The Bill be now read a second time" do stand part of the question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining orders of the day do now stand deferred, and the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday at 3:00 of the clock. I think it is understood that at that time we will debate the report and recommendations of the Royal Commission on Forestry.

On motion the House then adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 6, at 3.00 of the clock.

WEDNESDAY, April 6, 1955.

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

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne contained a word of welcome to Mr. M. J. Boylen, and expressed the Government's pleasure over the fact that that famous mining promoter had turned his attention to Newfoundland. It is with profound satisfaction that I announce the first fruits of Mr. Boylen's interest in Newfoundland. The old workings of the Tilt Cove Mining Area, which was closed down in 1902 have been reopened by Mr. Boylen and his organization. This work commenced in October past, and they have now dewatered the old shaft, which is one of five hundred feet comprising eight working levels. They have also cleaned out the sixteen hundred foot tunnel and carried out a diamond drilling programme with their underground machinery, Mr. Boylen has reported to me as follows:

"The result of this work has been most gratifying to date. We can see possibilities of at least five million tons of good copper ore above the five hundred feet horizon and the geological conditions would indicate the mine to be a deep seated one. The work could safely be projected to great depths. To project it to just the one thousand foot horizon, ten million tons or more of copper ore can be expected. The mine workings and ore zones are open in every direction and are improving with depth. The overall grade looks to be between 2½ and 3 per cent copper. Premium grade magnetic concentrate will also be made, as well as recoverable gold. Silver has not as yet been assayed,

nor has the nickel, but we do know that these two minerals exist, although the quantities are undetermined at this time. In addition to the above minerals a good clean pyrite concentrate will also be made.

"It is our intention to proceed immediately with plans for a 2,000 ton concentrating mill at Tilt Cove, with the first unit of this mill operating at 1,000 tons of ore a day. As work goes along and the ore findings justify further expansion, we can then add to this at little extra cost. We are fully financed for a 2,000 ton unit, and will be proceeding immediately to sink a new three compartment shaft to a depth of 1,000 feet."

Mr. Speaker, the House will be most interested to hear this statement from Mr. Boylen, namely: "I consider this development and ore deposit to be of major importance, and this mine will be brought into production by Maritimes Mining Corporation, Limited, and Bathurst Mining Corporation Limited. These companies have received firm commitments of \$1,500,000 in each treasury and they already have in addition to this \$500,000 in each treasury. Furthermore, options outstanding on the two treasuries will bring in an additional \$6,000,000 when it is required."

Falconbridge Nickel Mines, Limited are participating with Mr. Boylen in financing of this operation, although Mr. Boylen has direct control of the management.

The Bathurst and Maritime companies have also acquired jointly from Falconbridge Nickel Mines the latter's Cull Pond property. They will proceed this year to sink a three-compartment production shaft to a depth of 800 feet and develop the ore

bodies already lined up. The tonnage indicated is approximately 5,000,000 tons of copper ore, and the ore deposit seems to be open at depth. Other good possibilities also exist on the property. Mr. Boylen tells me: "This property could justify a 1,000 ton mill operation." Mr. Boylen's statement says: "They will doubtlessly carry that out but not until they have first brought the Tilt Cove property into production."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Boylen informs me that his organization has under its control, through options, other deposits in that section of Newfoundland that they consider to be valuable. Anacon Lead Mining Limited, United Montabaun Mining Limited, New Hurricane Mining Limited, Kontiki Lead and Zinc Mining Limited, Keyboycon Mining Limited, Uddlen Mining Limited, Nudulama Mining Limited and New Highbridge Mining Company Limited, all six of which form part of Mr. Boylen's organization, are all of them acquiring properties along that part of our coast and inland from it, and are actively working their undertakings this year. They are all amply financed, Mr. Boylen informs me, for such exploration work. In addition to this Mr. Boylen's Engineering Company will carry out extensive studies of the 1,000 square mile concession which the Government has ceded to him.

"We feel," Mr. Boylen says, "that this part of your province has been greatly overlooked and that the conditions there certainly warrant extensive work."

The fact, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Boylen has great faith in this part of Newfoundland is well known in the words he used in a letter to me, namely: "I am sure the people of New-

foundland will be very pleased to hear the great news when you announce it from the floor of the House of Assembly on April 6th and I am sure it will give you great joy in doing so, as it certainly gives me to be able to announce that we have accomplished what we set out to do."

It gives me great joy, and I am sure that it will give all Newfoundlanders great joy to know that Mr. Boylen and his organization are so deeply committed to a great programme of exploration and development in this province. For me personally it is profoundly pleasant to see our policy of mineral development get such a vigorous push ahead as I am privileged to announce today.

Your Honour, I should like to draw your attention and that of the House to some very distinguished ladies and gentlemen in our Chamber today. In the first place we have Mrs. Hillier of Grand Falls. She is accompanied by her son, David Hillier, who has just won the public speaking contest for the Town of Grand Falls and who has come to St. John's to take part in the finals, I believe before Rotary Club tomorrow. I am sure that members of this House for whom public speaking is so necessary a part of their equipment in trade will have the kindest wishes to express to David Hillier and indeed to the other contestants in this island-wide public speaking contest.

Then we have here a distinguished American citizen in the person of the Consul General of the United States. He is accompanied by a number of officers of the U.S. Air Force, who have special interest in seeing something at first hand of the British system of Parliamentary Procedure, which means to say, Mr. Speaker, we

arc all, while these gentlemen are present, going to be a little self-conscious, to make sure we give a good demonstration. Now of course my honourable friends opposite may differ with me as to what might be a good demonstration. I might feel a real old-fashioned, rousing parliamentary row would be the best demonstration of the British system of Parliamentary procedure. I hope my honourable friends opposite will accommodate us in the matter. Finally I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that we have present today, I assume for the purpose of hearing the debate later on, on the report of their recommendations as Royal Commission on Forestry, two members of the Forestry Commission, and I am sure that the House is delighted to see them present.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I may, first let me say how pleased we are on this side of the House to hear the announcement just made by the Premier relevant to the copper mines in this country. I do hope the announcement will be followed by active mining operations and that all success come therefrom. I would not say right off the bat that that development is the direct result of the mining policy of the Government. I am inclined to think this is one particular company which has gone ahead under its own steam and without any pumping into the machine by the Treasury of this country. I am very glad indeed they have found something worthwhile.

I was some seven years, I believe, in Grand Falls, and I do wish to join with the Premier and the whole House in welcoming here this young orator of tomorrow. I am very proud to see him and his parents here and I am quite sure that the Honourable Min-

ister of Public Works will join with me personally in welcoming this young chap. I hope the day will come when he will stand up here and will live to be in the Opposition sometime, because it is grand to be in opposition on occasions.

We are all very happy indeed to see the U. S. Consul General here, and in that connection we are proud to see the fine young men who have accompanied him here today. We all remember the recent past when the world suffered, all of the democratic world, and depended on men like these, their brothers, so many of whom gave their lives that we might come into this House today to argue and give even our own lives. It is a very happy occasion to welcome to this House the American Consul General and the young officers who are with him. I can assure him the people of Newfoundland have always had, and will always have in the future, nothing but the greatest regard for that great nation to the west of us, who, we hope, will buy a lot of our products generally and particularly when we get this copper mine going. We are very happy to have them here.

I am not going to say very much about the Commissioners on the Forestry Report, (they are all fine men, some personal friends of mine) lest I may today or tomorrow have to go to town on that report. I am very glad to see them here, particularly my friend, Mr. Goodyear, who I know has given of his best to the compilation of this report.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Presenting Petitions

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition by some 802 persons of Quirpon,

Forteau, Griquet, St. Lunaire, Noddy Bay, Spillard's Cove, Ha Ha Cove, Raleigh and other places all lying in the vicinity of the northern tip of the long peninsula, near the Straits of Belle Isle.

The people in these places desire to have a road built linking them with each other and with the high-road leading from the largest settlement of St. Anthony. They pointed out in their petition that a rather important fish plant is being built this year in Quirpon, as part of our great fishery development programme, and it would be most important for the places named to be connected with Quirpon and for all of these places and Quirpon to be connected with the highroad that leads into St. Anthony where there is operated also a large fish plant, the property now of the Fishery Products Limited.

Mr. Speaker, I give this petition my warmest support, and ask that it be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition tabled for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on various Bills begs leave to report that it has considered two Bills to it referred, "An Act Respecting the Consolidated Sale of Goods" and "An Act Respecting Bulk Sales," and the Committee recommends the same with some amendments.

On motion report received and adopted.

Giving Notice of Motion

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Registration of Deeds Act."

Giving Notice of Questions

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

When the management of the Birch Plant was transferred to the present operators was there an inventory of machinery and equipment made and checked by any Government official? If so, lay on the table a copy of such inventory certified by the official making the inventory.

If the accounts of the plant were audited at the time of the transfer or at any time; produce a copy of such audit duly certified.

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House the following information:

Were tenders called for the work of repairing the House of Assembly? If so, give the names of the parties tendering, the amounts of each tender, and how much has been spent to date on the said repairs. Give details of expenditure. Who is the party performing the work?

Answers to Questions

Question No. 35—In course of preparation.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries & Co-operatives): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table a reply to Question No. 21 on the Order Paper of March 29th.

QUESTION No. 21.—The following information is supplied by the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives in reply to questions by Mr. Malcolm Hollett :

1. Q. The total amount of moneys paid to the Newfoundland Fisheries Authority to date to cover cost of salaries, wages and travelling expenses for all personnel of the Authority. Give names of persons and amount paid each under these several headings.

A. Salaries and Wages

Harry G. Dustan	\$40,340.72
Harry C. Winsor	37,083.32
Ross Young	38,541.65
Ann Story	3,437.49
Patricia Thistle	2,779.37
Marie Mercer	2,044.37

124,226.70

Travelling Expenses

Harry G. Dustan	4,194.43
Harry C. Winsor	3,107.95
Ross Young	5,162.15
Clive Planta	2,149.51

14,614.04

2. Q. How much has been paid out for Technical Services and salaries and expenses under this item. And how much for Sundry Expenses.

A. Technical Services	2,854.94
Sundry Services	4.20

2,859.14

3. Q. What amounts have been paid out under the following headings in the Authority's grant; Fishing Demonstrations; General Engineering; Commercial Pilot Plants; and other headings:

A. Fishing Demonstrations	6,573.35
General Engineering	7,255.82
Commercial Pilot Plants	0.00

13,829.17

4. Q. How much money has been actually spent under Fisheries Development by the Authority at the following places: Quirpon, LaSclé, Seldom, Valleyfield, Badger's Quay, St. John's, Merasheen, Change Islands, Joe Batt's Arm, Twillingate, Catalina, Trepassey and any other fishing settlements? Give details as to what work has been accomplished in these places.

A. Quirpon	1,093.46	
LaScie	10,286.92	
Seldom	600.00	
Valleyfield — Badger's Quay		
St. John's		
Merasheen	1,511.05	
Change Islands Joe Batt's Arm Twillingate, Catalina, Trepassey—		
Fishery Products Limited	1,042,784.15	
Nfld Quick Freeze Ltd.	40,000.00	
		<u>1,096,275.57</u>
		<u>\$1,251,804.62</u>

5. Q. How much money is involved in acquiring those premises at Twillingate formerly owned or operated by Ashbourne's Ltd.? What was the purchase price and what does the property consist of?

A. Private Transaction between Fishery Products Limited and Ashbourne's Ltd.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would call your attention to Order 7 — "If at the hour of 6:00 p.m. except on Wednesday the business of the House is not concluded, Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock p.m. At the hour of 6:00 o'clock p.m. on Wednesday Mr. Speaker adjourns the House without question put. The House then stands adjourned until Thursday . . ."

I might say, Mr. Speaker, it may be necessary that the House meet tonight, and in any event it is not the present intention of the Government to ask that the House sit on tomorrow, Thursday, therefore, I would move at this juncture that this order be suspended for this sitting.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Government would be prepared to have it instead of 8:00 of the clock 8:30 of the clock?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If this motion carries, Mr. Speaker, it means only

that before we rise at 6:00 o'clock we can arrange it to an hour suitable to all members. We can decide that then.

Motion carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Attorney General if he is going to table the report from the Commissioners of Public Utilities which he promised to bring here?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I overlooked that, but I will be able to inform the House at its next sitting as to just what the position. I might have it for tonight, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the Day

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines & Resources): Mr. Speaker, I move that this House now adjourn.

The House will recall that during the past year the Government has had three Commissions of Inquiry at work.

and one less formal commission looking into our wildlife resources. The report of Wild Life was presented to the Government in the latter part of the calendar year, and about three weeks ago the Commission on Forestry presented its report, which report was subsequently presented to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor and then tabled in the House. At that time the Honourable the Premier intimated that time would be set aside at an appropriate time for debate on this report. With the agreement of the House this afternoon I made the motion that the House would now adjourn, which enables me to make some introductory remarks on this report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable in a way that the report was not available some weeks or some months before this Session of the House of Assembly. As it was, it was available the time that the Government was getting ready for the opening of the House, and it was tabled in the House at the time when the Honourable the Premier was concerned with a great many pieces of legislation and other matters of public importance, so it is very doubtful if all of us had the opportunity not only to read but to study and cogitate upon some of the findings of the Royal Commission, as that report is not a small report, and it covers some very important aspects of our economy and makes some very thought-provoking statements.

At the time that I tabled the report here I reviewed the terms of the Commission, and I gave the House some information on the composition of the Royal Commission itself. I do not propose today to repeat what I said on that occasion, as I don't think it is necessary. The Honourable the Premier has already welcomed those mem-

bers of the Royal Commission that are here today, and with them is Mr. Cameron whom I am sure the House will desire to welcome. I regret, Sir, as I am sure we all do, that the Chairman of the Commission, Major General Howard Kennedy, one of the world's outstanding figures in forestry is not able to be here with us today. It was his intention to be here and it was hoped he would be here. But unfortunately one of the States of the United States has for some months been clamouring for his services. So that, as soon as he terminated his services and his contract with us, which was at the date of the presentation of the report, he immediately took off to the State of Idaho where he is now doing some important studies into the forestry activities of that State.

As I stated before, I doubt very much if any of us members of the House have had an opportunity to study this report as it should be studied, for reasons which I think are obvious. Consequently I think I could do no better than to make a sort of rambling excursion through the report, chapter by chapter for perhaps the next ten or fifteen minutes or so, and make a brief statement about each chapter as I see it. During that time honourable members may have an opportunity to crystallize some of their thinking about the report and perhaps give thought to some of the statements which will be contained in the summaries of what I would give.

Now the copy of the report which we have is an advance copy and regrettably but unavoidably does not contain the maps and photographs which will be an integral and very necessary part of the report when it comes from the printers. This is a mimeographed copy of the report. The printed copy will of course be much

smaller and more convenient to handle, and will have the maps and charts and photographs. That report will be available to us in, I think, two or perhaps three weeks time.

The report starts out with the terms of the Commission itself, which I do not propose to go into now, as I have already done so. Then it gives the contents of the twenty chapters. If I very briefly give the names of the chapters we will have a fairly comprehensive idea as to the contents of the report itself.

Chapter 1, historical, Chapter 2 contains general observations; Chapter 3 deals with the pulp and paper industry in a general sense, Chapter 4, a very difficult chapter, I might say, deals with taxation. When I say difficult, I mean from the standpoint of laymen; Chapter 5 deals with forestry protection, Chapter 7 insects and diseases; Chapter 8 with the adequacy of pulp wood reserves in Newfoundland; Chapter 10 with the problems of the third paper mill; Chapter 11 deals with sawmills and other wood-using industries; Chapter 12 deals with the structure of the Department of Mines and Resources itself, which department is responsible for Forestry under the Government; Chapter 13 deals with and is devoted to Labrador; Chapter 14 reforestation; Chapter 15 Forestry Research; Chapter 16 management; Chapter 17 education; Chapter 18 legislation; Chapter 19 expenditure and Chapter 20 is a miscellaneous chapter dealing with a number of topics. The preface to this report tells something about the organization of the Commission and its activities. That chapter was made available to the press and radio by the Honourable the Premier at the time the report was presented, so I will not go into it now other than to say the Commission

visited every strategic part of the Province and that it travelled many thousands of miles by plane, by helicopter, by motor boat, by steamer and by motor car and jeep and on foot.

The report then goes on to summarize some of the principle recommendations as contained in the report itself later on. I will not go into that summary now but I will return to it later. Chapter 1 deals with a brief history of Forestry Development in Newfoundland, starting with the very earliest form of settlement in the country, that of John Guy. It pays tribute — and I know the House will wish note taken of this — to the first forestry officer the Province had in the person of the Late Col. Jack Turner, who did so much to fix our attention on the importance of forestry in our economy. Chapter 10 deals with and makes some comment about the early settlers' problems in 1610 with forest fire destruction, which was a very serious one. One fire alone at the head of Conception Bay destroyed sixty or seventy thousand acres of forest. It is, I think, and as the report shows later, as a result of this there is such a great portion of what we now call "barrens" near the coastline. This area was once covered with a good growth of forest, and it was destroyed not by one fire but by a succession of fires over the years.

Chapter 2 deals with and gives some general observations on the forest industries. It gives some interesting figures on the relationship or ratio of forestry in relation to our total economy. It gives, for example, the estimated income of all Newfoundland, I suppose what our friends in Ottawa call "The Gross National Product," and in this case would be "The Gross Provincial Product." It sets it at 204 million dollars in 1951, and shows that

of that amount 64 million dollars, or about 30%, was derived from our forest industries. Our exports, of course, for that year were valued at 59.6 million dollars, almost 60 million dollars, and for 1952 it was 62 million dollars. Chapter 2 also deals with a matter of very great importance to every member of this House and in fact to all our people, that is the "three-mile limit" and the unrestricted cutting of firewood on our Crown Land reserves. That chapter recommends that the concept of the three-mile limit be replaced by forest management areas and competent forest areas at as early a date as possible. It discusses also the problem of fuel, which is a historic one, and suggests that one way of reducing the tremendous cuts of our soft wood for fuel would be in expanded and increased use of birch, about which I shall have something to say a little later. This chapter also states that the Commission is not in favour of the cutting of pitprops; that we should not encourage the cutting of pitprops purely because of the high waste factor principle, but a select cutting far more selective than pulpwood cutting, and partly because when pitprops are exported from a forest great damage is done to the remaining timber from wind and other factors. Chapter 2 does however, stress the need to expand the pulpwood industry. In fact, Mr. Speaker, all through this report there is one fact emerges, that is that we are not a pitprop country if I might use that term, we are a saw-logging country and although a certain amount of logging is necessary we are above all a pulpwood country. Chapter 2 also recommends that the Province initiate steps immediately with the Federal Government to have a forest inventory conducted, an inventory of the entire

Province, or of the wood resources of the whole Province.

Chapter 3 gives statistics and wages paid by the two paper companies and gives production figures for both mill and woods operations. Here there is an interesting comparison made, Mr. Speaker, because for some time we have been in some doubt as to what our position is vis-a-vis the pulpwood and paper making operations on the Mainland. How do we stand in comparison with them? We have heard some rather pessimistic statements on our position. The conclusion reached by the Commission is that the Newfoundland industry is in a satisfactory condition vis-a-vis the paper mills operations on the Mainland both with regard to the actual mill itself and also with regard to the woody operation. That is the most encouraging conclusion reached by the Commission.

Chapter 4 deals with taxes. I read it two or three times, Mr. Speaker, and thought over it a bit, and I must confess I still find it a little difficult to understand. I feel quite sure that Newfoundland will need perhaps the advice of some of our financial advisers in interpreting all that chapter. Certainly it is not one for a layman like myself to analyze in any detail. It deals with ground rents, transfer taxes, fire tax etc, and gives the summary of tax agreements between the Newfoundland Government and the two paper companies, and makes recommendations as to the manner in which taxes may be collected from the two paper companies. As the House knows the Province is not directly collecting taxes from these two companies. Chapter 4 of the report submits proposals for the re-negotiation of those agreements which now exist between the Government on one hand and the two great paper companies on

the other. In connection with this I might draw the attention of honourable members to the statement in Chapter 4, which is a very thought-provoking statement. It says as a sort of concluding statement — "it is obvious from the above that companies utilizing forest resources in other Provinces make much greater payments to the Province than do Newfoundland companies. The amount which an industry similar to the pulp and paper companies in Newfoundland would pay to the Provincial Treasury of other Provinces can be shown to approximate $3\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars if in Quebec, $3\frac{1}{4}$ if in Ontario and $3\frac{3}{4}$ if in New Brunswick." I am sure the House will realize the significance of that statement.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like perhaps to interject a personal observation if I may — Frequently we hear what I consider irresponsible statements and allegations made about these early agreements made between the Government of those days and the various companies. They say with regard to the railway that the Government gave away everything to the Reids. They say with regard to the Anglo - Newfoundland Development Company set up here in the early 1900's that the Government gave away everything free, gave a hand-out to the company and they say the same thing with regard to the agreement made between the Government and the first company that operated in Corner Brook in the mid 1920's. The fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, that it was always touch and go as to whether any government could get these industries going. We know how many years the early governments laboured to get the railway built; we know, too, how difficult it was to induce capital, and still is, in certain areas, to come into

this Province. In a statement like this, because the companies are not paying any taxes that should not be taken as an indictment of previous and earlier governments in this Province and in the country or colony of Newfoundland.

Chapter 5 of the report stresses the satisfactory condition which, in the Commission's opinion, exists between labour and management in Newfoundland. I am not going to analyze this not very long chapter. But it does show very substantial areas of agreement have been reached between capital and management and labour, and the report is particularly complimentary in its references to the work of the Woods Labour Board, which I believe is perhaps unique in all Canada.

Chapter 6 deals with forest protection and makes some very sweeping recommendations. I will outline the present setup which is a little complicated because the responsibility for forest fire protection in Newfoundland is divided on the one hand between the Forest Fire Protection Association, which is concerned with the west coast and the interior, and the Department of Mines and Resources, which is responsible for, broadly speaking, the three mile limit, for the east coast and for the Crown Lands Reserves. Incidentally the Commission called in here, as I think I intimated earlier, one of the outstanding specialists in forest fire protection, in the person of Mr. Brady, who was lent to us by the Government of Ontario. He made a separate report which the Commission has seen fit to have incorporated in this report itself. His report is more extreme, more sweeping than the Commission is prepared to adopt, nevertheless it is the most thought-provoking report, and I certainly urge that it be studied by every person interest-

ed. I may say I am very happy that the Commission does pay its respects to the present setup and compliments it on what has been achieved during the past few years. That achievement, I think, is fairly obvious in that figures show that there has been always a consistent reduction in the amount of timber wood which has been destroyed by forest fires during the past ten or fifteen years. The Commission recommends that one body should be set up that shall be responsible for forest fire protection on all the forest land in the province. Here is an interesting recommendation, Mr. Speaker: It also recommends that a levy of \$25 per square mile should be placed on all the areas which are privately owned, all the forest lands which are privately owned, and that a levy of \$25 a square mile should provide the funds for the forest fire protection services.

Chapter 7 deals with insects and diseases, now prevalent in our forests. In this connection I should point out, the Commission called in a man who was considered, (I do not like to be using the superlative too much, but I think it was justified) to be a man, a leading authority on insects and diseases. He came and spent some considerable time and made a very thorough examination of the situation. We have several infestations in various parts of the province affecting different species of trees. The most dangerous and the one doing the most damage at the present time is the Woolly Aphid. That fact helped the Commission in making later decisions regarding a third paper mill, because the Woolly Aphid is particularly destructive to old, over-mature trees. One of the reasons why, in the Commission's view, we must hurry up and get rid of our over-mature trees was

not only because of the losses through decay but above all because they are facilitating the spread of the Woolly Aphid and other insect pests. I might add also, Mr. Speaker, the Commission recommends that the Federal Government which is responsible for biological research in the forestry areas, should increase their facilities and services in Newfoundland with a view to coping with what the Commissioners considered to be a menace to our forests.

Chapter 8 deals with the rate of growth, and gives some tables showing the rate of various soil types in relation to the different stands of timber. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, one point, I think, which comes out here, and certainly has come out in some of our conversations and discussions, is that the rate of reproduction in Newfoundland is most satisfactory. Sure we have all heard in years gone by that it might take a hundred years to reproduce, or ninety years, for some of the species in Newfoundland, but the period of regeneration and reproduction is much shorter than that, or than we have been led to believe.

Chapter 9 deals with the adequacy of pulp wood reserves: With regard to this the Commission feels that the position of the AND Company is that they can produce annually from their limits four hundred thousand cords and that Bowaters Newfoundland, Corner Brook operation, can produce from their limits 650,000 cords. The Commission then goes on to what at first sight may appear to be a rather complicated comparison between the situation now and as it will be in 1990, which is not so far away perhaps as seems at first sight. It feels that we will have during that period from now to 1990 an annual surplus of two

hundred thousand cords. That is a very important point. That is an annual surplus of two hundred thousand cords over and above anything that might be needed by the two paper companies, and it is for that reason that the Commission recommends that we should take every measure possible to utilize that annual surplus of two hundred thousand cords which will be ours for the taking between now and the year 1990, and which, incidentally, will be lost to us if we do not utilize it, as timber is a crop.

Chapter 10 is a chapter, I am sure, every honourable member read, because it deals with a third mill. I will simply make this point in introducing Chapter 10 — That chapter can only be read properly, and interpreted properly, when everything that precedes it has been read, the other nine chapters. The Commission, in Chapter 10, recommends that a policy of acquisition of additional areas, that is, in addition to what we now have on our Crown Lands, and that as freehold areas become available, that the Government should acquire these freehold areas — in fact it recommends that the Government acquire them either by negotiation or if necessary by expropriation — and it then goes on to recommend that a modern — and that word modern is used advisedly and deliberately, — (a modern two machine newsprint mill of 1955 is an entirely different thing from a newsprint mill of 1925) they recommend that a modern two machine newsprint mill with a daily capacity of four hundred to five hundred tons, which would require about two hundred thousand cords of pulp wood annually, it recommends that that will be established in the eastern portion. It is very vague, and deliberately

vague I am quite sure, from conversations I have had with the Chairman and other members of the Commission on that point, when it says on the eastern portion of the island — It reasons there in its recommendations that this mill should be operated jointly by Bowaters and the AND Company. The reason for that, I think the Honourable the Premier has already stated or implied in some reference to this report, and this report itself actually uses the term "the crazy-quilt patterns of the timber holdings we have". I regret that I do not have a map here today. We have not had time to prepare a map suitable for it. If we did have a map showing the holdings of these timber rights belonging to the AND Company, Bowaters and the Crown Lands it would look like a checker board. We would find the AND up in the Great Northern Peninsula and we would find Bowaters' timber holdings away over on the east coast of Newfoundland, in Bonavista Bay and, as this report says, we actually have the practice going on, a decreasing practice I am glad to say, of Bowaters cutting wood on the east coast of Newfoundland and pulling it past the very door of the AND Mill at Grand Falls, right over the Topsails, over to the Corner Brook Mill, to be used there for making paper. Similar anomalies exist all over because of that crazy quilt pattern of our holdings. The Commission feels that a third paper mill could be best established by a joint effort of the two paper companies in conjunction with the Government, that is in connection with Crown Land Reserves. The Commission also recommends that in case of further expansion of either of the two existing paper companies that the resources of Southern Labrador be utilized.

We will come to that in a moment, on the chapter on Labrador.

Chapter 11 deals with the position of the local saw mill industry. I am not going into that in detail except to say, we have fourteen hundred saw mills, and the recommendations given there, if properly utilized, may very well mean the future life and expansion of life of many of these saw mills. The Commission states that the saw mills around 1900 were based on pine, all pine logs, and they have certainly disappeared except in a few areas. The Commission recommends that before these remaining pine forests are destroyed by disease that some arrangement be made particularly with the two paper companies to exploit these pines for saw mill purposes. The Commission has a word to say about birch. It says there is a total, in its opinion, of about three and a quarter million cords, and they believe that 97,000 cords of that could be used annually. This means there is ample birch for our hardwood, birch mill, and also plenty of birch for fuel purposes.

Chapter 12 gives an outline of the setup as it presently exists in the Department of Mines and Resources. I am not going into that now. The recommendations are there for an overall setup of what might very well be an entirely new organization to look after the forestry resources of our province. It does make a point there somehow that the amount we have spent as a Government, and I am talking now in terms of the past, on forestry is very small compared with the amount the Governments have spent on fishery, in spite of the fact that forestry is, from the economic or at least the dollar standpoint, of far greater importance to us.

Chapter 13 deals with the timber resources of the Labrador itself. It is estimated there are forty-nine million cords on Labrador, and it is recommended that in particular the forests of southern Labrador would, as it were, be integrated with the pulpwood paper making activities of the Island of Newfoundland itself. These great forests of Labrador are a standby if at any time we should be faced with any catastrophe from the standpoint of fire or disease on the Island of Newfoundland itself.

Chapter 14 deals with reforestation, and says in effect that we should not undertake any major reforestation until further experimentation has been carried on.

Chapter 15 deals in particular with the reserves held by the paper companies; insofar as forestry research is concerned it recommends an expansion of Federal activity in forestry research in Newfoundland, and does compliment in particular the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company on this activity. The Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company is, of course, an older company established in the early 1900's, twenty years before Corner Brook got underway.

Chapter 16 deals with the removal of all the matured and over-matured timber on the forestry resources. I think I can say, if I interpret it correctly, the Commission states, or at least emphasizes, that the removal of the matured or over-matured timber from the holdings of the paper companies is something about which the Government itself should be concerned. It is more than the concern of the paper companies, it is the concern of the Government to see that those matured and over-matured trees are

removed before they are destroyed either by fire or by insects.

Chapter 16 deals with education, and recommends two avenues of departure on the matter of education, one at a professional level integrated with Memorial University and another at a somewhat lower level designed to give our fieldmen the measure of training they need to implement the Government's policy.

Chapter 17 deals with legislation recommended during the next four or five years, an overall comprehensive piece of legislation being prepared to take the place of all the pieces of legislation we now have on our statute books.

Chapter 19 deals with the expenditure and I will not go into that now.

Chapter 20 is miscellaneous — It does not feel we need to undertake any bog drainage measures for forestry purposes but says here that bog draining might very well be something we ought to consider from an agricultural standpoint. It explains the position as regards partridge berries and blueberries—That is a problem which faces us every day, as the blueberry land has a tendency to revert to forests, and we are sometimes concerned as to what step should be taken. The Commission says in a choice between blueberries and forests we should let the forests go and keep the land producing blueberries, because the blueberry crop, per acre, is more remunerative than would be forest trees. It recommends that at this point we ought to be extremely careful about alienating any important timber resources or water power resources. I might say at this time that the proposed area talked about has in it the Terra Nova River which has a potential of 72 thousand horsepower

hydro development, the second largest potential in the province, and we ought, therefore, as a Government to be extremely careful not to alienate that as well as millions of dollars worth of timber concerned.

There are several important appendices, but I have not time to go into them as I do not think I should delay the House further. In particular I would recommend to the honourable members the chapter on the history of saw mills in Newfoundland, a chapter, I believe, chiefly prepared by the Newfoundland Commissioner, Mr. Goodyear. I think that chapter should be read. I don't think very many people in Newfoundland are familiar with that story. I, myself have had some experience in historical research in Newfoundland but I must confess that most of the material in that was completely new to me. It gives the whole history of our saw mill operations starting back in the nineteenth century.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a brief digest of this report. I feel that it might well be the "hibic" as far as forestry operations in Newfoundland are concerned for the next half century and perhaps longer.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay the House too long over any prolonged discussion on this Report of the Royal Commission on Forestry. In the first instance we have not had an opportunity to study this document. It is quite a voluminous affair, and I believe, has quite a number of pages. It consists of some twenty chapters on various subjects. To be honest with the House, Sir, I have to admit I did not have an opportunity to look

at that until about 6:00 o'clock this morning when I happened to awaken from a very sound sleep and decided I ought to do something with it. I spent an hour, only to doze off again at 7:00 o'clock to be awakened by a vision of a woolly aphid, and lo and behold it had dark eyeglasses and a bow tie—that is an honest fact. I turned him over and looked at him and he was a woolly aphid all right—However, this, Sir, is not something to be hilarious about or something over which we should crack too many jokes. It is a subject which touches on one of the greatest of our natural resources, the forestry.

The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources has given us a play-by-play description. Unfortunately he has not had the time nor the opportunity to go into the details of the various chapters, and like some of the rest of us he would perhaps have liked to have had more time.

I did gather this morning when I was reading this (I may be wrong but I did gather) it was the impression of this Royal Commission that anything whatsoever that is done in the future relative to our forests and relative to any forest policy we may set up must have always before it, always in the forefront, the idea of a third paper mill here in Newfoundland. I am quite convinced that that must have been uppermost in the thoughts of the members of the Royal Commission as they went about their task from day to day—the third paper mill—we got to have it—we must have it.—Is there enough wood? Eventually they decided, yes, there was plenty of wood here in Newfoundland and we won't have to bring any wood from Labrador until about 1990. I gathered that, but I am probably wrong in my first impression. To that end, Sir, they

suggested different things, doing away with the three mile limit and with unrestricted cutting on that limit by our fishermen or by anybody for that matter.

We have a three mile limit and certain growths of timber all around the coast in various areas on that so-called three mile limit and people, fishermen particularly, can cut the wood in an unrestricted sense for firewood and for stage material and wharf material and flakes and what not. That has been going on since time immemorial. I do hope if as a result of this Royal Commission's demand that this three mile limit be done away with there will be some reserve kept for these people who go down to the sea in ships and earn their living in deep waters. They have to have timber and they have to have firewood. It would be a crime beyond all description that to serve the purpose of the AND and Bowaters, for neither of whom I have any great love or affection, as I will show you shortly — I don't blame them really — but it would be a crime beyond all description if these men in our country who have to have flakes and firewood, etc. and have to get it in the cheapest possible way, if at the recommendation of a Royal Commission they were deprived of that right and freedom to go into the woods where and when they like, within the three mile limit, and cut the trees and necessary timber. I am quite sure that no Liberal Government and certainly no Tory Government would ever stoop to such a thing as that.

Now that is one of the recommendations, and in one sense of the word a very great one — After all we always have to deal with people, even when talking of new industries it means dealing with people, and we have to be very careful about that.

Now that is one of the things that is recommended, after a period that is to be done, I believe. Then they recommended the cutting of pitprops is more or less a waste of good timber, and they think no pitprops should be cut except those which are cut in an effort to clean up after a slight fire or after some other logging enterprise and pitprops should only be taken as a matter of cleaning up the forests.

Then they make another recommendation, that the two Governments, apart from the department concerned, the Federal Government and the Provincial Government should get together on this thing and make an endeavour to find out just how much timber is available in Newfoundland. Now, Sir, if we have not yet arrived at the amount of timber which is available in this country, in Newfoundland, and I am not referring to Labrador, then I say: "God help us." When are we going to arrive at it, Sir? Surely AND and Bowaters know exactly how much timber they have, and surely the Department of Mines and Resources is fully aware of how much timber we have in other parts of the country, apart from the AND and Bowaters. If we do not know after all the reports we have had — we had the IBEC Report which gave us all that, whether they knew or not — I say now they did not know. These people did not know what they were talking about. What they did was quote from a report made in the Commission of Government days, away back in those days. Being a sort of a suspicious mind, I must admit here I did look through this report rather rapidly to see if I could see some quote from the IBEC Report and to see if I could see some quotes from the Commission of Government. I must say that on the face of it I have found none. I am glad of

it. I believe this Royal Commission has gone about in in a straightforward way and have gotten the facts through their own searching. We have been told by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources how much travelling was done, and I am quite sure that the Commission knew their business. I have only the pleasure of knowing one, Mr. Roland Goodyear. He knows wood, and I am quite sure that he would make only these recommendations which he believed to be in the best interest. As I said, I may have to criticize his decisions, although he knows much more about wood than I do. Anyway the Government decided to find out just what wood is available in Newfoundland.

They further recommend that Newfoundland's forest potentials should be set up to the end that they go into the study of the amount of forest we have and the amount of woodland etc. and even so far as to have set up a corporate body and a corporate stock of a hundred shares. Then they recommend that a board of directors be set up, appointed by the Government, the Chairman being the Minister, and the vice-chairman being a representative of either AND or Bowaters and then another man from the other company and another member representing some of the smaller timber interests and one member who shall be known as the Director General of the FDA. Now I am always suspicious of Director General, Mr. Speaker. We have had a lot to do with Directors General in the last few years, and I do hope if the Government finds it necessary to set up this particular body consisting of the Minister and officials of the AND Company and officials of Bowaters and representatives of sawmill interests and a Director General, I do hope that the Director General

will be a man who will be always available without any special warrant whatsoever to produce him. That man, the Director General, is to be paid, is going to have some special job, also how much it is is not stated. He also is to be known as Chief Fire Warden of Newfoundland. Now I do not know how many fire wardens we are going to have in Newfoundland. We have several already, I believe, fire chiefs, I take it. This fire warden would be relative to the forests and he would report to the Government every year.

It requests the Federal Government to make certain biological investigations, and then, with regard to cutting lumber for small mill owners, they recommend a limit should be set at about fifty million feet, wood board measure. As I have said: these men know their job better than any of us here, and if they say fifty million board feet is all that should be cut for the production of lumber for the people of this country then, I say, they probably are correct. Except if they are doing that in order to make up sufficient timber to bring along a third paper mill, then of course it would be questionable which is the better service, whether a big corporation with a big paper mill employing six thousand people or whether it would be better to supply the smaller mill owners who supply the needs of our people all throughout the country. That is a matter which has to be decided on.

They recommend the passing of a Newfoundland Forestry Act to define the Government's forest policy, but they are not suggesting that be taken up until about 1960.

Now I come to the point where they, the Commission, feel that a third paper mill should be quickly brought into

being by the joint operations of Bowaters and AND, who are invited to pool their resources in Newfoundland, which together with timber on Crown Lands in Newfoundland, in its opinion, are ample to support a modern, two-machine mill of a capacity of five thousand tons daily and requiring two hundred thousand cords of pulpwood annually. Now having said that, I believe they would go about finding these two hundred thousand cords. As I say, I am not as familiar with the contents of this report as I should be in order to get up here and say very much on it. I believe it is the contention of the Commission that there are sufficient woods over and above what are required by Bowaters, for instance, and possibly AND Company, who are certainly self-sufficient as far as wood is concerned, if you add that to the wood which can be preserved and used on the three-mile limit. Then I think the Commission, in order to make up the two hundred thousand cords which they believe are essential to the running of this mill and would be essential, they say this could be done here in Newfoundland to build a one hundred and fifty ton, daily capacity mill on the east coast. Now I am a bit sceptical. I want to see a third mill. I want to see a third mill as much as anybody else, and I am quite sure we can have a third mill, but I do not yet see how we can get a third mill without using some of our wood on Labrador. Definitely by using that we can have a third and possibly a fourth. But the Commission has come to the decision that without any wood, at least up to 1990 from Labrador there is ample wood here, some going to waste, some matured, some over-matured etc. ample here to justify the erection of a mill. Now I would say that was not

the opinion of the people who made the IBEC Report. They have definitely said that the amount of wood here in Newfoundland was limited, and all it could possibly do is supply the AND Company and Bowaters. That was in 1951 they made that report. As I have said before, I have no faith in the IBEC Report. I hope they are wrong and I hope this Commission is right. I think the IBEC people made \$80,000 by copying out a report made by the Commission of Government, which they haphazardly had obtained, and on that they based this report and said, you cannot use another mill here unless you use the Labrador wood. They went to work and figured out what it would cost to build another mill, somewhere in the vicinity, I believe, of forty-five million dollars. They also came to the conclusion, I believe, they could turn out paper at a price, I believe of \$80 or \$90 a ton and showed what profit they would make, but I believe that basically their figures were wrong. At any rate this present Royal Commission had definitely come to the conclusion that there is sufficient wood, sufficient trees in Newfoundland alone, to build a third mill and have this mill running right up to 1990 before there would be any need whatsoever to bring in wood from any other area such as the Labrador.

Now there are various other recommendations, Sir. They are not in my opinion so important as that one. There is, for instance the acquisition of additional forest areas from private people who have freehold forest property, and a reforestation project to be sponsored by the Federal and Provincial Government, but says the Provincial Government must not do that until the Federal Government sees how they get along. I am a bit sad

at seeing that there because I really thought the lands and forests were definitely under ownership of the Provincial Government and they had to make all arrangements in regard to that. So I fail to see why the Provincial Government should wait until the Federal Government should go ahead and experiment with regard to any reforestation. I would be inclined, I think, to disagree with the Commission on that.

There are various other recommendations, arrangements for a professor of forestry, and for arrangements of five year courses at the Memorial University, and later taken up at the University of New Brunswick. But the chief recommendation, in my opinion is the one that is taken up with a third paper mill. Now far be it from me, and far be it from anyone in this country to do anything that would deter a company or corporation from coming in here and going ahead with this third mill. I am hoping that it is possible to do it. As I have said, I have more confidence in the report of this Royal Commission, much more so than I have in any report heretofore made, and I am hoping they are correct. But there is one thing, and this is an important thing — I admire the fearlessness of this Royal Commission composed of Major Kennedy — I just forget all the names — I have not had the honour to meet any of them except Mr. Goodyear — I say I admire their fearlessness and honesty where they came out with statements relative to taxes. I refer to the taxes which this Provincial Government can collect from the companies already in existence here. It is exactly nil, practically nil. This Commission comes out with the whole thing, and they refer to various private companies on the Mainland of Canada, they talk about stumpage

rates. We know we get nothing or practically nothing as far as stumpage rates. Certainly I am not blaming the Government. I suppose I would have to blame the Liberal Government though, because it was said a few days ago that the Liberal Government brought everything in here, the paper mills, railway and everything. I take it, therefore, that it was a Liberal Government that made the agreement and contracts with the AND Company and the International Power and Paper, etc. so that any blame attached to any agreement drawn up, I hope the Royal Commission was aware it was charging a Liberal Government of the past with some dereliction of duty, I would call it — For instance the stumpage in Ontario, on spruce is \$2.80 a cord. In Quebec it is \$2.00 a cord. In New Brunswick it is \$4.00 a cord and in Newfoundland nil. I think I am right in saying "nil." On spruce — just imagine last year, I believe it was estimated these two companies took a million cords of wood. At \$4.10 a cord that would mean \$4,100,000 we could have had if the past Liberal Governments had not been delinquent in their duty and made a sensible agreement when these companies came in. And we have a lot of spruce here and more on the Labrador, black spruce, I believe on the Labrador.

I say, all credit to this Royal Commission who has brought these things out into the light. I hope that bringing this out into the light will shame these two companies into coming across and saying to the Government: look, we realize these agreements were made at a time of stress and strain, and we realize that the governments of these times, the Liberal Governments of these times, were broke — Liberal Governments as a rule are always broke, if they are not broke when they come

into office they soon break themselves. We all know that. We realize at any rate, (these companies) that the Liberal Governments were broke in those days, and probably our ancestors took an unfair advantage. We will be satisfied to give you some stumpage and allow you to get some taxes. I hope the work of this Royal Commission will eventually lead to that, and if it does it is going to mean a lot to our people, if we can get anywhere from one to one and a half to two million dollars on stumpage rates and other taxes on these companies. I say, with all due respect to these companies — they have done a good job here, and are doing a good job for the people working for them, and I am not casting any reflections on anybody in these companies. I knew the AND Company very well. I know the past president and I know the present president. They are all fine men, but have to work under certain agreements — I am not talking personally whatsoever.

Here is another matter — This Commission has found out that on the basis of the above information and the records of the companies concerned, it can be estimated that companies similar to the Newfoundland companies (in the sense of holding the same amount of limits, cutting the same amount of wood and making the same profits) would make payments to the Government concerned as follows, neglecting charges for fire protection were made to the Provincial Governments concerned; In Newfoundland \$.05 per cord; Ontario \$3.44 per cord; Quebec \$4.19 per cord and in New Brunswick \$4.29 per cord. It is shameful, Mr. Speaker, shameful, when you come to quote some of these things which have been uncovered and brought to light of day by this Royal Commission. However, it says here: There are two

courses of action which might be followed. The first of these would involve amendment of the Bowater's Act by dealing with the additional restrictive provisions which are not included in the AND Act. The second course would be the amendment of both Acts. I may be wrong, but I believe they estimate, if these things could be done and the AND Company and Bowaters could be compelled to pay certain stumpage, at least, we would get an average of one million three hundred and sixty thousand dollars per year for the first twenty years. These are the recommendations on that particular point which the Commission submitted. The Commission recommends that in consideration of the establishment of a third pulp and paper mill as proposed by the Commission in Chapter 10, proposals be made to both the existing companies for a voluntary renegotiation of their agreements in order to insure that the Crown Lands portion of their holdings will yield to the Province a comparable rate to those received from forestry organizations in other parts of Canada. Now I think that is a very fine conclusion to come to, and again I congratulate them.

We, as a Province, Mr. Speaker, have very little resources which we may tax, and there is nobody more aware of that than the Honourable the Premier. The Federal Government can tax these people, they can take profit taxes and all sorts of other taxes, but we in the Provincial Government, and after all the Government must be made solvent, can collect no money. There can be no Government without money — I am quite sure the Government, on the opposite side, will have to find other means of taxation to carry on even what they are doing now. Any government, as time goes on from day to day,

is going to have to spend more year after year in order to give to the people the public services which are desirable and which are imperative. I say, therefore, if these two companies cannot see their way clear on a request from this Government or any Government to negotiate these agreements which were made to them in the black days of yore, in the light of present day needs, if they cannot see their way clear to renegotiate them surely, I say here, something drastic will have to be done, and must be done. I will back any Government which would do it. It is all very well to say, well, you have an agreement hard and fast and all that sort of thing and it cannot be broken — My honourable friends on my right and on my left would probably tell me, no, you cannot break these agreements, or any lawyer here would tell me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No lawyer would tell you that.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know — but the people of this country won't tell me that, nor the Government. It is the peoples' country, and if some of the people of the past made a pretty raw deal with some of these companies, I feel confident the companies will come across and renegotiate and thereby divert the necessity of any harsh methods. Now that is not a threat at all, that is a suggestion. I do, as I said, compliment the Commission for the straightforward way in which they have come out with certain facts and figures relative to this. I do not see here sufficient facts to warrant, in my opinion, this Government plugging into the building of a third paper mill, and I don't think they will. The only sensible suggestion, I think, is the one which has already been made by the Commission that the two companies concerned, the

AND Company and Bowaters, get together and say, there is so much wood here going to waste, and there are people in this country who need the employment, let us get together, first let us make a square deal with the Government relative to taxes and secondly let us decide we are going to build a third paper mill. Let us cut out all the double expenses on the manufacture of wood — It has been pointed out by this Commission, and I think by the Honourable Minister, the spectacle of train-loads of woods passing through Grand Falls over the Topsails and on to Corner Brook and vice versa from the Northern Peninsula into the mill at Grand Falls. These things would have to be adjusted between these companies as well as individuals. They have to live in this streamlined age a little more in accordance with the idea of conserving our wealth just as we as individuals, if we have any wealth, ought to conserve it if we expect to get the best that there is in this world in which we are living.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on talking about this for quite a while, but I think it probably would be unwise for many reasons. As I have said, I congratulate the Government on undertaking this. It cost us fifty thousand dollars, you know, and I do hope we get something out of it. It cost the taxpayers of the country fifty thousand dollars. At any rate the Government have tabled the report unlike the TBEC Report for which they paid, I think, \$80,000, and which was only tabled a couple of days ago, and that was in 1951. I do hope that this one will get greater consideration, and that out of this Forestry Report there will come a definite policy. I hope that we do not again, next year or the year after have to set up another Commission to find out something else about

wood. A plan is outlined here. I suggest to the Government; go as nearly as you can to that plan, and I believe that the production of this report will redound to the betterment of this country. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, when the Grand Falls contract was made in the very early part of this present century by the Liberal Government of Sir Robert Bond, and later in the 1920's the Humber Contract was made by the Liberal Government of Sir Richard Squires, Newfoundland was not a Province of Canada. Newfoundland was a British Colony in the case of the first mill, the Grand Falls Mill, and a British Dominion or about to become a British Dominion, in the case of the Humber Mill, the Corner Brook Mill. In those days the principal means known and used to raise revenue to run the public services was the customs tariffs. It is true that in 1917, during the First World War, the Government of Sir Edward Morris, afterwards Lord Morris, introduced the income tax, but it is also true in the first place that it was a modest income tax and in the second place that they abolished it in 1924. So that as late as 1928, just at the outset of the great world depression, the customs tariffs were still the main source of revenue of the Government of Newfoundland, it had always been so from the beginning. Now admittedly in 1855 and 1860 and 1870 and 1880 and 1890, until about the beginning of the present century, the rates of import duties levied were very modest because the needs of the Government were very modest, because the standards and levels of public services were very low. But virtually all of the money they did raise was raised by means of a tariff and import duties, so that there was no particular incentive in New-

foundland in those times to put any value on the island's natural resources from the standpoint of raising revenue. Value, of course, was placed on them from the standpoint of giving the people a living.

MR. HOLLETT: How about the Mainland?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am talking at the moment about Newfoundland — the only value that our governments of the past put on fish and minerals and timber and waterpower and other natural resources was the employment they might give. They just did not look upon these resources as a direct source of revenue. True they would become an indirect source of revenue if they gave employment to the people because you could tax the people's food, the people's clothes and everything the people used, everything they consumed, by means of a tariff. They had to import everything they used and consumed. As everything was imported it had to climb over the great tariff barrier with which in those days we surrounded this island, we barricaded this island against the importations of goods from the rest of the world, and as people imported they paid a tax to the Government. That was the principal source and almost the only source of revenue of the governments in those days. So that as I say, there was no particular reason, no particular incentive to raise the revenue. They got it the easy way through an ad valorem customs tariff. Furthermore, even in so advanced a country as the United States and in so advanced a country as Canada, what was then Canada, the concept which is commonplace today hardly existed then, that is that the Almighty, the Divine Providence, has given each country or nation or state or province natural resources which ought to be

taxed, as taxes must be collected, these ought to be taxed to provide a revenue with which to carry on the public services. So that in the United States and in Canada the governments quite commonly, indeed almost universally gave away periodically, with a lavish hand, with incalculable generosity, virtually all of the public domain, virtually all of it, to provide parties, private interests and virtually without taxing it. Now this modern concept has come into use and had come into these countries long before it ever came into Newfoundland, with the result that across the United States, government after government and then latterly the Federal Government of the United States adopted and practised methods of recovering, to what we would call the "Crown," but what they call the "Public," which means the same thing, the alienated public domains, forest land, minerals, oils etc. Mention of oil reminds me that to this day in the United States you have still that titanic tussle of public opinion between those who believe that oil ought to belong to the nation and those who believe it ought to belong to the few individuals in it — That was one of the great issues of the recent presidential election in the United States — as recently as that — there is not even yet a universal acceptance in the United States of public ownership as against private and individual ownership of the public domain.

So that, while we must praise these two great Liberal Governments for having brought these paper mills to Newfoundland, I do not think it is realistic to blame them for being children of their age, blame them for not being prophetic, blame them for not being fifty years ahead of their times.

Now I, too, like the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, am fascin-

ated by this Chapter 4 of the report, on taxes. And apparently the Royal Commissioners were fascinated by this subject of taxes. Major General Kennedy and Dr. Cameron, Mainlanders, Canadians, come down to the new Province and they are pleasantly surprised to find very much more timber than they had expected, and shockingly surprised to find that that timber, such of it as is in use, such of it as is under exploitation by private interests, goes virtually untaxed. To them, that is, as is quite evident in this chapter, a shocking thing, something new to them, something novel, something quite unexpected. So they point out to us here in chapter 4 that, if these two companies, the AND Company and the Bowaters Company were paying to the Government of this Province what they would be paying in other Provinces of Canada were they operating in those Provinces, here is what the Newfoundland Government should be receiving today: Three and a half million dollars a year on the Quebec scale, three and a quarter millions a year on the Ontario scale and three and three-quarter million dollars a year on the New Brunswick scale. That is to say, if the AND Company and Bowaters were operating today, not in Newfoundland but in New Brunswick, they would be paying taxes to the Government of that Province in an amount of almost four million dollars a year. They point that out on page 7. They say it is obvious that companies utilizing forestry resources in other Provinces make much greater payments to the Province than do Newfoundland companies. The amount which an industry similar to the pulp and paper companies in Newfoundland would pay to the provincial treasury in other Provinces of Canada have been shown at approximately three and a half million

dollars if in Quebec, three and a quarter million dollars if in Ontario and three and three quarter million dollars if in New Brunswick.

Then they give the explanation, or something by way of an explanation, of the low payments to the Province of Newfoundland. It resulted from the terms of the original agreements under which the companies operate. In other words they are exempt from taxation "The Bowaters Company" (I am quoting now) "was granted exemption from all taxes whatsoever in perpetuity except for a tax on income." Now with regard to the tax on income" (they go on) "for the period ending in 1973, this tax on income was not to exceed \$150,000. After 1973, there is no maximum amount of tax on income." We might have been reminded in that chapter that for the first five years after the agreement between the Legislature of that day and that company, the predecessors of Bowaters, it was not to exceed a payment of \$75,000 a year. In other words they said: in perpetuity, as long as water flows and grass grows green, (to use an old legal term) as long as time lasts, Bowaters, because they inherit from the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, the originators of the mill, Bowaters are exempt from taxation except that in lieu of all taxes they shall pay in the first five years income tax not exceeding \$75,000 a year and after the first five years and until 1973 an amount not to exceed \$150,000 a year. Now this is on a company which has made ten and twelve millions a year profits, net profits.

Now to go further; when we became a Province of Canada the question arose at once — was Canada to recognize the legal exemptions of this statutory contract with Bowaters, because under the Tax Rental Agreement the

Government, the Legislature of Newfoundland is required to impose a five per cent tax on Bowaters. We refused to do it. We have refused to this moment to do it. Resolutely and point-blank we told the Government of Canada; no, we are not doing it. Whether we were right or wrong is another matter. But that is the stand we took. Now the Government of Canada took the stand they could not have Bowaters operating within Canada and be exempt from taxes which were of general application to all similar companies and of application to the AND Company within the same Province. I felt at that time, as Leader of this Government, and as Leader of a movement to make Newfoundland a Province of Canada, that I was bound morally to assist and do whatever was in my power to assist Bowaters to be continued in their exemption from income tax beyond this amount laid down in the Statute. So I went to Ottawa in company with Bowaters and saw the Prime Minister of Canada and saw the Minister of Finance and took the stand formally, on behalf of this Government, that the Government of Canada ought not to tax Bowaters any more than they were taxed in the statutory contract between the Legislature of Newfoundland and their predecessor in 1923. The House is aware of what happened. The Government of Canada referred the matter to the Supreme Court of Canada. Bowaters made an appearance in the case, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that Bowaters were taxable under the Laws of Canada as distinct from the Laws of Newfoundland. Under the Laws of Canada they were taxable precisely as any other company is taxable. Since then Bowaters have been paying the Federal taxes to the Government of Canada, but we have

not collected one cent of that \$150,000 a year. The Government of Newfoundland is collecting precisely nothing from Bowaters.

MR. BROWNE: Why is that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well frankly speaking — very frankly — for two reasons (1) that we do not think we can do it under the Statute as it stands and unless the Statute is changed. The Statute is that in lieu of income tax or in lieu of any other taxes, and the Government of Qitawa now is collecting an income tax, and in the second place, if we were to change the Statute it would be merely to collect a few coppers. If we changed that Statute in this House, if this Government came before this Legislature with a request to change that Statutory Contract with Bowaters it will not be for the purpose of collecting a few coppers.

On page 9 of the same Chapter 4 the Commission says: "The Commission has been particularly concerned with respect to the situation in which it has found itself as regards its responsibility under Clause 15 of the Terms of Reference — to recommend measures for the raising of Government revenues necessary to provide for the proper administration of the forest resources and to provide for any equitable contribution to the public funds. If revenues of any consequence are to be derived, they must come from the pulp and paper industry."

"The Commission has made a careful study of the legislation and agreements under which the two companies operate, and has secured counsel's advice on the interpretation of the various sections. As a result it is reluctantly forced to the conclusion that these agreements effectively preclude the Province from obtaining any sub-

stantial revenues from their operations. The inability to levy taxes on the Bowaters Corporation, implies, in the interest of fair treatment, and unwillingness to tax the AND Company alone." We are not hindered nor restricted by law from imposing taxes on the AND Company but we are by Statute precluded from imposing them on Bowaters. And because we do not impose taxes on Bowaters we don't think it would be fair to impose them on the AND Company. That is the very clear meaning of that paragraph.

Then towards the bottom of the page: "However for the information and possible guidance of the Government in arriving at a decision, the Commission feels that a summary analysis of the situation that would arise if the Legislature were to amend or rescind the Acts relating to the two paper companies would be useful."

"There are two courses of action which might be followed. The first of these would involve amendment to the Bowaters Act by dealing with the additional restrictive provisions which are not included in the AND Act. The second course would be to amend both Acts."

Now it was because of language like that my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition spoke admiringly, and I was glad to note he did speak admiringly of the courage of the Royal Commission. I will go on again:

"The amendment of the Bowaters Act would permit of the assessment of a logging tax, such as is applied in other Provinces. It would require the amendment of both Acts to enable the application of stumpage rates for pulpwood from the Crown Land portions of the company holdings."

Now it goes on on the next page and

part of the page after, to discuss in detail and give facts and figures and proposals for collecting revenues from these paper companies and on page 12 says:

"The whole problem is extremely involved and only sympathetic negotiations between the Government of Newfoundland and the two companies involved would seem to offer an amicable and realistic settlement of the various factors, with legal action as the last resort." In other words with action by this House as the last resort. If the Government and the companies could not after friendly negotiation agree on a bilateral or multilateral settlement then the last resort is action by this Legislature.

MR. BROWNE: What sort of action would you have in mind? I am referring to what the Royal Commission has in mind.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What I have in mind might be left to another more suitable occasion.

MR. BROWNE: It could only mean Legislative action.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right. And that is the word perhaps that ought to have been used. "It might be argued that compensation in connection with the revision of the company's Act would be considered in the nature of capital gain, and thereby benefiting the companies concerned. It is also to be noted, if the companies become subject to logging taxes roughly one half of the sum collected by the Province will come from reduction in the Federal income tax payments stumpage and logging tax payments would return much more to the Province than they would cost the companies, and, if the compensating pay-

ments were not taxable as income, this would also offset the increased provincial charges." What that means, I think, is this: In the tax rental agreement which we have made with Ottawa, and which all other Provinces except Quebec have made with Ottawa, we have given to the Government of Canada the sole right for the life time of the agreement to levy income tax and corporation taxes in this Province in return for a fixed minimum payment they make to us each year. In the terms of that tax rental agreement companies whose principle occupation is the generation of electricity, steam or gas for sale or hire may have an income tax imposed on them by the Legislature of the Province concerned, and the amount paid to the Government of the Province by the company concerned becomes for the purpose of the Federal income tax another item of their annual expenses and is a deductible expense for the purpose of computing the amount of Federal income tax payable. That is the meaning, I take it of this paragraph which says that stumpage and logging tax payments would return more to the Province than they would cost the companies. As a matter of fact it would cost the Treasury of Canada if they paid the Newfoundland Government, they would enter it as an expense in their annual account rendered to the Government of Canada and the amount paid the Newfoundland Government would become an item of expense deductible for the purpose of computing the amount they would pay in income tax to the Government of Canada.

Then, and this is underlined: "The Commission recommends that in consideration of the establishment of

a third pulp and paper mill, as proposed by the Commission in Chapter 10, proposals be made to the two existing pulp and paper companies for voluntary negotiation of their present agreements in order to insure that the Crown Lands portions of their holdings will yield to the Province a revenue commensurate with that received from forest resources in other parts of Canada."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would not at this stage venture to suggest to the House or to the Province what is the belief and the policy of this Government in this particular matter. We all know that all around the world, not only in Iran but in Egypt, in Mexico and in all the backward parts of the world in which thirty, forty or fifty years ago, in another age, pre World War 1, pre Atom Bomb, pre Hydrogen Bomb, in another age altogether, which seems like another world to us today, in such countries when such agreements were negotiated in that other age under which concessions received are now pretty frankly admitted universally to be pretty fantastic concessions, in such countries around the world the process of re-negotiating has been going on.

We come to the question of the third paper mill — Now there just is not any need, I take it, to argue that it would be nice to have a third paper mill in Newfoundland. That is so obvious that every child alive knows it. I am not going to take up the time of the House in any effort to show that it would be revolutionary in our economy, in our social and

political condition to have another great pulp and paper mill of five hundred tons, the same size as Corner Brook when it started; to have a third paper mill here on the east coast of Newfoundland. Remember, Mr. Speaker, within the memory of many hundreds of people living today the west coast was a barren wilderness, not even part of Newfoundland until 1902. It was as recently as 1902, the French Shore.

MR. BROWNE: Not after the railway went there. The railway went there before 1902, did it not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There was no railway across to the west coast until 1899 or 1900, around there — In other words just about the time I was born the west coast of Newfoundland became a part of Newfoundland, was not any longer alien and foreign territory, no longer did the British navy patrol that coast to banish Newfoundlanders away and to protect the property of French Nationalists. In other words the west coast became truly part of Newfoundland and even came to be represented in this House, with a population of a mere handful for the whole of the west coast. It is hard to credit that today, the "Garden of Newfoundland," it is hard to credit that that whole coast bursting with prosperity brought about by that great paper mill, our second city —

MR. BROWNE: It was foreseen, you know, what its possibilities were.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, just as now we foresee the possibilities for the east coast if a third mill should come. So, as I have said earlier, knowing as we do in Newfoundland today the almost miraculous effect of the great mill at Grand Falls upon the whole central portion of this island, the springing up of a dozen new towns,

and the effect on the west coast, we know, living on the eastern third of this island, what effect it would have on the fortunes of us all, fishermen and lawyers and doctors and teachers and loggers and labourers and mechanics and railroaders and seamen and everyone else and what it would mean to Newfoundland to have this third mill. It is the aching, yearning hope of every Newfoundlander, this third pulp and paper mill.

Now it is a rather striking fact that Bowaters eighteen million cords, or whatever it is, of standing timber on this island, happens to be in not one unbroken stand of timber. It is many stands, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition reminded us here, or was it my honourable friend and colleague? Bowaters timber stands are scattered, up in Fortune Bay, at the head of Bay D'Espoir on the Gauder Lake, near Glenwood in Bonavista Bay, inside of Gambo, Middle Brook, Dark Cove, Hare Bay, Wellington, Indian Bay, in back of Lumden, on the Strait Shore, down at Bay Verte, down in White Bay, down in St. Barbe District, in Port au Port District, down in St. George's District. Similarly the AND Company's holdings of twelve or fourteen million cords of growing timber are not one continuous unbroken mass of timber, but rather is made up of fifty or more parcels of timber. And you have the rather extraordinary position of seeing the various parcels of timberland of these two companies intermingled with dozens of parcels of Crown Land Territory, an inextricable mixture of the AND Company, Bowaters and Crown Land timber in Newfoundland. That is why the Royal Commission have said, and have so strongly recommended that the third paper mill ought to be built by these two existing companies jointly, because

then, as they pointed out, and reference has not yet been made here in this House to this very remarkable fact, then the logging operations for the two existing paper companies and the third paper mill could be carried on as one joint, unified, coordinated logging plan; in short the one, Newfoundland-wide logging organization owned by the three paper mills. That would centralize, unify, co-ordinate logging operations embracing the best brains and experience of the two existing organizations that are there already — they would produce the two hundred thousand cords a year for the third mill, the logs, the pulpwood that was necessary for the third mill would be shipped in to the three mills. What was most economic to be shipped into Grand Falls would be shipped into Grand Falls and what was most economically shipped into Corner Brook would then be shipped into Corner Brook and, as the Royal Commission has pointed out, substantial savings could be made on the cost of the pulpwood to the two paper companies. I hope some honourable member in speaking to this debate today will draw our attention specifically to the words, while talking I just cannot find where they are — I hope someone will look it up and quote the words to us of the Royal Commission of the substantial savings each company can make by elimination of overlapping and duplication and criss-crossing of each other's territory and the expense of hauling pulpwood back and forth. There can be no taking no for an answer, and I may say here now, we are not taking no for an answer, this Government, we are not taking no for an answer — We are having this third paper mill — The public interest demands it, and I say, in all our history there has never been a case where

the public interest was so obvious, so apparent as it is in this matter of a third paper mill — there never was — it is enormously more apparent than was the case for establishing the mill at Grand Falls, and it is more apparent than it was the case for the establishment of the mill at Corner Brook. Indeed it is because these two mills were established, and we have seen so vividly, so dramatically, the beneficial results of these two mills to Newfoundland that it now becomes so obvious, so apparent, that the public interest demands the establishment of that third pulp and paper mill. If that is so, if it is absolutely apparent, if it is obviously in the public interest to have that third paper mill, how can we take no for an answer? Under the sovereign powers of this Legislature, sovereign within our jurisdiction, we can do anything here but make a man out of a worm and a worm out of a man.

MR. BROWNE: What about the Supreme Court of Canada?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Supreme Court of Canada cannot touch the sovereign powers of this Legislature. They cannot do it. It is impossible. It cannot be done.

MR. BROWNE: They are doing it every day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They cannot touch the sovereign powers of this Legislature, cannot touch them. Nobody can. In property and civil rights we are absolutely sovereign as though we had never heard of Canada and had never heard of Great Britain. We are absolutely sovereign within our jurisdiction. And I say: this sovereign Legislature, sovereign in the sense and within the field I have been discussing, must not and shall not take no

for an answer. Now whatever may be involved therein is more than I can say at this moment. But — We are going to have the third paper mill — We are going to have it. This Government is going to bring it about. And I have no doubt, and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition told us pretty plainly a few moments ago that he had no doubt of what the people would do about the necessary action. I don't want to go any further than that. I do not believe there is going to be any need of drastic action. I do not believe there is. This thing is so obviously the thing to do that I believe it will be done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken longer than I intended. So far as I know I am now finished. I may think of something after the meal hour, which I want to add to what I have said. If I do think of something it will not take me more than a few minutes to say it. I am sure that the honourable and learned member for St. John's West is going to want to say something about this and that other members of the House will want to say something, for which reason I think we ought to meet tonight. I am aware of the fact that some members are going to church, but I hope they will be back by 9 o'clock. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to see 6 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Because of suspension of Standing Order No. 9, I can only say the House recesses until 9 o'clock.

On motion the House then recessed until 9 o'clock tonight.

WEDNESDAY April 6, 1955.

NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 9:00 of the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Before resuming business I have to call the attention of honourable members and others to the regulations relating to parking in the grounds. Special parking spaces are allocated to members of the House; and no one must park in front of the steps nor in such a way as to prevent a member's car from entering or leaving the grounds. The Sergeant-at-Arms will instruct the police officer on duty each day in future to ticket and have removed any car which violates these regulations. It could be interpreted as interfering with the admission to the House of members whose duty it is to be here. Car No. 18107 is now infringing the rules and must be removed or the police officer will ticket it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing more to say on the main body of the report of the Royal Commission, but I would like to say something on the Royal Commission itself, and to say something in general about their report and their recommendations.

When the Almighty made the Island of Newfoundland He endowed it with certain assets that I am quite sure He designed it for us, the people who dwell in Newfoundland. Whilst I can make no pretense whatsoever at being able to read an Inscrutable Providence, I believe I do know enough to know that the Almighty intended His creatures in Newfoundland, as He did His creatures everywhere, to use their intelligence and to make intelligent use of the good things He placed here for us. I don't think we Newfoundlanders have any just complaint until we have made full and intelligent use of the good things that God has provided for us. So, therefore, our first task is to find out what we have got. Now I think

broadly we may say that we have land and air and sea. The land itself can be used, perhaps for agricultural purposes. On that point we will know a lot more, I think when the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture is delivered to us tomorrow and tabled a little later in the House. I very strongly hope that as a result of the two years of painstaking, thorough-going investigation by that Royal Commission, we will know a lot more than we know tonight about what our Newfoundland earth contains that is good for us, that can be turned to general value for us Newfoundlanders. In the earth, of course, there are minerals. On that point, fairly strenuous efforts have been made in recent years to find out what minerals there are, the extent and the variety. There is possibly oil. I am not too happy about the effort that has been made to find out what oil there is and where it is. There is possibly natural gas; and I am not too happy about what has been done in that regard either.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I can anticipate the honourable member's point of order, and I am going to uphold it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I was going to point out, we are on the Forestry Report.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is on a report not yet in existence.

MR. HOLLETT: I am sorry to interrupt.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Timber growing on the earth and water running on that earth, and in places running very rapidly and in great volume,

down hill, creating the possibility of hydro-electric energy. Then in the fresh waters of the island there are possibly some fish, and in the salt waters around our coast millions of fish and other forms of marine wealth. Now, sir, surely Newfoundlanders have no just reasons for complaint about their standard of living until they have taken all necessary and intelligent steps to discover just what they have, the number and variety and the extent of the assets and advantages given to us to be used, by the Almighty.

This Forestry Report, incredible as it may seem, is the first report ever made in Newfoundland's history on the forest wealth of this island. Incredible as that may seem, it was left until 1955, it was left until the one hundredth anniversary of Responsible Government for a report to be written on the forest wealth of the Newfoundland people. I think the Government deserves very great credit.

MR. HOLLETT: For IBEC?

MR. SMALLWOOD: For having had that report made. I think the Government deserves very great credit for having gotten such out-standing men to make investigation and to write that report and those recommendations. Sir, wherever this report is taken in North America in pulp and paper and forestry circles, wherever it is taken, it will command the utmost respect because, and here, God knows, I mean no disrespect to our own native-born Newfoundland member of this Royal Commission when I draw attention particularly to the names of the two Mainland, Canadian Commissioners — but above all, and again I mean no disrespect to Commissioner Cameron, particularly and above all because of the name of

Major General Howard Kennedy. The combination of the three is irresistible. And we have gotten a report which is not only for us, and for governments that may follow in the years ahead, a bible on forestry but a bible also for anyone in North America who may ever be concerned with the forestry resources of this island and our great peninsula of Labrador. I wish it were possible to have a report as thorough as this, as objectively, as scientifically written as this, on our other natural resources. I don't think it is possible for a report to be written on the mineral resources of Newfoundland that would be anything in the same class at all with this report. It is not possible as yet to write such a report as this on our hydro-electric, our water power resources, and it is not possible in the very nature of things to have a report as accurate as this, as precise as this, on agriculture because there you are in a field where you have imponderables, you are in a field not capable of being measured as precisely as the field of forestry.

This report, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition reminded us this afternoon, cost the people of Newfoundland something of the order of fifty thousand dollars. Well a good many fifty thousand dollar bills, if you can make bills of that size, have been lost by the people of Newfoundland and misspent by this representatives and wasted in the last hundred years. I wonder if ever the people's representatives took fifty thousand dollars of the people's money and invested it so soundly, so wisely and so profitably as this particular fifty thousand dollars?

MR. HOLLETT: The Fisheries Report?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If their recommendations should result in a third pulp and paper mill on the Eastern third of this Island, then although this Government will get, as it will deserve, great credit for having brought that mill about, let us never forget the contribution that will have been made to it by Mr. Roland Goodyear, by Professor Cameron and by Major General Kennedy. I dare say a third paper mill would have come if they had never been born, if they had never been appointed a Royal Commission, if they had never written their report. I dare say it would have come. I believe that where the IBEC people went astray in confining their thoughts to a pulp and paper mill based on the use of Labrador wood, and thereby delayed rather than hastened the building of the pulp and paper mill. This Royal Commission has probably saved us years and years of waiting for the coming of the third paper mill. Because, Mr. Speaker, the thing that is outstanding in this report is the fact that now, today, this year, last year and the year before and for a number of years past and for quite a number of years to come, thirty-five years about, we are logging every year enough pulpwood to maintain right here on this Island, logging enough pulpwood to maintain a pulp and paper mill producing four hundred and fifty to five hundred tons a day. It is this Royal Commission that discovered that. It is this Royal Commission that brought that fact to our attention. It is this fact that makes the third pulp and paper mill so inevitable, so logical, so sensible, so necessary. Because, if anyone thinks for one moment that this Government is going to sit by and allow anyone to stand in the way of a proper utilization of this two hundred thousand cords of pulp wood a year that the

Almighty gave us, and gave us undoubtedly to use in a pulp and paper mill until perhaps even a better use is found for it, then anyone so thinking is making a very serious mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot thank the Royal Commission enough. It has many weaknesses, and one of my weaknesses is extravagant praise — When a man does a good job, when a man makes an honest effort, even if he were my worst enemy I feel like praising him very highly. I do indeed praise this Royal Commission. And let me make a suggestion now that in the entrance to the mill, the third paper mill, we will have a plaque placed and on that plaque we will have the names of these three Royal Commissioners.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, for some years, as one interested in the development of the natural resources of the Province I was particularly perturbed by the question of the continuity of supplies for our newsprint. Consequently, when the report of the Forestry Commission was handed to me, one of the first things which I tried to do was to get an independent reply to a question which I had frequently asked in the past years, and on which I was still not satisfied. That was the question of whether we had sufficient reserves of wood in our Province to maintain the mills as they were and as they have been expanding during the past three or four years. When I came to the report I was very glad indeed, first of all to find that there seemed to be no doubt whatsoever in the minds of the Commissioners that we did have ample reserves to carry on the mills at their present stage of manufacturing. The second question, sir, which was natural to one

who has been in the Government for the last five or six years, was the question of revenue. Revenue for our country, day by day, for our growing needs, expansion of social services and for trying to bring our level of services up to what we think they ought to be and somewhat on a par with that of our neighbouring Maritimes. We were conscious too of the fact that we needed more sources of revenue in order that we might have the wherewithal to carry on that expansion. Consequently the second thing in which I was deeply interested was to ask whether the Commission had come up with any suggestions whereby, by a utilization of our forestry resources, we might increase the yearly return to our exchequer. Certain figures which they produced gave the answer: A comparison of the money which flowed into the exchequer of Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, as compared with what we received ourselves from the two companies operating in our midst was sufficient evidence to show that at least we were not taking the fullest advantage of those companies operating here in our Province.

In the yearly report of the Citizens Research Institute of Canada, in 1954, one statement pointed out that during 1954 Alberta continued to lead all Provinces in per capita income from licenses and permits. Naturally we cannot compete with Alberta where the licenses and privileges from oil royalties have already amounted to \$10,000,000. On the other hand, another statement in the same report says reliance on revenue from other levels of Government was greatest in Newfoundland. In other words we are the lowest of the ten provinces in the revenue which we derive from private permits and licenses, stumpage and rentals. I am reminded too that

the natural wealth of the province depends to some extent on the uses made of the country's or province's natural resources. When we look at the history of the paper companies in this Province and we realize the tremendous asset they have been to the Government of this Province we cannot be carried away entirely by what we have done, because we cannot ignore some of the things which we ourselves or our predecessors have been guilty of. It is quite true the times in which these agreements were made, the times were such that the representatives of this Province, or this country, were very glad indeed to get the mills on the terms which they did. But in the light of circumstances as they are today I fail to see why agreements made twenty, thirty or forty years ago should be held as documents which could not be re-committed for renegotiations. At this juncture, of course, I am not privileged, even though I am a member of the Government to give any indication what the Government intends or desires to do in this matter. As a matter of fact I am not indicating any decision has been made on it or not. But speaking as one who has given some little thought to the matter of finding revenues for our growing needs it is natural I should look at all the resources which have been developed so far, in the hope that possibly some way may be found of augmenting the moneys derived directly to the exchequer, which we might expend on the growing services for our people.

Although I had found an answer to these two questions, I must admit that when I came to the solution put forward by the Commission I was rather amazed at first. The idea of a third paper mill did not shock me so much, but the idea put forward

that the mill, the third mill, and I was very much taken with the great stress which they laid upon the necessity for a third mill in order to make the most use of our timber, particularly that very large portion that is apparently over-matured which should be cut and harvested between now and the next twenty-five years. I was somewhat taken back by the idea that the two companies now operating should combine as it were and have controlling interest in a third mill. I read the section several times, and whilst I can see quite a number of advantages in the arguments taken by the Commissioners, yet I can still see some disadvantages possibly accruing from the adoption of such an idea. However, at this stage, of course, it is premature to argue whether a third mill should be put up by the companies here already or whether a third party might be brought in. Along that same line I was very much surprised to find, in view of the way that the Commissioners had said that no effort had been made, apparently, by either of the operating companies to exchange their timber as an alternative to the uneconomic problem of hauling wood long distances. It is quite true there is a reference there to a joint proposition by the three principals concerned, the two paper mills and the Government itself in a proposition around Birchy Lake. But there seems to have been no large and determined effort on the part of the companies to try and overcome the economic difficulties which are referred to in the Commissioner's Report.

The question of revenue for the Province, of course, is one of increasing importance. I was very pleased to note that the Commission had qualified what they had said in their

comparison of the moneys received from the different companies in the different provinces. The final statement, that revenue accruing from the forests to the Newfoundland exchequer should be commensurate with that being paid in other provinces of Canada carrying on a similar operation.

There are quite a number of other things, sir, in the report, which well deserve all the attention which the Government could give it; but naturally the idea of a third mill and the possibility we may be able to do something on the east coast similar to what has taken place on the west coast and in central Newfoundland is something which has focused our attention for the time being, perhaps to the exclusion of other important things which are contained in the report. As a member of an east coast constituency, naturally I am very keenly interested in the possibility that we may be able in some way or another to use this report as a focus point on which we can try and evoke interest and finally somewhere on the east coast a paper mill of two hundred thousand tons capacity to take care of the timber which apparently is going to waste at the present time.

Now I said there were other things in that report which deserve more than passing attention. During last Fall, sir, Clarenville, the only town in the Province of Newfoundland which has a creosote industry, I was very much concerned for some months, knowing that the contract which that company had had for some years for the creosoting of some quantity of ties for the railroad was coming to an end at December 31, 1954. The failure of that industry alone for that community would have meant a very serious loss, inasmuch as for some six

months of the year fifty odd people get steady and remunerative wages at that particular work, and in addition a similar number of men receive very good wages indeed from the actual work attending on that creosoting plant in the handling of birch ties, etc. Consequently, I was interested in what was in the report, or what the Commissioners might have had to say on the birch supplies in this Province. Perhaps some of their statements are given with a measure of caution, yet I believe it is fair to say that they pointed out that we have an indefinite supply of birch to carry on with roughly ninety or one hundred thousand cords a year. They do say, however, that the requirements for the railway within the foreseeable future will be something of the nature of sixty thousand ties per year, which is somewhat lower than the present requirements. But they also pointed out that should the railway change from soft tie to a hard tie for branch railways that requirement would be up some eighty to eighty-five thousand ties per year. The importance of that particular industry to my own constituency is very great indeed. Apart from the fact which the Commissioners bring out, that the supply of birch is sufficient to keep the birch mill in operation, yet perhaps the success of the birch mill itself depends upon a rounding off of operations by the inclusion within its boundaries of the birch tie industry for the railway.

Again, sir, as a matter of more than passing interest I looked with some concern at what the Commissioners might have to say on the lumber requirements for this particular province, and the indiscriminate cutting that has been going on from time immemorial on our three-mile-limit, and power saw mill operations. As

a matter of fact, on the latter I wish they had gone a little farther than they did go. Some two years ago when there was difficulty in trying to get clear of the supplies of lumber cut by our local saw mill owners, I received quite a number of inquiries from both people in my own constituency and outside trying to dispose of the lumber that year. And in an effort to try and make sales for them I saw several of our dealers. During the course of that period I had one talk with one of our biggest lumber dealers. He was very well informed indeed, and was able to give me quite a bit of information on the grading, particularly in Nova Scotia at that time, and compare the same with some of the things going on locally. As an illustration I accompanied him to a pier to look at two carloads of lumber which had just been landed, one from Nova Scotia and the other from some of our local districts. The cargo from Nova Scotia was piled, each category 18', 10' and 12' lengths. The cargo from the Newfoundland schooner was piled indiscriminately on the wharf, all mixed up together. It contained a considerable portion of black heart or rot, particularly in the butts of 9" timber. So he showed me why in preference they imported lumber from Nova Scotia rather than take it from local suppliers. That was indeed indicative of but one phase of our saw mill industry. It was refreshing rather than otherwise to me to find that the Report Commissioners put a limit as it were on the annual cut to be produced in Newfoundland, because it is extremely important, particularly in view of their judgment on a third mill, that we should make some attempt at trying to maintain our forest reserves so that the industries can continue in perpetuity.

For that reason of course, I was extremely interested in knowing their comments upon the insect pests which in late years have begun to ravage certain of our wood areas.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many things in this excellent report that it is difficult indeed to mention all of them in a short speech nor is it necessary we should so do. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources in introducing the Report emphasized the importance, I think, of the Report as something on which we can outline our forest policy during the next few years. The Premier has not over-emphasized the importance of that Report. While it is true that the report itself is of very little use to us except as information as it stands at the present time, the implementation of the major recommendations within that report and the implementation during the next four or five years of the various recommendations which are put forward although they may not be adopted entirely, and although it may be needed as time goes on to modify some of the things which are put forward, yet the whole thing in itself is a very broad and comprehensive, statesmanlike policy which outlines the formula which we must adopt, I believe, if we are to make the most of the forest resources of our Province, and if we are to get for the exchequer most of the returns which are possible in order that we may be able to carry on the expansion which is so extremely desirable and necessary if this Province wants to take its place in the Dominion of Canada.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate or rather in this discussion on this Report, but inasmuch as there

appears to be a little time I feel that possibly it will not be out of place if I were to rise to make a few brief remarks in connection with this matter.

It is well known to most of my friends that I have the honour to represent in this House a constituency wherein is the pioneer pulp and paper mill, and if not the pioneer one certainly the one that has continuously operated since 1908. I am given the understanding that there was something of the form of a pulp and paper operation prior to them. As I was a very young lad at the time it follows I do not know very much about it, and I have not read much of its history. But since 1908 and the coming into being of the Anglo Newfoundland Development Company's operation at Grand Falls — I was then a young lad, and I have some rather vivid recollections concerning the same. I am very happy that I am privileged to represent in this House the constituency in which this delightful industry was instituted and brought about through the interest and energy of our forefathers in connection with the Government affairs and industries of this Province. I repeat that I am proud that I have the privilege to represent that constituency in this House of Assembly.

Now to refer to this Report, Mr. Speaker, which has been generally acknowledged — and I have no intention of making an alibi for not having read it completely. It has been generally acknowledged by all who have spoken to the matter that this Report is very comprehensive and that very few of the members of the House have been able to spare the time necessary to give it the review that would give one an opportunity to intelligently cover the many, many important matters in this report. My

first thought in connection with the matter is to congratulate the Government, of which I happen to be a part, on its foresight for introducing and bringing about this Royal Commission on Forestry, to determine, if possible where we actually stood in Newfoundland insofar as our timber resources are concerned. It is common knowledge that at least within my memory in my more mature years, of course, that we have been talking about all kinds of timber resources — plenty of timber in Bay D'Espoir — plenty of timber in other sections of Newfoundland — Plenty of timber belonging to Newfoundland on Labrador — Yet no definite effort had been made by our predecessors in office, as far as I am aware, to determine just where we stood as far as this great natural resource is concerned. So, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be associated with a Government that has taken upon themselves to appoint this Royal Commission and so learn for the first time, as far as I am concerned, where we actually stand in Newfoundland with regard to our timber resources.

The Report is very comprehensive and covers in detail many points which few speakers in this House will attempt to cover, as my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply has just said. I agree with his comment, wherein he said that he does not think it is necessary to cover all the points or discuss all the points raised here. The Report is outstanding, as far as I have gone in reading and scanning over this delightful Report, it is nice to see that the Commission has taken care in its recommendations to make sure that the two industries now operating have sufficient resources, sufficient supply, almost perpetual in their holdings to

carry on these two great paper mills on which we in Newfoundland depend so much. It is encouraging to note that there is sufficient supply to carry on these two great industries, and one would wish to divert for a moment to cover the great value of these two great industries to Newfoundland. It is well known by those who have studied the economy of this island that these two great mills actually supply the livelihood for perhaps a little more than a third of the population of Newfoundland, indirectly a much greater number. And as one of my colleagues or somebody was moved to say, the ramifications of the provision of raw materials for those two mills extend so far throughout Newfoundland that it provides a living for many people who have never even seen Grand Falls and who have never even seen Corner Brook. We know of them, yes. It is a very wonderful thing for this Province that our forefathers had sufficient insight to get these two industries working.

Now I am very proud to see that in this Report a very clear definition has been laid down on the basis of actual statistics provided, and figures are clearly set forth. I do not propose to review them in detail, to show that the necessary supply is in our Island Home. In addition to that we have the necessary supply, we hope, to provide a third mill, a third pulp and paper mill in this island. Ramifications of this third mill, when and if brought into operation will, without the slightest doubt increase the value of the pulp and paper industry and increase our economic progress to such an extent that it will take care of possibly another twenty or thirty thousand people, depending on the magnitude of the mill. I believe it is recommended that sufficient timber

is available to supply another five hundred ton mill. It is recommended, I believe for somewhere on the east coast of Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, if and when that third project can be brought into operation, needless to say, it will provide one of the greatest stimulants to the economy of our Island Home that has taken place since the days of 1923 when the hum on the Humber was one of the greatest comments of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking entirely off the cuff, with no notes whatsoever. Perhaps I should not apologize for that, as really I owe it to this great subject, and every member of the House, I take it too, owes to this great subject, to really give the matter some study. I acknowledge here and now that every member of this House should really give to this topic a very extensive study, but unfortunately most of us have not found the necessary time. I want to refer, however, in passing, to a thought that has occurred to me, and I have no doubt it is referred to in this extensive report in some measure. It is on the matter of selective cutting for the timber mills and for the pulp and paper mills.

For many years, those of us who moved around the Island have seen from time to time in the pulpwood piles, in the booms in the river and in the piles actually in the woods the products of the lumbermen — It has always been a matter of some consideration to me as to whether or not we were actually doing the selective cutting in this country that the proposition really merits. Needless to say, in making this comment I acknowledge that I am definitely — I do not do so in the sense of any authority when speaking on it, but nevertheless I cannot help but express the thought that when one sees such immature wood

cut and placed in the piles and in the booms and on the banks, as the case may be, where it is stored for dumping into the rivers in the springtime — I am quite certain Mr. Speaker, that I am not alone in this thought when I speak with some concern as to whether or not we are quite right, whether or not our pulp wood operators, our paper mill operators are quite right in cutting the timber, the immature wood which we see so frequently. It has been my privilege on occasions to mention that matter to the officials of the companies. Needless to say they have a very good explanation as to why they do it. I am quite satisfied that these people know far better than I, with regard to preserving their areas of pulpwood and their quantities. But nevertheless I put the question to them and I am not yet satisfied with the answer. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure that the people who give us the answers really feel that they are really doing exactly right in the matter. But one of the arguments at least in favour of cutting that small wood is that when the logger goes over an area he cannot do the selective cutting in the sense that some of us would like because were they to leave this young, immature wood, it appears that it does not get sufficient shelter because of the larger trees being taken out and so it blows down, and in that way more value is lost than if they actually cut the smaller timber. That probably is the answer, but my informants have always been good enough to say to me that they do it for another reason. They do it because the reproduction of the forest in this Island of ours is really more rapid in some species of our timber than in many of the Provinces of Canada. I don't

think that would apply so much if we were to refer or use the same terms in reference to British Columbia.

In 1953 during a visit to British Columbia it was my privilege to be taken by two of the largest timber companies in that area into the great forests to see something of their methods of production. Needless to say, being one of those people who have always been attracted by large forests and big trees, for some reason or other I have always been attracted by them, Mr. Speaker, I really love to see these tremendous large trees being harvested; and for that reason I went actually into the forests to see it. I was rather amazed to find amongst other things — and I did discuss the proposition with two gentlemen who were kind enough to take me on, officials of the company, they actually cut off the tops of the trees; one of the very things that we here in Newfoundland condemn our people for doing in the case of cutting ties for the railway. We frequently claim that the loss of that top to obtain a tie is a serious loss to the harvest of our Newfoundland forests. Needless, to say, of course, everything depended on the size of the timber; and because our timber is not so large as we find it, or anything as near, not even as large as the tops they cut off and discard in British Columbia — We try to rescue and preserve every bit that we can. But they in their great forests are not so worried, so I actually saw tops cut off of many great trees, some of them 150', 160' up to 200'; and I know I am speaking in the presence of gentlemen who know there are many of them much taller than that. But I saw the tops cut off these trees at nineteen inches each and thereon and the tips of these trees left in the forest to decay. Now

whether that is the common practice in British Columbia I am not in a position to say. But I did remark to my host on that occasion that we in Newfoundland would be very happy to harvest the tops they were cutting off and wasting. It is merely a word in passing, sir, I am happy, sir, that we in our forests are, if I may use the word, not wasteful or perhaps I would be accusing my friends in British Columbia of actually wasting their timber. I do not mean it in that sense. I take it because they have so much they are perhaps not so worried about these small portions, but it has worried me in regard to seeing small timber cut in this Island. Evidently the foresters know what they are doing, and if the replies they have given to me are sufficiently correct and satisfactory to them, all I can do is accept them. I merely mention it in passing as I feel it is worthy of note. I have never heard reference to it in the House of Assembly before. Naturally it gave me much concern because like many other Newfoundlanders, I felt we did not have too much and we could not afford to waste our timber.

I have been told from time to time and have read a few little documents on the matter of what wood we are cutting and matters of that kind. But who am I to criticize. I put it this way, Mr. Speaker, in making my remarks I do not make them in the sense of criticism. The very fact that a sufficient reservation of timber is assured in this Report for the operation of those two mills almost in perpetuity is something for which I am sure every Newfoundlander will be grateful to know; and because there appears to be sufficient to put another mill in operation. Needless to say we will be eternally grateful

and happy when that comes around. So I say; I think the Government has done a very fine job in getting men of such ability to become members of the Royal Commission and producing this very wonderful report as to what we actually own or possess in our forest resources.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for me to go on any further. I have actually taken longer than I had intended. Whilst the topic is so valuable and one in which I am delighted to take even a private part, yet I confess I have not given this report all the thought I had hoped to give it. I will give it much more attention in the future, but I have not given it up to now sufficient attention to be able to intelligently discuss it. I think the two main factors are, when we are thinking of the development of a third mill, we are making absolutely sure that the resources are there to take care of the two mills which are now operating. I believe, if one scans the report closely, one will see that a recommendation is there that the great resources of timber on the Labrador may be held in reserve as future security for the continued operations of these two great mills.

Mr. Speaker, in making these few brief remarks in connection with this report I want to congratulate the Royal Commission for the production of the same and the Government for appointing the Commission. I am happy to know that we have such resources which I trust, as is intimated here, will be a further stimulant to the economy of Newfoundland. I am looking forward with great pleasure and interest, as every Newfoundlander, to the time when somebody, needled or pressed or pushed, as the case may be, by the Government and/or the De-

partment of Mines and Resources, who are really responsible for the forests in the Island, will succeed in getting—and I am not interested as to just who they are—all I want to know is that they will be satisfactory operators, and if, as the Report recommends, the two present operating companies see the advisability of taking hold and operating a third mill in order to bring together as it were, their supplies of timber, the description of which has already been given today, and so avoid that loss of economy of one company hauling their timber past the other company's door, as has been very clearly portrayed. If these two companies clearly see their way to operating a third mill, I shall be happy. If they do not, I shall be happy, as far as I may, to give any assistance or push I may be able to give so that some other company will come in here and operate a third mill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if no other honourable gentleman wishes to speak to this motion, I would ask leave of the House to withdraw the motion I made earlier today—that the House do now adjourn.

Motion withdrawn.

First Readings:

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and Frobisher, Limited."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the District Courts Act."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Education asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Local School Tax Act, 1954."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Economic Development asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting Mortier Bay Development Company, Limited."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Economic Development asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and the United Electric Light and Power Company Limited, relating to a Franchise."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Committee of the Whole on various Bills:

No. 8, 26 and 27.

MR. CURTIS: I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, if we could have the Bill read by numbers unless there is any suggestion that my honourable friends would like to ask some questions?

MR. COURAGE: It has been suggested by the Honourable the Attorney General that instead of reading all the clauses we merely call the numbers, is that agreeable?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, this Bill has been passed by a Select Committee, and approved?

MR. COURAGE: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: It is satisfactory to me.

A Bill "An Act Respecting Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages": Clauses 1 through 6 carried.

Clause 7.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask whoever is in charge of the Bill what happens if the bill of sale is not registered within thirty days.

MR. MURRAY: I think the situation, Mr. Chairman, arises under Clause 4, if you go back.

MR. CURTIS: That is exactly the same as the effect under the Registry of Deeds Act.

MR. BROWNE: But, if you do not register a deed for a certain number of days it does not make any difference.

MR. CURTIS: But it does provide, in the case of Chattel Mortgages if not registered in thirty days they are void as against subsequent mortgagees who register their title first. If they are not registered in thirty days and the second mortgage is registered first, the second mortgage gets the preference.

MR. BROWNE: But suppose the second mortgage is registered within thirty days, before the first one?

MR. CURTIS: My honourable friend is satisfied it would be void—the first mortgage is not registered if the second one is registered before it even if not done within thirty days.

Clauses 7 through 10 carried.

Clause 11:

MR. BROWNE: Is this something new here, the renewal statement: What is the point, if the mortgage is still there and not released.

MR. CURTIS: I presume it is to try to keep the records effective. I don't know if my honourable and learned friend has had the experience I have had—a chattel mortgage may be still there although paid off long ago, and nobody ever bothered to release it. In other words this is just to keep them alive.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, would there be many of these chattel mortgages, do you anticipate, and will they be registered in the same way as deeds?

MR. CURTIS: They are registered, I understand, Mr. Chairman, in a separate book.

MR. BROWNE: Do you get many of them?

MR. CURTIS: Motor cars.

Clauses 11 through 25 carried.

Schedule carried.

Motion carried, that the Committee report having passed the Bill, without amendment.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Education (Teacher Training) Act":

MR. COURAGE: This Bill was read and all clauses passed except Clause 2, which was allowed to stand.

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, the honourable and learned member for St. John's West questioned the word "general". I checked with the Department of the Attorney General and was told that leaving out that word made no difference whatsoever to the meaning of that clause. The drafting was okay as far as their office was concerned.

Clause 2 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment. Carried.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Interpretation Act":

Clauses 1 and 2 carried.

Moved that the Committee rise and report having passed this Bill, without amendment.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and has passed the Bill "An Act Respecting Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages," without amendment.

Report received, on motion, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and has passed the Bill "An Act to Amend the Education (Teachers Training) Act," without amendment.

Report received, on motion Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and has passed the Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Interpretation Act," without amendment.

Report received, on motion, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Second Readings:

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Provision of Building Standards."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, the Local Area Planning Act has been repealed. That Act contained two sections, one dealing with provisions relating to planning, which has now been placed under the "Urban and

Rural Planning Act," and the second part dealt with provisions regarding building control. This building control has now been re-enacted in this particular Bill. In addition to that, this particular Bill contains a provision to permit the adoption of the National Building Code, either in whole or in part.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if that could stand over. We only got that today and we have not had a chance to examine it at all.

On motion debate on second reading deferred.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Life and Accident Insurance Agents (Licensing) Act."

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Act is to make it possible to vary the license fees for insurance agents. The reason for that being that there are certain insurance agents coming here from the Mainland, and it is felt that they should have to pay somewhat different and higher license fees than local agents.

That is the only thing in that amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, could we have that deferred until the next day?

On motion debate on second reading adjourned.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Elections) Act."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, the first amendments in this proposed

Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Elections) Act" are suggestions proposed in order to insure conformity with amendments when made in this section of the Local Government Act, providing for holding of municipal elections on the same date. A second amendment repeals the provision on the qualifications for voting in a municipal election. The proposal would extend the right to vote to non-resident taxpayers. The next amendment, Sir, is designed to obviate the need for the preparation of new residents' voters' lists for a deferred or for a by-election. Section 5 provides that a qualification for voting in the first election to be held in a municipality shall be a resident for a period of not less than three months, and the remaining amendment is designed to clarify existing provision for the abatement of a petition. The proposed revision carried with it provisions under the Provincial Elections Act.

I move the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, it is true this Bill was read a first time on Monday, and is now being read a second time, but I think the honourable member will know we have not had time to study it. I beg to ask that it remain over until the next day.

On motion debate adjourned.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act."

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, there are several clauses in that amendment, and I have been provided with notes from the department as to the purpose of these amendments.

In Section 2 the amendment is necessary because the word "Municipality" is used in Section 36 of the principal Act and refers to both municipal

areas and councils existing with jurisdiction in that area. The new definition is Clause 2 of the Act and allows for the use of the word "Municipality" in either case—the town or rural district mentioned in the present definition of "Municipality" is an area only, and hence the necessity of that particular amendment.

At the Federal-Provincial Conference held in December, Newfoundland was represented by the Deputy Minister of Public Works and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. The question arose with regard to uniformity of reporting accidents. It has been the practice in Newfoundland that, where a vehicle was involved in an accident wherein the damages amounted to fifty dollars or more, the driver was bound to report that accident to the officials. In other provinces that limit was set at one hundred dollars. So, I repeat, for the purpose of uniformity, it was recommended at this conference that we would bring our Act into conformity. So that this change is recommended, from fifty dollars to one hundred dollars, in Section 67 of the principal Act, as designed to serve this purpose.

The amendment to Section 107 (1) of the principal Act is desirable because under the present Section 107 a judgment creditor who for example has received a judgment of say five hundred dollars against a worthless debtor can recover four hundred dollars from his own insurance company, and one hundred dollars plus disbursements came out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. Now a judgment creditor who has received a judgment for \$99 against a worthless creditor cannot receive from the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund whereas when he obtains a judgment for \$100 he can recover the one hundred dollars plus his

disbursements and one half his tax out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. The proposed amendment contained in Paragraph (a) of Clause 4 of the Bill provides for \$100 deductible on all amounts payable out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. The Amendment to Section 1 (b) of Clause 107 of the principal Act, Act No. 75, 1954, contained in Paragraph (b) of Clause 4 of the Bill is necessary because of the proposed amendment contained in Paragraph (d) of Clause 4 of the Bill. The amendment to Paragraph (a) of the principal Act is contained in Paragraph (c) of the Clause 4 of the Bill, and is necessary because of the proposed amendment to Section 107. (1) as contained in Paragraph (a) of Clause 4 of the Bill. The amendment to Section 107 of the principal Act as contained in Paragraph (b) of Clause 4 of the Bill repeals sub-section 10, 11, 12 and 13, of Section 107 of the principal Act and substitutes provisions which provide that a judgment creditor cannot receive out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund on a judgment by default where the defendant did not file a defense, the defendant did not appear or where he could not appear by counsel at the trial, or the defendant consented to judgment, unless twenty-one days before judgment by default has been entered, the plaintiff has served notice in writing on the Minister stating that on the expiration of a period of twenty-one days from the service of the notice judgment by default will be entered unless within that period the Minister acts under sub-section (11). Under this provision the Minister does not have to act, but if he feels there is a defense he can file a defense and sit in on the assessment of damages. At the present time the Minister cannot interfere in respect of default of

judgment until after judgment has been entered, and the judgment creditor applies for an order out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. By that time, of course, it is too late to upset the judgment, except in the most glaring cases. The amendment as contained in Paragraph (b) of Clause 4 of the Bill would enable the Minister to take appropriate action at the very beginning of the case.

The amendment to Section 109 of the principal Act allows for repayment on permission of the Minister of Finance by instalments, of the amount paid out of the fund in order to satisfy a judgment and costs. The Minister of Finance will fix the amounts of the instalments and the times in which the instalments are to be made, if the Minister of Finance agrees to repayment by instalments. The Minister of Public Works may, if the judgment debtor gives proof of financial responsibility, restore the judgment debtor's driver's licence, or car licence, or both. However, if the judgment debtor defaults in his instalments, his driver's licence and car licence also shall be cancelled and shall not be restored until he has made good to the fund the amount paid out of the fund and until he has given full proof of further financial responsibility.

The amendment to Section 122 of the principal Act is provided in Clause 6 of the Bill, and provides for the payment of funds to the municipalities where peace officers have been appointed by them for the purpose of enforcing regulations under Section 63 of the principal Act and where the complaints have been made by such peace officers.

These, Mr. Speaker, are merely amendments to contribute to smooth-

er operations of this Highway Traffic Act in connection with penalties or a judgment of financial responsibility. I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to check on these points. I appreciate the trouble the Minister has taken to see we got a good explanation—I followed him very well, but would like the debate adjourned until the next day.

On motion debate adjourned.

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that the House when it rises, adjourn until Tuesday next at 3:00 of the clock.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General promised to let me know the result of the Public Utilities Inquiry.

MR. CURTIS: Yes—Actually, Mr. Speaker, I was going to do that but overlooked it. It is not a report on rates at all. The letter that I have referred to is simply a letter just giving me a report as to what happened in the hearings at Placentia and Carbonear and these places. It is just a formal report, and no advantage would be gained in tabling it.—It is just an interim report showing what they had done.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the Minister of Finance, or perhaps the Premier to tell us when we are likely to get down to the Estimates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Pretty soon.—The Estimates and the Budget come together—the week after next, I should think, by then.

On motion the House then adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 12, at 3:00 of the clock.

TUESDAY, April 12, 1955.

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

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the government has been advised by the Bowater Corporation of North America, Limited, that a new company, the Bowater Power Company, Limited (incorporated in the Province of Newfoundland, Canada) has been formed with the object of acquiring and operating the hydro-electric development at present owned and operated by Bowater's Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Mills, Limited, and of acquiring the undeveloped water powers and the water power rights at present owned by that company.

The value of the assets now to be taken over by the Power Company have been appraised at a sum in excess of \$34,000,000.

The directors of the Power Company will include Sir Eric Vansittart Bowater (President), Chairman of the Bowater Paper Corporation Limited and President of the Bowater Corporation of North America, Limited; Mr. George S. Currie (Vice-President), partner in McDonald Currie and Company, Chartered Accountants; Mr. Gordon R. Bell, President of the Bank of Montreal; Mr. Paul Bienvenu, President and managing Director of Catelli Food Products, Limited; Mr. Eric Cook, Q.C., partner in Cook and Bartlett, Barristers and Solicitors, St. John's, Newfoundland; Mr. H. M. Spencer Lowin, Vice-President of Bowater's Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Mills, Limited; and Mr. John H. Price, Executive.

The existing hydro-electric plant, which has an installed capacity of

150,000 horsepower, supplies the entire power requirements of Bowater's Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Mills, Limited at Corner Brook, Newfoundland. In addition, it supplies the regional requirements of the Newfoundland Light and Power Company, Limited, the Buchans Mining Company, Limited and other industries in the area.

The demand for electric energy in this area is increasing rapidly and one of the objects for which the new Power Company has been formed is the further development of the water powers within the drainage areas now to be acquired by the Power Company.

From the wording of this release, I think the House will be justified in assuming that in order to carry out the proposed transfer Bowater's Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Mills, Limited, will shortly be redeeming its "B" debentures guaranteed by the government of Newfoundland, and that the government will be released from its guarantee undertaken in 1923 when this great enterprise was undertaken.

Presenting Petitions

MR. DROVER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Roddickton, Englee and Main Brook in White Bay. The petition itself, Sir, is a little complicated. I believe I could present three of them bearing on the same thing. It is for a road which will link with Roddickton. This is the third time that these people have presented a petition to the House of Assembly within the past six years for this road. This petition is signed by 446 voters of the area, and in Canada Bay alone there are two thousand people.

I wish to add, Mr. Speaker, that all of the land or timber rights in Gander Bay have been granted to Bowater's Pulp and Paper Mill, within the last two years. They already have a road from Main Brook to Roddickton, and the people are requesting that the government would negotiate with Bowater's the right to use that road. For the government to build a road over the same route that Bowater's already have a road, is a little bit unreasonable, and as the people of Canada have sanctioned the giving not only of the three mile limit but all the timber rights they think that an amicable arrangement could be made whereby the people of the area could have access to the road which has already been built.

I have much pleasure in presenting this petition, Sir. I do not think that the request of the people is unreasonable, and I have pleasure in presenting it to the House of Assembly and asking that it be tabled and forwarded to the Department of Public Works for their consideration.

On motion petition tabled for reference to the department concerned.

MR. NORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition from Trout River in the Electoral District of St. Barbe. The petition is signed by the Honourable Member for the District of St. Barbe also by three hundred voters from Trout River. The settlement of Trout River is linked with the road link of Bonne Bay, Deer Lake highway. In the winter season it is impossible for even a snowmobile to get through to Bonne Bay thus isolating it completely. This results in great inconvenience to the travelling public, delays in mail to Bonne Bay, Corner Brook and St. John's. Employment is also adversely affected as pro-

ducts cannot be shipped out and goods brought in and employees are delayed in getting to and from their employment.

The petition states that a road from Deer Lake to Woody Point and on to Trout River be put on the snow-clearing program in the snow season.

I have much pleasure in supporting this petition, sir, and ask it be laid on the Table of the House to be referred to the department concerned.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned,

MR. NORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of some one thousand people requesting that a road being built to Isle aux Morts continue on to Burnt Island. The petition points out the great necessity for this road as there is no other means of transportation other than by boat travel. As weather conditions will not always allow boats to get outside the harbour the people of Burnt Island give other good reasons; sometimes they have to wait weeks for mail delivery, and are unable to sell their fish during the summer months because the quantity of the catch is not sufficiently large to warrant the services of a collecting boat. From the tourist point of view, they have a fine salmon river but tourists cannot get there except by boat.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition and ask that it be placed on the Table of the House and forwarded to the department concerned. It is signed by some two hundred voters on behalf of one thousand residents of that settlement.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table the first annual report of the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority:

Giving Notice of Motion

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD: (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Finance, I give notice I will on tomorrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider a Special Grant to Her Majesty. I may say that is referring to Supplementary Supply, in respect of the year gone.

HON. F. W. ROWE: (Minister of Mines & Resources): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act to Approve and give Statutory Effect to an Agreement between the Government and Mr. M. J. Boylen."

HON. E. S. SPENCER: (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Public Works Act."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs & Supply): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Slums Clearance Act", also a bill, "An Act to Establish the City of Corner Brook, and For Other Purposes in Connection Thereof."

HON. H. I. POTTLE (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, to revert to former orders of the day — In as much as the time limit is about to expire for the presentation of regulations; I now table regulations made

under authority of the Social Assistance Act, 1954, which regulations came into effect on the 1st day of April, 1955.

On motion regulations tabled.

Giving Notice of Questions

(38) MR. BROWNE — To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay upon the table of the House the following information:

A statement showing the actual cash investment of the promoters of the following industries in their respective concerns:

- (a) Koch Shoes Ltd.
- (b) Gold Sail Ltd.
- (c) Atlantic Hardboards Ltd.
- (d) Newfoundland Tanneries Ltd.
- (e) Atlantic Gloves.
- (f) United Cotton Mills.
- (g) Hanning Electric Co. Ltd.
- (h) Atlantic Films Ltd.
- (i) Eckhardt Mills.
- (j) Superior Rubber Co. Ltd.
- (k) CMIC.

State the name of the auditor or officer of the Company on whose authority this information is based. If no cash was invested give the value of the materials representing the investment of the promoters stating whether such value is duty paid value or landed value prior to duty and other taxes and give the name of the responsible party on whose authority the value was given.

If the amount of the cash and for materials invested was less than 50% of the total value of the concern at the commencement of operations on whose authority was the formula laid down in the

Acts confirming the agreements between the government and the concerns varied. Table a copy of the Minute of Council or other documents authorizing any departure from the agreement as confirmed by the House of Assembly.

By what authority was working capital supplied to the above companies or any of them? Specify in each case. When applications have been received by the Government for working capital or for other purposes after operations were commenced; have such applications been in writing? If so table a copy of the correspondence on such applications and state whether an examination of the accounts of the companies has been made by the Auditor General or any other person on behalf of the Government in order to ascertain if the company applying for such working capital has been operated efficiently.

Was the appointment of the Hon. Member for Green Bay as director of any of these companies authorized by the Government? If so table a copy of the Minute of Council authorizing such appointment and outline the duties which the Hon. Member was expected to perform. State whether the Hon. Member has made any report to the Government on his observations, and if so, table a copy of the same. Has the said Hon. Member been employed as Auditor or in any other capacity for such expenses for which he has received pecuniary compensation? If so give details.

(39) MR. HOLLETT — To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fish-

eries and Co-operatives to lay on the table of the House the following information:

(1) A statement showing quantities and qualities of fish bought in 1954 by the Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.

(2) A statement showing what prices were paid to fishermen of the Province by said Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd. during 1954 for the following grades:

- (a) Labrador Salt Bulk.
- (b) Labrador Ordinary Cure.
- (c) Labrador Hard Dried.
- (d) Merchantable (Extra Large, Large and Medium, Small).
- (e) Mederia (Extra Large, Large and Medium, Small).
- (f) Thirds (Extra Large, Large and Medium, Small).
- (g) West India.

(3) Who are the present Directors of said Company, and does the Government still control 51% of the shares? If not, then to what extent financially, is the Government interested?

(4) What is the limit of Revolving Credit presently afforded this Company by the Treasury?

(5) What amount of money is presently owed the Government, by the Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd?

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

(1) Give a detailed account of steps already taken by the Fisheries Development Authority towards implementation of the report of the Walsh Fisheries Committee.

(2) Table a report of the work of the Division of Fisheries Economic Research, relative to the

(a) Salt Fish markets, (b) the Fresh or Frozen Fish markets, (c) the markets of other fish products.

(3) Table report showing work performed by the Co-operative Division of the Fisheries Department.

(4) An account of the Minister's trip to the Carribean Salt Fish market area, together with cost of same? Was this cost charged to Fishery Research? Would the Minister advise the House what was the retail price of Salt Cod in that area at the time of his recent visit? What is the present retail price there?

(5) Did the Government pay the costs or any portion thereof of the trip to Jamaica and the Caribbean area of Messrs, Lake, Cheesman, Crosbie and Russell when they accompanied the Minister and the Premier there recently? If so what was the amount paid on account of each?

(6) How much money was still owed to the Department of Fisheries by Mr. Clive Planta when he resigned his position with the Department?

(7) List the names of Firms and Individuals and the amount of loans or guarantees to each which have been loaned for Fishery Development or expansion purposes in the Fisheries.

Answers to Questions

QUESTION NO. 36.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question will be

given by my colleague, the Attorney General, when he answers some other questions that are on the Order Paper with regard to the birch plant.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I might say in that same connection. I hope to be answering these questions tomorrow.

Question No. 37: In course of preparation.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 34: I should point out first of all, Mr. Speaker, we do not have to answer any questions, and in fact I am not going to give any full particulars of the companies. However, as we do have the names of the directors, which incidentally, could be obtained from the Registrar of Deeds, as I presume the company is registered — However, to save the honourable gentleman time I am listing the directors as they are recorded in our department, and the address of the head office, which is Whitbourne, according to our records. The assets against which we have taken a loan of \$25,000, are listed also.

In connection with 34 (2), Mr. Speaker, I may say this has taken us very considerable time, because no distinction was made between the loans which were made between the Commission of Government and the mink farmers of that day and loans made by this Government in that question — So we have copied off — and had several of our stenographers assigned to this all last week — we had copied off all the agreements which have ever been made between the government and mink farmers in Newfoundland. Incidentally, I do not know the reason for it, but during the Commission of Government days such agreements were not registered in the Registry of Deeds. I am tabling

the list of all those to whom loans were made at any time.

34 (3) The answer to that is that this Government has no knowledge of any such agreement.

34 (4) The answer to that is that the Government is under no obligation directly or indirectly to supply meat to mink ranchers at 2c. a lb.

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources in reply to Question 34 (Mr. Hollett), Order Paper dated 5th April.

Question

- (1) Give full particulars Trinity Mink Limited, Coy., to include the names of Directors, the address of the Head Office of the Company and a list of the assets against which the Government has taken a Mortgage for the recent loan of \$25,000.

Answer

- (A) The Directors of Trinity Mink Limited are as follows:

Victor Clouston, Murray's Pond,
Portugal Cove Road

Bernard Andrews, Maple Street,
St. John's.

John Spence, Toronto.

Earl Maxham, Worcester, Ver-
mont, U.S.A.

- (B) The address of the head office of the Company is:
Whitbourne.

- (C) List of assets taken against loan of \$25,000.00 authorized Trinity Mink Limited:

1. Area of land on which ranch of Trinity Mink Limited is

located situate at Blaketown containing approximately 25 acres having an appraised value of \$3,000.00, together with all buildings and erections thereon having equity of \$25,000.

2. 1 Water pump & heater

1 Food chopper

1 Watering system

1 Food mixer

1 Refrigeration unit

1 Food slicer

3,000 Mink pens

50 Female mink

Having equity of \$20,000.

Question

- (2) Table a copy of Agreements made between the Government and the various Mink farmers relative to loans made to said farmers, including the Trinity Mink Limited Company.

Answer

Annexed hereto are Indentures covering loans made to the following mink ranchers:—

G. W. McNeil

D. Mitchell

Kenneth Butterfield

G. G. Holden

J. Scott

Amos Goudie

Reuben Goudie

B. Stone

Ormond Wellington Francis

Wm. Dawe

G. Gould

Balston Kerr

Trinity Mink Limited

T. Burton

W. Dawe

A. Dunphy & Sons

Lewis Osmond

K. & R. LeShane

A. E. Stroud

J. Etsell

Butt & Voisey

Lem Knight

Eric Goudie

Ward Knight

Harry Saunders

Lester Knight

Eugene Flight

Winifred Strong

Walter Gillard

Max Speucer

Ross Young

Jesse Cave

Stanley Fudge

F. Burton

Robert Durdle

C. Tremblett

A. Ayles

William Finn

Jas. Small

Jack Barton

Robt. Sweetapple

Garfield Gordon

Ray LeShane

J. Strong

J. Kerrivan

Geo. Blackmore

E. P. Bridger

R. S. Knight

F. W. Earle

Herman Rowsell

Harry Knight

Has Noble

Fred Knight

Rd. Kirby

Walter Young

Geo. Marshall

Alex. Spencer

D. Fudge

Clifford Fudge

Alfred Fudge

Ed. Burton

E. Keel

E. Etsell

Thos. Best

Ced. Small

Wm. Eaton

William Critch

Healey Gordon

Doug Voisey

Harold Moulard

Question

- (3) What agreement, if any, has been entered into between the Trinity Mink Limited against whose property the Government states it holds a mortgage and Victor Clouston of St. John's Vera Spence of Toronto and Earle Bernard Andrews of St. John's, M. Maxham of Worcester in Vermont, U.S.A. Table a copy of said agreement.

Answer

The Government has no knowledge of any such agreement.

Question

- (4) Is the Government under any obligation to supply whale or pot-head whale meat at 2 cents per pound to Mink Ranchers, either directly or through the operations of any Company to whom the Government has advanced or loaned moneys, or guaranteed same? If so, table a copy of any agreement.

Answer

The Government is under no obligation either directly or indirectly to supply whale meat to mink ranchers at 2 cents per pound. There is no agreement.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to one or two questions here: Question No. 30, on the Order Paper of Friday, April 1, in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The answer to this question is so voluminous that it has taken many days to prepare. I do not propose to read it out, as I think it would take up the whole of the afternoon, and I am satisfied that the House does not wish me to describe these expenditures to that extent. We have gone back as far as

1946 to get the information in connection with the machinery which had been sold by the Department of Public Works. After machinery has become obsolete, it is the practice of the Department to pass it over to the Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply who in turn arrange for the sale thereof. Since 1946 there have been some thirty pieces of obsolete equipment sold ranging from a used tire for which \$8.20 was received, up to trucks and various other pieces of equipment, amounting to several hundred dollars. In the case of the number of machines hired to private individuals, the list is well over two hundred since it goes back some time. The dates are not given here, but I would like to point out in this connection, for the information of the House and anybody interested, that the Department does not set itself up to hire equipment to private individuals nor to any organization. It is quite the reverse. We endeavour to avoid it as much as possible. Nevertheless there are cases where requests are made for the hiring of the use of bulldozers, and the time varies from a half hour to as much as thirty hours, and in some cases a grader or a shovel, etc. This is only done when other equipment is not available in the area, and the department can manage to see its way clear to allow the individual to have the use of that equipment, for which people are charged absolutely the same rate as we ourselves pay people who hire equipment to us. In other words we pay from \$10 to \$14 a bulldozer and up to \$30 an hour for a shovel, and I think \$30 or \$40 for a grader. These same charges we pay are charged to individuals who hire the equipment from us. The amount of money paid in each case is, as received, turned over

to our office and there passed over to the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I table a sufficient number of copies of that reply so that all members may have them and also the press.

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Public Works in reply to Question No. 30 (Mr. Hollett) Order Paper of Friday April 1st, 1955.

1. Question

- (a) Who are the contractors who are building the Buchan's Road; (b) what amount of moneys have been spent on this road to date; (c) what has been the cost per mile (average cost); (d) give number of miles built to date; (e) the number of miles of this road that remain to be built; (f) is this road being built under firm contract, or on a cost plus arrangement; (g) were tenders called?

Answer

- (a) J. Goodyear & Sons Ltd., & H. K. Goodyear.
 (b) \$841,221.00
 (c) \$22,373
 (d) 37.6 miles
 (e) 3 miles
 (f) 8 miles built on cost per mile basis; 33 miles present contract

on unit cost basis. It is not on cost plus.

(g) Yes.

2. Question

Who built the Concrete Highroads Shed at Grand Falls and what was the total cost of same?

Answer

- (a) J Goodyear & Sons Ltd.
 (b) Steel purchased by
 Department cost \$12,201
 Building Contract
 J. Goodyear & sons 65,000
 Total cost \$77,201

3. Question

Give an itemized list showing all Highroads machines or vehicles or property of whatsoever nature which has been sold, hired or loaned in the Grand Falls Area by the Highroads Department. Give types of machines, the original cost, the price received and the name of the person or companies to whom sold. Also what were the terms of hiring or loaning in any such cases?

Answer

See annexures

4. Question

Table a copy of all contracts let to J. Goodyear & Sons since the 1st of January 1952. State the amount of money paid out to date under each contract or agreement, showing what work has been performed to date under each said contract.

Answer

	Paid to Date	Work Performed
(1) Badger—Buchans Road miles 8-16 & 25.6-33	\$284,309.00	15.4 miles road completed
(2) Badger—Buchans Road miles 16-26.2	80,748.00	7.2 miles road completed
(3) Badger—Buchans clearing right-of-way 33.23	11,597.00	work completed
(4) Badger—Buchans Road miles 33.3-40.3	173,887.00	7 miles completed
(5) Clearing Middle Brook— Soulis Brook	15,554.00	100.35 acres cleared
(6) Clearing Gander—Wesleyville	15,836.00	In progress
(7) Const. of road Lumsden towards Musgrave Harbour	477,230.00	18 miles road & 12 bridges built

ANNEXURE "A"

LIST OF HIGHROADS MACHINES SOLD

Machine	Model	Cost	Date Sold	To	Price Rec'd
1 Bulldozer Blade	1946	\$2,573	16/4/53	Goodyear	\$ 25.00
1 Carryall Scraper	1935	3,725	1/3/53	Goodyear	250.00
1 Carryall Scraper	1935	3,725	1/3/53	Goodyear	250.00
1 Pontiac Car	1942	1,625	21/6/47	H. Cramm	455.00
1 Oldsmobile Car	1937	1,400	24/6/46	F. Davis	450.00
1 Ford Car	1943	1,395	1/11/54	E. Ellis	206.00
1 Byers Shovel	1935	4,500	1/7/52	Goodyear	560.00
1 Byers Shovel	1935	4,500	1/2/47	Goodyear	325.00
1 International Truck	1934	4,300	10/8/50	Goodyear	200.00
1 Tractor	1935	5,330	1/1/54	Goodyear	500.00
1 Tractor	1935	5,300	1/11/52	Goodyear	300.00
1 Ford Truck	1943	3,200	6/6/50	Goodyear	200.00
1 Ford Truck	1943	3,200	11/12/51	F. King	225.00
1 GMC Truck	1939	1,775	22/11/47	J. Kelly	350.00
1 GMC Truck	1939	1,775	22/11/47	J. Kelly	300.00

ANNEXURE "A"

LIST OF HIGHROADS MACHINES SOLD

Machine	Model	Cost	Date Sold	To	Price Rec'd
1 GMC Truck	1939	1,775	1/9/47	W. Kearley	100.00
1 Chevrolet Truck	1939	1,000	19/6/46	D. Mercer	200.00
1 Chevrolet Truck	1939	1,000	18/6/46	W. Kearley	400.00
1 Chevrolet Truck	1939	1,000	19/6/46	D. Mercer	100.00
1 Chevrolet Truck	1939	1,000	6/6/46	Fr. Meaney	250.00
1 Chevrolet Truck	1939	1,000	4/6/46	A. O'Reilly	300.00
1 Chevrolet Truck	1939	1,000	19/6/46	D. Mercer	225.00
1 Chevrolet Truck	1939	1,000	1/9/47	A. O'Reilly	300.00
1 Chevrolet Truck	1939	1,000	1/9/47	W. Kearley	200.00
1 Chevrolet Truck	1939	1,000	1/9/47	K. O'Reilly	275.00
1 Mack	1942	2,500	1/6/50	Goodyear	200.00
1 Mack	1942	3,000	1/6/50	Goodyear	200.00
1 Mack	1942	2,680	1/6/50	Goodyear	200.00
1 Mack	1942	2,680	1/6/50	Goodyear	200.00
1 International Van	1946	1,400	8/10/50	Goodyear	250.00
1 Pickup (International)	1946	1,400	1/11/50	A. Northcott	400.00
1 Chevrolet Pickup	1939	1,550	4/6/46	M. Budgell	520.00
1 Used Tyre			1/5/54	J. Hiscock	8.20
4 Shacks (used)			1/9/54	F. King	252.00

LIST OF MACHINES HIRED

Name of Hirer	Type of Machine	Period of	Rate	Charge
		Hire Hours	\$	\$
James Keats	Grader	2	12.00	24.00
J. C. Constable	Snowplough	¾	12.00	9.00
Gordon Green	Snowplough	½	12.00	4.00
G. A. Gill	Snowplough	¾	12.00	9.00
Exploits Valley Garage Ltd.	Snowplough	4	12.00	48.00
A. E. Hickman Co. Ltd.	Snowplough	1	12.00	12.00
Beatrice Byrne	F.W.D. Truck	11	4.00	44.00
	Grader	33	10.00	330.00
J. C. Constable	Snowplough	½	12.00	6.00
A. E. Hickman Co. Ltd.	Snowplough	½	12.00	6.00
J. Goodyear & Sons Ltd.	Trailer	2	5.00	10.00
J. F. Duggan	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
H. E. Wheeler	Bulldozer	10	12.00	120.00
E. J. Clarke	Cement Mixer	20	3.00	60.00
Mrs. Mary Basha	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
George Stewart	Bulldozer	5	12.00	60.00
Nfld. Engineering & Const. Co. Ltd.	Grader	10	10.00	100.00
	Trailer	10.00	5.00	50.00
Lewisporte Wholesalers, Ltd.	Grader	2	10.00	20.00
Bramwell Pretty	Grader	2½	12.00	30.00
Grand Falls Motors Ltd.	Snowplough	2	12.00	24.00
Geo. L. Baggs	Bulldozer	12	12.00	144.00
A. G. Eddison	Grader	1½	12.00	18.00
	Trailer	1½	5.00	7.50
Church of England Building Fund	Bulldozer	10	12.00	120.00
	Shovel	3	15.00	45.00
Salvation Army Educational Fund	Bulldozer	10	12.00	120.00
C. Callahan	Bulldozer	6	12.00	72.00
William Stroude	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
C. J. Thorne	Bulldozer	4	12.00	48.00
David Furey	Cement Mixer	2	3.50	7.00
Major G. L. Barnes	Bulldozer	1	12.00	12.00
Peter Dwyer	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.00
	Grader	1	10.00	10.00
	Trailer	2	5.00	10.00
Baxter Burry	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.00
	Grader	2	10.00	20.00
	Trailer	2	5.00	10.00
Windsor Style Shop	Grader	1	10.00	10.00
Steers Ltd.	Compressor	21	4.00	84.00
	Jackhammer	39	.50	19.50
United Church	Grader	1	10.00	10.00
	Trailer	1	5.00	5.00
Frank Duggan	Snowplough	2	12.00	24.00

LIST OF MACHINES HIRED

Name of Hirer	Type of Machine	Period of	Rate	Charge
		Hire Hours		
Stewart Morgan	Grader	2	10.00	20.00
	Trailer	2	5.00	10.00
Kevin L. Brown	Bulldozer	1	12.00	12.00
Roy Walsh	Bulldozer	5	12.00	60.00
Alex Woolridge	Bulldozer	1	12.00	12.00
	Grader	1	12.00	12.00
	Trailer	1	5.00	5.00
Edgar Burry	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.00
	Grader	2	10.00	20.00
	Trailer	2	5.00	10.00
G. Yetman	Bulldozer	1	12.00	12.00
Rev. Hogan	Concrete Mixer	12	3.00	36.00
J. C. Fraser	Grader	1	10.00	10.00
A. J. O'Reilly	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
David Burry	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.00
Roy Walsh	Concrete Mixer	3	3.00	9.00
Lewisport Motors	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.00
Roy Walsh	Concrete Mixer	2	3.00	6.00
H. Diamond	Grader	4	10.00	40.00
H. Feener	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.00
Philip Cooper	Bulldozer	4	12.00	48.00
Bernard Davis	Concrete Mixer	4½	3.00	13.50
R. L. Strong	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.00
E. J. Clarke	Trailer	5	5.00	25.00
Austin J. Wall	Bulldozer	4	12.00	48.00
George L. Baggs	Bulldozer	6	12.00	72.00
Clarence Lingard	Bulldozer	5	12.00	60.00
E. O. Whiteway	Concrete Mixer	10	3.00	30.00
Fred Hackett	Bulldozer	1	12.00	12.00
Harry Bartlett	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
Bruce Jewer	Bulldozer	4	12.00	48.00
Joseph J. Baggs	Bulldozer	8	12.00	96.00
Lewisport Motors	Bulldozer	1	12.00	12.00
Nfld. Engineering & Const. Co. Ltd.	Truck	57	2.50	142.50
	Shovel	25	15.00	375.00
	Maintainer	5	10.00	50.00
	Trailer	5	5.00	25.00
	Bulldozer	18	12.00	216.00
Exploits Valley Garage, Ltd.	Shovel	68	15.00	1020.00
	3-yard Truck	60	3.00	180.00
Calvin McBay	Bulldozer	4	12.00	48.00
Imperial Oil Ltd.	Shovel	7	15.00	105.00
	Bulldozer	8	12.00	96.00
	3-ton Truck	38	3.50	133.00

LIST OF MACHINES HIRED

Name of Hirer	Type of Machine	Period of		Charge
		Hire Hours	Rate \$	
John Dicks	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.00
A.N.D. Co. Ltd.	Grader	12	10.00	120.00
	Trailer	6	5.00	30.00
	Grader	6	10.00	60.00
	Trailer	6	5.00	30.00
Calvin Morgan	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.00
Harry Bartlett	Bulldozer	1	12.00	12.00
Wesley Elliott	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
Ambrose Hollett	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
P. P. Small	Compressor	22 $\frac{1}{4}$		134.00
	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
Rev. J. P. Hogan	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.00
E. J. Clarke	Trailer	3	5.00	15.00
Bernard Davis	Bulldozer	4	12.00	48.00
	Cement Mixer	5	3.00	15.00
Levi Skinner	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
	Cement Mixer	10	3.00	30.00
	Water Pump	4	1.00	4.00
A. E. Hickman Co. Ltd.	Trailer	8	5.00	40.00
James Evans	Concrete Mixer	5	3.50	17.50
Gordon Fudge	Bulldozer	1	12.00	12.00
Wilson Price	Concrete Mixer	1	3.50	3.50
W. Wells	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
Walter McBay	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.00
E. P. Newman	Bulldozer	4	12.00	48.00
Bernard Davis	Cement Mixer	4	3.50	14.00
Fred Boyles	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.00
Bernard Davis	Concrete Mixer	1	3.50	3.50
C. L. Lingard	Concrete Mixer	12	3.50	42.00
Jesse Grandy	Bulldozer	4	12.00	48.00
	Cement Mixer	15	3.00	45.00
J. Goodyear & Sons Ltd.	Grader	8	10.00	80.00
	Trailer	12	5.00	60.00
	Grader	6	10.00	60.00
	Trailer	6	5.00	30.00
	Grader	2	10.00	20.00
	Trailer	2	5.00	10.00
	Grader	2	10.00	20.00
	Trailer	2	5.00	10.00
	Welder	7	5.00	42.00
	Trailer	5	5.00	25.00
	Welder	9	6.00	54.00
	Trailer	6 $\frac{1}{4}$	5.00	32.50

LIST OF MACHINES HIRED

Name of Hirer	Type of Machine	Period of		
		Hire Hours	Rate \$	Charge \$
Wesley Kearley	Electric Welder	¾	6.00	4.50
George A. Pardy	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.50
Levi Skinner	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
R. C. Parish	Electric Welder	3	6.00	18.00
Wavell Theatre	Bulldozer	2	12.00	24.00
Oasis Club	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
Roy Cluney	Snowplough	1	12.00	12.00
A. E. Hickman	Snowplough	1	12.00	12.00
Exploit Valley Garage Ltd.	Snowplough	5	12.00	60.00
Donald Elson	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
George D. Ireland	Bulldozer	1	12.00	12.00
Charles Shallow	Bulldozer	3	12.00	36.00
St. Joseph's Parish	Bulldozer	6	12.00	72.00
J. Goodyear & Sons Ltd.	Trailer	8	5.00	40.00
J. Goodyear & Sons Ltd.	Trailer	6	5.00	30.00
United Church of Canada	Bulldozer	1	12.00	12.00
	Grader	1	10.00	10.00
St. Joseph's Parish	Bulldozer	17	12.00	204.00
	Trailer	1	5.00	5.00
	Grader	1	10.00	10.00
	Bulldozer	4	12.00	48.00
J. Goodyear & Sons	Trailer	2	5.00	10.00
Charles Shallow	Bulldozer	1	12.00	12.00
Mrs. M. M. Dean	Bulldozer	4	12.00	48.00
J. Goodyear & Sons	Compressor	37		185.00
	Jackhammer	66	.50	33.00
A. M. Noel	Grader	2	10.00	20.00
	Trailer	2	5.00	10.00
A.N.D. Co. Ltd.	Compressor	35		175.00
	Jackhammer	70	.50	35.00
J. King	Concrete Mixer	4	3.50	14.00
E. O. Whitway	Bulldozer	4	12.00	48.00
M. A. Hoddinott	Bulldozer	10	12.00	120.00
J. Goodyear & Sons	Trailer	10	5.00	50.00
Cyril Pelley	Trailer	20	5.00	100.00
Falcon Bridge Mining	Grader	10	10.00	100.00
	Trailer	10	5.00	50.00
George B. Scott	Bulldozer	1	12.00	12.00
J. Goodyear & Sons	Trailer	4	5.00	20.00
J. Goodyear & Sons	Bulldozer	10	12.00	120.00
	Trailer	2	5.00	10.00
C. N. Luscombe	Trailer	1	5.00	5.00
Boyn Cohen	Roller	1	7.00	7.00
John Penney	Cement Mixer	4	3.50	14.00

LIST OF MACHINES HIRED

Name of Hirer	Type of Machine	Period of		Rate \$	Charge \$
		Hire	Hours		
Matthew Thorne	Bulldozer	1		12.00	12.00
J. F. Duggan	Grader	4		10.00	40.00
	Trailer	4		5.00	20.00
John Evans	Grader	3		10.00	30.00
	Trailer	3		5.00	15.00
C. M. Luscombe	Cement Mixer	3		3.50	10.50
Bishop's Falls High School	Cement Mixer	8		3.50	28.00
B. J. Elliott	Grader	6		10.00	60.00
J. Goodyear & Sons	Grader	1		10.00	10.00
	Trailer	1		5.00	5.00
	Grader	13		10.00	130.00
	Trailer	13		5.00	65.00
	Grader	10		10.00	100.00
	Trailer	10		5.00	50.00
	Trailer	15		5.00	80.00
C. L. Lingard	Cement Mixer	3		3.50	10.00
John Seymour	Cement Mixer	5		3.50	17.50
Miss Doris Jones	Grader	3		10.00	30.00
John F. Pike	Snowplough	1/2		12.00	6.00
J. Goodyear & Sons	Trailer	1		5.00	5.00
C. Bourget	Grader	3		10.00	30.00
J. Goodyear & Sons	Trailer	7		5.00	35.00
Mrs. Pauline Evans	Cement Mixer	9		3.50	31.50
Elliotts Garage Ltd.	Grader	3		10.00	30.00
H. Wheeler	Bulldozer	2		12.00	24.00
M. Eveleigh	Snowplough	2		12.00	24.00
A.N.D. Co.	Welding Tractor	13		6.00	78.00
	Welding Tractor	3		3.00	9.00

QUESTION No. 35: The answer to No. 35 is somewhat similar, but not quite so difficult to get all the details. I am very glad that the Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's West has asked this question. As he will be able to see, the work done by this department during the past year was very voluminous indeed as there are listed on this paper possibly some thirty or more contracts. The name of the contractor in each case is given, the type of work which has been undertaken and the amounts of money paid. Mr. Speaker, I table sufficient copies for all members.

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Public Works in reply to Question No. 35 (Mr. Browne) Order Paper of Wednesday, April 6, 1955.

Legend: (a) Nature of work; (b) Cost; (c) Were tenders called? (d) Tenderers; (e) Work done; (f) Amount paid.

QUESTION.—The names of all contractors or contracting companies, with whom contracts were made for the building of roads and bridges or other construction work during the fiscal year 1954-55, together with a description of the nature of the work to be done and the cost of same. If tenders were called for in any case give the names of parties tendering and the amount at which they tendered; in whose presence are tenders opened; what amount of work has been done on each contract and how much has been paid for same.

ANSWER—

Contractor

- J Goodyear & Sons Ltd.
 (a) Clearing and grubbing Gander—Wesleyville.
 (b) \$33,600.

- (c) Yes.
 (d) J. Goodyear & Sons Ltd.
 (e) 7 miles clearing completed and 2 miles of grubbing completed.
 (f) \$15,836.

- Concrete Products (Nfld.) Ltd.
 (a) Portugal Cove Ferry Terminal.
 (b) \$77,928.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
 Colonial Construction Ltd.
 Alexander Osmond.
 (e) Completed.
 (f) \$80,604.

- Concrete Products (Nfld.) Ltd.
 (a) Grading from Alexander Bay—Gambo Pond.
 (b) \$542,225.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
 Western Construction Ltd.
 W. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 (e) Right-of-way only cleared.
 (f) \$17,862.

- Concrete Products (Nfld.) Ltd.
 (a) Construction of Soulis Brook Bridge.
 (b) \$32,412.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
 Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 W. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 (e) Not started.
 (f) Nil.

- Concrete Products (Nfld.) Ltd.
 (a) Construction of Middle Brook, Gambo Bridge.
 (b) \$37,737.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
 Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 W. J. Lundrigan Ltd..
 (e) 30% completed.
 (f) \$7,308.

- Concrete Products (Nfld.) Ltd.
 (a) Construction Exploits River Bridge.
 (b) \$270,660.

- (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
 W. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 (e) 2% completed.
 (f) \$7,867.
- Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 (a) Grading from Middle Brook
 —Fishell's Brook.
 (b) \$277,220.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
 Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 (e) 15% completed.
 (f) \$56,054.
- Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 (a) Grading from Highland's
 River—Codroy Pond.
 (b) \$220,952.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
 Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 (e) 30% completed.
 (f) \$116,070.
- Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 (a) Grading from Jeffrey's Road
 —Highland's River.
 (b) \$487,284.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
 Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 W. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 (e) 50% completed.
 (f) \$308,744.
- Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 (a) Grading from Fishell's Brook—
 Robinson's River.
 (b) \$410,105.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
 Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 W. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 (e) 45% completed.
 (f) \$204,528.
- Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 (a) Grading from Robinson's
 River—Jeffrey's Road.
 (b) \$317,562.
 (c) Yes.
- (d) Concrete Products Co. Ltd.
 Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 W. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 (c) Right-of-way cleared.
 (f) \$9,405.
- Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 (a) Construction of Crabb's River
 Bridge.
 (b) \$189,759.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
 Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 W. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 (e) 95% completed.
 (f) \$110,199.
- Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 (a) Construction of Morris Brook
 Bridge.
 (b) \$19,830.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
 Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 W. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 (e) 95% completed.
 (f) \$18,077.
- Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 (a) Construction of Flat Bay
 Bridge.
 (b) \$141,050.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
 Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 W. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 (e) 95% completed.
 (f) \$89,052.
- Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 (a) Reconditioning Road from
 Grand Bay to Junction of
 Trans-Canada Highway.
 (b) \$19,587.
 (c) No.
 (d) ———
 (e) Completed.
 (f) \$18,316.
- Western Construction Co. Ltd.
 (a) Reconstruction of road from
 Port-aux-Basques to Mouse
 Island.

- (b) \$61,000.
 (c) No.
 (d)
 (e) 90% completed.
 (f) \$53,170.
- Grant Mills Ltd.
 (a) Building 2 piers and 2 abutments for Lower Humber Bridge.
 (b) \$54,767.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Grant Mills Ltd.
 (e) 2 piers and 1 abutment completed, second abutment nearing completion.
 (f) \$36,833.
- Willett Engineering & Surveying Co.
 (a) Survey from Gander to Jonathan's Pond.
 (b) \$7,804.
 (c) No.
 (d)
 (e) 19.5 miles surveyed.
 (f) \$6,853.
- Wm. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 (a) Construction of road Rocky Hr. towards Port Saunders.
 (b) \$360,650.
 (c) No.
 (d)
 (e) 30% completed.
 (f) \$191,324.
- Wm. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 (a) Grading from Pynn's Brook—South Brook.
 (b) \$322,915.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
 W. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 J. Goodyear & Son Ltd.
 (e) 70% completed.
 (f) \$432,025.
- Wm. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 (a) Grading from Deer Lake — Pynn's Brook.
 (b) \$445,416.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd.
- Western Construction Ltd.
 W. J. Lundrigan.
 (e) 10% completed.
 (f) \$32,973.
- Gavrock Brown.
 (a) Construction of road Wareham to Junction of the Hare Bay — Wellington Road via Trinity.
 (b) \$9,015.
 (c) No.
 (d) —
 (e) 12 miles, 4500 ft. & 5 wooden bridges & culverts.
 (f) \$9, 015.
- Gavrock Brown.
 (a) Construction Snowmobile trail Wareham to Indian Bay.
 (b) \$5,300.
 (c) No.
 (d) —
 (e) 3 miles, 700 ft. & a wooden bridge.
 (f) \$5,316.
- Springdale Construction Co. Ltd.
 (a) Construction of road from Indian Brook to King's Point.
 (b) \$80,000.
 (c) No.
 (d) —
 (e) 60% completed.
 (f) \$48,825.
- Twillingate Engineering & Construction Co.
 (a) Construction of Morgue & Garage at Fogo Cottage Hospital.
 (b) \$4,130.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Twillingate Engineering & Construction Co.
 (e) Completed.
 (f) \$4,130.
- Twillingate Engineering & Construction Co.
 (a) Construction Magistrate's residence at Twillingate.
 (b) \$22,900.

- (c) Yes.
 (d) Twillingate Engineering & Construction Co.
 (e) Completed.
 (f) \$21,607.
- Wm. J. Lundrigan Ltd.
 (a) Extension Roads Workshop, Deer Lake.
 (b) \$178,400.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) W. J. Lundrigan Ltd. Colonial Construction Ltd.
 (e) 75% completed.
 (f) \$100,455.
- Concrete Products (Nfld.) Ltd.
 (a) Construction of cribwork sections new ferry terminal, Bell Island.
 (b) \$137,487.
 (c) Yes.
 (d) Concrete Products Ltd. Colonial Construction Co. Ltd.
 (e) Started only.
 (f) Nil.
- Alexander Osmond
 (a) Repairing North face of Portugal Cove Wharf.
 (b) \$4,500.
 (c) No.
 (d)
 (e) Work completed.
 (f) \$4,500.
- Alexander Osmond
 (a) Reconstruction of South face of Portugal Cove Wharf.
 (b) \$12,000.
 (c) No.
 (d)
 (e) 33% completed.
 (f) \$3,240.
- J. Goodyear & Sons Ltd.
 (a) Construction Road Badger—Bnchans approximately 16 miles. This is an extension of contract let in previous year.
 (b) \$275,000.
 (c) No.
 (d)
 (e) 7.2 miles completed.
 (f) \$80,747.

(1) It has never been the practice to give amounts of unsuccessful tenders.

(2) In the case of Trans-Canada Highway projects, tenders are opened in the presence of a committee consisting of the Minister of Public Works, officers of the Department of Public Works, and one or more representatives of the Federal Government.

Tenders for other works are opened in the presence of committees constituted for the purpose.

HON. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table a supplementary answer to Question No. 6, March 25th, by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. This information was inadvertently omitted when the answer was first given: Answer tabled.

Supplementary answer to Question 6, on Order Paper dated March 25, 1955, addressed by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition to Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare.

**Number of Families and Cost Sick and Able-Bodied Relief Issued for
Labrador, Months February 1954 to February 1955. Blanc
Sablon (Incl.) to Cape Harrison (Excl.)**

MONTH	Year	Sick		Able-Bodied Relief	
		Families	Cost \$	Families	Cost \$
February	1954	27	672	116	3,985
March	1954	18	349	106	3,317
April	1954	19	420	110	3,501
May	1954	24	552	89	2,550
June	1954	41	1,315	44	1,137
July	1954	17	308	2	30
August	1954	9	124	2	34
September	1954	10	164	3	109
October	1954	5	75	13	652
November	1954	11	147	45	1,740
December	1954	13	193	86	2,637
January	1955	14	253	128	3,903
February	1955	12	224	161	5,617
Total			4,796		29,212

**Relief Issued by D.N.L.A. Depots Makkovik, Hopedale, Davis Inlet, Nain,
Nutak, Hebron, from February 1954 to February 1955**

Year	Month	Cost	Families
1954	February	3,076	102
1954	March	3,076	102
1954	April	2,965	100
1954	May	2,629	89
1954	June	1,414	47
1954	July	1,028	34
1954	August	932	31
1954	September	1,415	47
1954	October	3,355	111
1954	November	2,973	101
1954	December	3,764	152
1955	January	3,282	109
1955	February	2,472	82
Total		31,797	

Orders of the Day**Third Readings:**

Third reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages."

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Education (Teachers' Training) Act." Read a third time, on motion passed and title be as on the order paper.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Interpretation Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

Committee of the Whole, on Bill, "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, before we get around to a discussion on this Bill, I wonder if the Premier has any more information in his possession that we could have on this side of the House concerning the population and religious denominations of the various districts. The other day I noticed he did pass copies of something over to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, but I understand he passed them back to him again. If there is in the possession of the Government any information culled from the latest taking of the voters' list — I understand the voters' list is completed for most of the districts — if that information is available, I wonder if we could have it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the only information we have, I have already passed over to the Leader of the Opposition. He now has that information, I believe, in his possession. At all events he has not returned it to me, and I did not request

that he return it. That is the only information we have. We got the information from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics of the Government of Canada. Now with regard to the voters' list, the Government has not obtained any information whatsoever in that regard. I suppose the voters' list has been taken. I assume that it has. I know that the Government passed an order instructing Mr. Short and appointing Mr. Short to be the Chief Electoral Officer or chief officer for the purpose of conducting the taking of the voters' list. I assume he had done so. I have not seen Mr. Short for some months because upon assuming these special duties he removed himself from the office of the Department of Economic Development into an office in this very building where he had been operating for months past. I have not seen him. I do not know, although I assume he has organized the task of taking the voters' list and that the voters' list has been taken and that he probably has some information of that type in his possession. The Government has not interested itself in that. The only information we got on the denominational side of the various districts is what we get from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, who have offices here in St. John's. That information has been published. I believe in booklet form, by the Government of Canada, and is equally available to all members of the House and is not especially available to the government.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on that point I may say: a few days ago the Honourable the Premier passed over this information in regard to the denominations of the various districts. He passed over two copies. One has been returned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman will allow me; I refer to the actual proof of this Bill, on the margin of which I had written — I had not but someone else had written in the figures — No doubt the honourable gentleman now has that.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have that in our possession. I am also very grateful to the Honourable the Premier for passing along to us the other copy, which I may say was passed back to the Honourable the Premier.

With regard to the Bill, I may say at this juncture, certainly we on this side of the House are very much opposed to it, as we already intimated in the various stages of the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member could possibly continue these remarks in opposition to the various clauses, as the various clauses come up.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, before we go on with that there is another point I would like to ask about, i.e., we have a Bureau of Marriages, Births and Death which makes estimates of changes in population from year to year. Have figures compiled by that bureau been considered in preparing this latest list, or was he satisfied with the information which he got from the Bureau of Statistics, compiled from the census taken in 1951?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the honourable and learned gentleman would identify the Bureau more closely. I do not know the Bureau of Marriages, Births and Deaths. If he refers to a Newfoundland Government Bureau — well it is news to me that Bureau has made estimates from year to year of probable

population. I know the Dominion Bureau of Statistics makes annually an estimate of the Provinces of Canada. I was not aware our own Bureau did so. It is, in fact very much news to me.

MR. BROWNE: Could the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare — he is not here at the moment — He may know something about it. I understood they issued a little booklet annually showing the changes. They used to do it. I am sure of that. I do not see what purpose it is serving unless it keeps information of that kind compiled from reports coming in from the various districts. It should be a simple matter of addition and subtraction, to add on births and subtract deaths from the time the amount was taken in the census. In that way we could get the population from any particular district for 1951 from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and our Bureau could add and subtract — I do not know whether that is continued now or not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If I may be allowed, I think it is "DBS" who does that. Possibly since Confederation our bureau discontinued doing it, in view of the fact that a much more widely ramified and more fully organized organization began to do it. At all events, since Confederation "DBS" has done it if not annually every couple or three years when they give an estimate of populations all across Canada. They are never taken by surprise when the census is taken, because they have anticipated the figures within a fraction of one per cent because of the estimates made annually or every couple of years for every Province of Canada. They know always within a few thousand what the census will be before it is taken.

MR. BROWNE: In view of that, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we should have more up to date figures than that supplied in 1951, because, Sir, here the population is nearly four hundred thousand, which would make a considerable difference to some of our districts. I believe the Commission on Forestry said that our rate of increase was the highest in Canada. So than there has been considerable increase in population since 1951, which may cause us to reconsider the allocation of members as set out here at the present time. Can the Premier tell me whether he gave any consideration to that new figure of around four hundred thousand which has been mentioned here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, we have given very careful consideration to it. And we have come to the conclusion it does not affect the general distribution of population in the island and as it is portrayed here in this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Surely, Mr. Chairman, in making this Act relative to the amendment; the very great increase in population in St. John's must have been considered by the Government. These figures were taken in 1951 and showed then a population in St. John's area of seventy-eight thousand people. Now since 1951 there has been quite an influx of population from other parts of the island into St. John's. I really think we ought to have some figures relative to that before we can properly discuss the House of Assembly Act. I wonder if the Premier or any other Minister could give us figures relative to the probable increase in population relative to St. John's and its suburbs?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The figures, Mr. Chairman, are equally available

to members on both sides of the House.

HON. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): The very latest were the ones supplied, taken from 1951. No other denominational figures are obtainable, anything else is only a guess. They are actual and precise as far as St. John's is concerned — I did gather what would be an informed estimate from the Bureau of Statistics. They have a system of the number of houses in a block and would be correct within a very small margin of error. It is still only an estimate.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, now that the Minister of Public Welfare and Acting Minister of Health is back in his seat, perhaps he can tell us if the bureau under Mr. Charles Tobin functions and if it keeps up to date the figures which it gets for births and deaths and adds and subtracts where necessary to the figures, say of the census in 1945 or the Dominion Estimates of 1951?

DR. POTTLE: I do not know if I could answer that precisely. The Registrar General makes his report every year, and it becomes part of the official records of the Department of Health. I shall make further inquiries and let you know before the end of the present session. The question is, again?

MR. BROWNE: The question is — I pointed out to the Honourable the Premier, the latest figures are for 1951. As generally assumed, there has been an increase in population by about forty thousand since that date. Is he not able to allocate that increase, or decrease as the case might be, from information received in the Registrar of Vital Statistics, to show how it is made up.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, one thing surprised me — I learned from the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs — it was only figures concerned with the distribution of denominations.

MR. MURRAY: I did not say that. But it is the thing we want to have the most precise information on.

MR. HOLLETT: I understood the Honourable the Minister to say these were the only figures we were interested in. I think the general population, the population as a whole has some bearing as well.

Clause 1 passed. Clause 2 read:

2. Section 3 of the House of Assembly Act, chapter 3 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"The House of Assembly shall consist of thirty-three members of whom twelve shall form a quorum."

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to this section. In sub-clause (3) of the Bill the words "thirty-three" be stricken out and the words "thirty-six" be substituted therefor.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I have here the Revised Statutes, Chapter 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this amendment carried?

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Chairman, I have here the Revised Statutes, Chapter 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this amendment carried?

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Chairman, I have here the Revised Statutes Section 3 — "The House of Assembly

shall consist of twenty-eight members of whom ten shall be a quorum." In the Bill as before us the House of Assembly shall consist of thirty-three of whom twelve shall be a quorum. Now the Minister of Provincial Affairs moves that this thirty-three be increased to thirty-six. He has not given us any reason for that nor any details whatsoever. He just proposes that it be increased from thirty-three to thirty-six. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we should have some valid reasons for altering the Bill at this particular stage from thirty-three to thirty-six. It has increased already from twenty-eight to thirty-three, wherein a substantial number, five members, have been added. Now we are going to add another three making it thirty-six, the same as it was back in 1855. Now, Mr. Chairman, there are several reasons why a member of this House should give careful consideration before proposing an amendment of this kind, and the first one should occur to every member — the question of expense — Is the House justified completely in accepting any increase in the membership of this House if it is going to cost considerable in its operations from twenty-eight to thirty-three and not to thirty-six? The salary alone for eight members will be twenty-four thousand dollars, without all the incidental expenses, holding election, in the different districts and booths, all such expenses. These too will certainly run the expenditure up to fifty thousand dollars. I think I could safely say that would be the minimum of expenditure involved in adding eight members to the House of Assembly. Is it completely justified in increasing the membership by that number?

Now I don't know if any consideration was given to a re-arrangement of

the districts around the country with a view to keeping the membership much the same as it is, twenty-eight, or even having it twenty-seven, because I am sure —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order: I suggest the honourable gentleman is in order only if he objects to the number being raised above thirty-three, and that he is out of order if he objects to the number being thirty-three. That has been passed at second reading. Now there is a proposed amendment that it be thirty-six. The honourable gentleman would be in order arguing that not thirty-six be the number but thirty-three. The honourable gentleman would not be allowed to argue that be altered to thirty-seven, thirty-eight not thirty-one nor anything but thirty-three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot see that exactly. The Act is really changed now to thirty-three. I think the committee could make it twenty-three or could make it thirty-five if they wanted to do so. I do not think the principle is quite so narrow as that

MR. SMALLWOOD: My recollection, Mr. Chairman, in the House before Committee of the Whole was held that it could not be amended. It was thirty-three and was the principle. It was so held by Mr. Speaker that thirty-three was the principle. We adopted it, and Mr. Speaker would not accept an amendment to change it to thirty-six. Therefore thirty-three is the principle of the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If that was so held by Mr. Speaker, of course.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would say therefore we could only amend it upward and not downwards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry — if

that principle was so held by Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, my recollection of that was that Mr. Speaker, went a little further and said his personal opinion might have been the Bill should have been recommended. I am not questioning the Premier's recollection on this, but I do question, Sir, whether it is quite specifically described irrespective of his recollection.

MR. BROWNE: If the Committee can make it thirty-five or thirty-six, what is to prevent it making it twenty-nine or twenty-seven, what is the difference? Suppose the Honourable Minister for Provincial Affairs had stood up and said: "Mr. Chairman, I move the words "thirty-three" be stricken out and the words "twenty-seven" be substituted would you have ruled him out of order then, Mr. Chairman?"

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is an hypothetical situation.

MR. BROWNE: It may be but I wondered, Sir — You have already given an answer which said you could not rule out of order to increase the number. I submit if that is in order certainly it is in order too for us to speak on that at this particular time. The debate is curtailed sufficiently, it seems to me, in Committee in any case. Now we are dealing with the question of the number of members to represent the people of Newfoundland in this House of Assembly and it is a question of whether it be thirty-six or thirty-three or some other number. What difference does it make whether it is about an increase or a decrease. We are debating now the actual number of representatives who are going to be here in the House of Assembly after the next election and the number of

constituencies there are to be during the next election.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, if we are to accept the ruling suggested by the Honourable the Premier to you, Sir, then we are to take for granted the number of thirty-three has already become law; and the Honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs has moved the amendment to thirty-six, and that is the only thing we can discuss. But I would point out that nobody as yet has decided that thirty-three is the correct number, and it has not yet become law. It has passed the House in principle, it is true, with objections from this side of the House. I am of the opinion of both my learned friends on my right and left that this figure of thirty-six is outrageous when we come to consider the work which is required of members today compared with the work that was demanded of them in the old days. Even prior to Union with Canada the number we had was much less than we have now on certain occasions, and surely since the railway has been taken from us and the post office, telegraph offices, customs and since the Honourable the Minister of Public Welfare and his Department are taking care of the needs of the people, and taking care of them, I say, in a very fine manner in many respects; I see no reason why there should be such an increase even to thirty-three, much less to thirty-six. There is not one-tenth of the work required of any member of this House today, even though we are all paid better than we were in the old days. I admit that. But why continue to do something which we know to be absolutely wrong. It is unjust that we should saddle this country with the payment of salaries and travelling expenses etc. of thirty-six members when the work can be

done with the number that we recognize as the present number, twenty-eight. I think the government would be well advised to take the extra cost into consideration, and to take into consideration the small amount of work demanded of any member in the country today. Why there are districts today, I am quite sure, outside of St. John's where the member of the House has not visited during his term of office or has not been over-worked by his visitations, has not been worried to death by the demands upon him and upon his time by his constituents.

Here we go and divide up the country in such a way we will have to have thirty-six member if this Bill becomes law. I shall go into the matter of the division of districts later. But I want to point out, Sir, that we believe that the foisting (as I call it) of thirty-six members or even thirty-three upon the electorate of this country when we consider the small amount of work demanded of members, that is something absolutely unpardonable. The Government, in the first place, has given us no reason whatsoever for any such increase. They have not told us yet why there should be an increase even from twenty-eight to thirty-three and no reason for the increase now from thirty-three to thirty-six. They talk about certain things which are almost "unmentionable," they say. But they have not given us any valid reason for the increase in the membership of this House. Until the Government does that, I fail to see how any of us can agree to any of this particular section, No. 2. What are the reasons for increasing the number of representatives from twenty-eight to thirty-six? What are they? I wonder why it is. Now I have every regard and every respect for every part of this country, for every district of two

or three, as the case may be, can be divided up into two in order to send another member into this House. It has been done in the case of White Bay and has been done in other cases, and I see no reason whatsoever for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member would forgive me.—He is anticipating the debate now. There is no such amendment here.

MR. HOLLETT: No, but there has been an amendment to increase members, and in order to do that we have to divide up certain districts into two. I see no reason why they should have two men in a district where formerly they had only one. Unless the government shows us the reason.—They have shown us the distances to be travelled, the number of square miles in a district and that sort of thing. I submit, Sir, if there are so many square miles in Labrador, it is certainly very thinly populated, and I suggest, Sir, if any particular district did with one member last year and the year before and for many other years, they can still do the same now. There are undoubtedly necessary changes. I can quite see why there should be some changes made in the House of Assembly Act, but to go and add eight members with an extra charge of fifty, sixty, or a hundred thousand dollars to the taxpayers of this country, I think, is ridiculous, unless, as I say, the Government or the minister concerned can come across and tell us why it is absolutely essential to have these changes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I may of course be mistaken, but I was very definitely under the impression that that precisely had already been done. So that there may not be any mistake about it, may I do it again? When our population was un-

der two hundred thousand souls, that is to say, in 1885, we had thirty-six members in this House. We continued to have thirty-six members in this House until 1928; forty-three years. For forty-three years the membership of this House was thirty-six, from 1885 to 1928, thirty-six members. Now it was then increased to forty. Then it was cut back to twenty-seven. It was cut back to twenty-seven because Newfoundland came down to death's door, because the people were hungry and naked and cold, shivering, diseased, miserable, living on mouldy bread and maggoty bread, living on six cents a day. Newfoundland was bankrupt. Newfoundland was insolvent. Newfoundland was on the rocks. Our condition was desperate beyond description. The people were rotting in poverty, rotting. Their bodies were rotting with beri-beri. They were hungry. Newfoundland was bankrupt, on the rocks. They cut it back to twenty-seven. Now we propose to put it back to normal, to the number it was in 1885 and up until 1928, the normal number. In the meanwhile our population has doubled itself. It has gone from under two hundred thousand to over four hundred thousand. We are now raising representation to thirty-six. We are raising it back to where we were back seventy years ago. That is what we are doing.

MR. DROVER: I wish, Mr. Speaker, to support the sentiments expressed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I do not think that Newfoundland can support thirty-three nor thirty-six members in this House of Assembly. It is very nice for the Premier to state that in nineteen hundred and so and so and up to the elections of 1928 we had so many members and reduced them in 1932

when our people were maggots and poor. Today, in times of prosperity, we have in this country, and I don't know if I am allowed to say it, in the District of White Bay, in which it is hoped an amendment will be brought in—I was not here—I am out of the House most of the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There has been no amendment moved.

MR. DROVER: All right, Sir. But while we have in the district which I represent people living on five dollars a month I do not think that the Government of this country can afford to increase the membership of this House to thirty-three nor to thirty-six. If the people of LaScie and Quirpon and Hampton and Bear Cove and a few other places must live on and accept dole orders because they are handicapped in some way or another and must live on five dollars a month.—We have the people—if you want to call it "Maggoty" in Newfoundland, living on five dollars a month.—Let us not increase the membership of the House of Assembly but rather let us go out and try to uplift the people we already have and give them a chance to live, give them my salary or someone's else's salary but don't go and increase the membership of the House and deprive these people, little boys and girls in LaScie or men and women. One man, you will remember Kenneth Critch of LaScie. The newspaper carried it, because he caught eighty quintals of fish his allowance was cut off. Don't increase the membership of the House of Assembly but give Kenneth Critch enough to live on.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, referring to what the Honourable the Premier said as to two hundred thousand and four hundred thousand, I

submit we are working on a figure of three hundred and eighty thousand in regard to this. But I know that in areas where populations have increased there has been no increase in representation in this House. I don't know whether that has struck home to the Honourable the Premier on the opposite side, nor to the honourable members. They want to increase the membership to thirty-six because the population of the country has increased. In answer to that, I say, any member in this House knows today that he has not got one tenth of the work to do that his forebears had who represented the people here in this House, more than that, the populated industrialized areas of this country, where the populations have increased, the representation has not to any great extent been increased. Talk about the maggots of days of yore, Sir, there are maggots in this country today, if that is the way the Premier wishes to describe it. I don't. I lived in those days and dished out dole on behalf of the Commission of Government in those days, and saw people "damn" near starving (excuse me, Sir) but they did not get maggots.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not choose to reply to an observation by another quarter, but from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I said nothing about people being maggoty. I said maggoty bread. The honourable gentleman, I know, does not want to misrepresent me.

MR. HOLLETT: Certainly not!—But I must say, I misunderstood the statement. But I will say if I eat maggots I am maggoty, whether they are in bread or something else. Talk about the cost and expense of an increased membership—In February last year, and I must refer to the figures

tabled here the other day by the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare in support of my contention that we ought not to increase the membership on account of the increased expenses. He pointed out, Sir, in February 1954, and I will take one or two or three of the districts, if you will allow me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable gentleman will forgive me I don't think he should belabour the point too much.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I need not mention the districts at all, but I will point to one of the districts, a fishing district, where last year some 1852 people were given relief and 80 families \$5,200 able-bodied relief received a total of \$7,552 in that same district. There is an increase there, Sir, I point to another district, wholly and solely a fishing district where \$6,482 were given out in sick relief and in able-bodied relief this year the amount, Sir, of \$12,824 or practically double. So I could go on through some of these fishing settlements, Sir. I maintain these districts will look askance at this House if we readily agree to increase the membership and tax the country with a further \$52,000 or more. I see no reason whatsoever for increasing the membership. The Government must have some reason, not properly explained to us.

It is all very well to say the population has increased. As I have pointed out, the facilities for travelling today are much better — by helicopter, by plane and by a dozen ways it is possible to get to the districts. In the old days, Sir, they walked most of it. The train probably took them part of the way and they walked the rest and went by boat, and not a motor boat

either in those days. More than that, as already pointed out, the member for an outpost district, a fishing district was almost the "God Almighty" to the district. He had to look after the roads, the dishing out of able-bodied relief and this, and that and the other thing. There is no justification whatsoever for these increases. As I look through the table given to me by the Honourable Minister of Welfare the other day, I am appalled. Last year we gave out altogether in sick and able-bodied relief \$944,762. Now that is something in these days of prosperity. "Never was this Province so prosperous," they told us the other day. Where is prosperity? Prosperity, yes, in Graud Falls.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, is this in order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe the honourable member is getting away from the subject now. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition still has the floor. The Honourable the Premier rose to a point of order. I think the honourable member who is speaking is hardly relevant at the moment, although I could follow his line of reasoning, providing he does not go into detail and discuss the affairs of the country.

MR. HOLLETT: I abide, Mr. Chairman, by your ruling. I am just trying to explain why it is outrageous to incur an additional expense by increasing the membership of this House from twenty-six. I do not think it is wise nor sensible, particularly in view of these figures here, which I quoted from. I think the Honourable the Premier spoke of the dole days, the dark days and mouldy bread. Surely if the Honourable the Premier could

speak of that on this particular occasion then I can speak of the so-called prosperity. Now I am not questioning your judgment, Mr. Chairman, but I want to substantiate the statement I made as well as the Honourable the Premier substantiated his. He said we needed thirty-six now because the population has increased. We had thirty-six, he said, in the dole days when people ate maggoty bread and I have heard so much harping on that by members on the opposite side of the House it makes me sick.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not as sick as if you had to eat it.

MR. HOLLETT: There are sick people today and hungry.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: Oh yes! Incidentally there must be a good many sick people over in the district of Carbon-car-Bay de Verde. The honourable member is not here. I will leave that for when he comes — If you want to look at the number of sick in that district and compare it with certain other districts, I would say there must be some germs in that area somewhere because there are double as many sick people in that particular area as are in most.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member will forgive me. I don't think the number of sick people is relevant.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you very much Sir. We are prone to wander from the straight and narrow in this world of ours. It is a grand thing we have a Chairman to correct us, and it is always good to have a Premier in the House to remind us of it.

I think I have made the point, Sir, which I wished to make at this particular time. There is absolutely no reason, no sense in increasing the number of members in this House from twenty-eight to thirty-six. I am quite sure that I am correct in that.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, as everyone is finished.

MR. BROWNE: Everyone is not finished, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MURRAY: I meant on this particular clause. Mr. Chairman, as the Premier has pointed out, the membership of this House, I think, somewhere in the 1930's was reduced to twenty-seven members. That was at a time of extreme stringency in this country, and everything was being cut to the bone; members salaries were cut, the civil service was practically depleted. I was here in the House and saw pensions for veterans cut substantially because the times demanded it. It was at that time a House of twenty-seven members was created and it stayed thus until Confederation came along. Under the terms of Union Labrador was created a district making the number twenty-eight. Now under twenty-seven members denominational balance was maintained with nine of each. When a member came in from Labrador this denominational system was upset, making it 10-9-9 instead of 9-9-9 as before. As you know the principle of denominational representation has been followed in this country since 1852. Well, if a principle is followed it is just as well to follow it to the utmost. As statistics show, the major denominations are divided into thirds. One of the reasons for this Bill is to rectify that loss of this balance as brought about by Confederation. Now another justification for this Bill, Mr. Chairman, is in

what happened in 1925. As we know, since 1925 there has been tremendous shifts in population. Districts have grown from nothing at all, as in the case of Corner Brook. Corner Brook in those days was a tiny village and has now grown to a great city of thirty thousand people. No one will argue that Corner Brook was properly represented. So that, under the present Bill, the representation from Corner Brook will be increased from one to two members. This appears a justifiable measure. Also in Grand Falls District, where a new town of Gander with five or six thousand people has come into existence. Altogether the population of Grand Falls has trebled since 1925, and, Sir, if honourable members ask what justification there is for increasing the representation, I say; everything demands that this present area of Grand Falls get further representation. So that accounts for another member of the House.

Now then Labrador: We have been all over this before, the Premier described it as a great sub-continent the other day. Certainly no one will argue that two members for Labrador means that Labrador is over-represented. These are all very, very valid reasons for the increase in the membership of the House. Now where do we get the number of thirty-six? It is not something pulled out of the air, but something which reverts to the system that came into effect in 1885, and a system under which we all grew up, I suppose, even the youngest member of the House is familiar with a House of thirty-six. Certainly to revert to an old traditional system with a population of four hundred thousand, there is nothing absurd nor preposterous about that. There are so many valid reasons for increasing the membership of this House, if it is an increase, when

we are going back to a system we were all accustomed to and a system that obtained from 1885. Why not go back to a system that obtained from 1885?

MR. BROWNE: I suppose that is a good question to ask. But, if the population has doubled since 1885 when we had thirty-six members, why not double the members? Why not have seventy-two today? The reason we do not have seventy-two is because there is no need for seventy-two. I submit the same reason that there is no need for seventy-two applies to the fact that there is no need for thirty-six. Everyone knows — I have not heard anybody either in the previous session or in this one show on any grounds that the people have suffered because of lack of representation. The members on the other side are very good members. The Honourable Minister for Mines and Resources, I am sure, is doing just as good a job for the District of Labrador as if he had a colleague with him representing the northern part of the district. So that there does not seem to be any reason for bringing Labrador into the picture as one of the justifications for increasing the percentage.

Now, my honourable friend, the Minister of Provincial Affairs, spoke about the shifts in population. We all admit that there are shifts. I have here in front of me tables I prepared myself showing the shift in population. The Honourable Minister knows that his own district has been decreased and that he is not only dissatisfied with that population but got to decrease it still further by taking off the population from the Upper Gullics as far as Big Pond, and reducing it to a smaller number. That is not the only district which has declined in population. There are seven districts in the country which have declined in population.

The Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs seems a little surprised by my statement. But I am going by comparisons between the 1945 census and the figures the Premier was so kind as to supply us from the 1951 census.

Then my learned friend spoke about the religious divisions: Well, if the religious divisions justify a balancing of nine, nine and nine, that was upset in 1949 by bringing Labrador, what is to prevent going back to twenty-seven or going forward to thirty. Thirty-six, he must admit himself, was an after-thought, which did not occur until Sunday afternoon according to information I received. A sudden reverse in policy justified the Government switching over from thirty-three to thirty-six. It was not because they need three, but they needed three to put back Port de Grave and Harbour Grace as separate districts again. They had a reason for putting the two of them together as one when the motion for second reading of the Bill was made.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will tell the honourable gentleman about it. What does he want to know?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, sure!

MR. SMALLWOOD: At this moment St. John's has four members, three of them Roman Catholics. Yet St. John's is a Protestant City, with a majority of Protestants in it. We decided we would not continue St. John's with three Roman Catholics out of four but instead made it three Roman Catholics out of five, by making two Protestant seats. That made five seats in the city of St. John's with the immediate suburbs.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something on that—What right has the Honourable the

Premier or the Government to make Protestant and Roman Catholic seats? They say they made five seats and have made three Roman Catholic and two Protestant. Where did they get this God Almighty power? I would like to know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We made it in the Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: By what right?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The right of any government. We have not made the law. It is not law yet. The House will make it law. But as a Government we have the right to do what we have done, to draft the Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Government has a right to name what a district shall be. You have to be a Roman Catholic District and you have to be a Protestant District. That is exactly what the Honourable the Premier said. We have made three Roman Catholic Districts in St. John's and two Protestant Districts. I would like to know who gave him the authority to designate districts into Roman Catholic and Protestants, to divide St. John's into five lots and say how many of our denomination there are.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Look at the figures. Mr. Chairman, did we pull them out of a hat?

MR. MURRAY: From the Bureau of Statistics.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the census.

MR. HOLLETT: I maintain, Sir, that the idea expressed by the Honourable the Premier is ridiculous. If the Government is going to decide how many Roman Catholics should stand in St. John's and be elected and how

many Protestants, are they not taking to themselves power that the people of this country have not yet delegated to them. I myself am not afraid to speak of the denominational aspect if it is absolutely essential, because I don't think it is a sin to be a Protestant and don't think it is a sin to be a Roman Catholic, and we all have the right to vote for John Smith whether he goes to Mass or to the Pentecostal — it is not a bit of difference. We have the right, and I maintain, Sir, no Government in this House has the right to say we have made three Roman Catholic Districts in St. John's and two Protestant Districts.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will go further, if the honourable gentleman will allow me. We have made twelve Roman Catholic Districts, twelve Church of England Districts and twelve Nonconformist Districts, in this Bill. It is up to the House to accept or reject — Is it not our duty —

MR. HOLETT: I say, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Premier has no right to make, if you like, three Roman Catholic seats in St. John's where the Protestants are in the majority, or where they say the Protestants are in majority. What right have they to make some districts, for instance like Grand Falls, with a very large Roman Catholic percentage, what right has the Government to say, we have to make a Protestant District of it? I say the Government has no right whatsoever to do that. They can make districts and cannot make them denominational, and if they do I shall be the first to preach against it. They have no right to say what district is Roman Catholic and what is Protestant. It is none of their business whatsoever, none.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, the

honourable and learned member for St. John's West raised a question regarding population distribution, a few minutes ago. At the time I suggested that there ought to be information given in the report of the Department of Health, and the figures for the year 1952, as estimated, are in fact given at page 125 of the 1953 report, according to electoral districts. By telephone I have been informed that the estimated population for 1954 is 398,000, but we cannot apportion that according to districts yet because all the returns of births and deaths have not yet been received from the Province. What the department does is to take the overall estimate of DBS, and spread these over the respective electoral districts according to actual figures which the Registrar has received of births and deaths for the year.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for his kindness in supplying us with this information, which would have been very useful if we had had it before. I note here the District of Ferryland has shown quite an increase, according to these figures.

MR. MURRAY: Times are getting better.

MR. BROWNE: Must be. Ferryland 6,237, and the estimate for 1952 was 7,000, so they must have gotten worse since my honourable friend became a member. He was elected in 1952. However, as we can see from the figures produced here, there are changes taking place, up and down. Now I was particularly interested in St. John's. According to figures given here 78,000 is the estimate, but if the overall figure is 390,000 for 1954, there is an increase of twenty thousand each year, which is a big increase. I know my honourable friend can make a case

on the basis of population, that the number of people in the country have been increasing — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have a recess.

On motion the Committee recessed for ten minutes.

Before the recess I was in the process of drawing attention to the figures which now have been produced by the Honourable Minister for Public Welfare, which gave very much later and altered figures from those supplied in the documents furnished by the Premier. I understand now that these are just the totals, and that a break down from the religious basis is not available. The Minister agrees with that. However, from the point of view of total increase, a comparison shows that some districts have increased and some have decreased. I won't quote all but will give some examples of the important ones that are under consideration. The Humber District for example, had a total here of 27,000 in 1951 an increase of nearly seven thousand over that of 1945 and in 1953 had increased to 28,000 as estimated for 1953. It is a reasonable assumption it has not dropped behind that. In Labrador there was an increase in 1953 of three thousand over 1945 and an estimate of a total of 7,500 for 1953. Bonavista is down from 1952. It seems to me the figures supplied by the Premier must be the figures for Bonavista North with Gander taken out, because there is a semi-circle around Gander, and the whole population of Gander area has been removed and added to Grand Falls. Therefore it seems to me that in order to see what the increase was in Bonavista area we would have to add that figure to the figures for Gander. But the figure for Gander were mixed up, and I am not sure what the correct figure is now. The

total figure for Grand Falls and Gander is given as 23,238; and Grand Falls and Bonavista North come to 46,000, so I don't understand the difference nor where these people have disappeared. It is 46,000, and 41,000 on the other.

I would point out that St. John's East and West are given at 79,000. Harbour Main-Bell Island is down here at 22,000. I feel that we should have had that information, as it is very hard to get members to grasp the significance of the changes in population especially when they are not very great. But where there is a great increase in population there is of course a case made there for an increase in membership. I will admit, in connection with Humber and Grand Falls the case had been made. But it seems to me the case made out for Grand Falls and Humber is a case also made out for St. John's. St. John's had increased at a greater rate than any other district of the country.

Now the Premier referred to what the Government proposes, that St. John's should be divided up to return three Catholics and two Protestants. Last year, as honourable members will remember, the Bill at that time was somewhat different for St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, would not these remarks be more in order when we come to deal with St. John's. May the honourable member discuss other districts, Humber for instance, and or go into long dissertation on Labrador.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

MR. BROWNE: The statement was made by the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs and by the Premier; for instance, the Premier refer-

red to the desperate condition Newfoundland was in when the membership of the House was reduced in 1932, under the Government of Sir Richard Squires, the Liberal Government in power in 1932, and the country was in a rotten state at the time. Now I know perfectly well, Mr. Chairman, there was a world-wide depression, but there is this to be considered, as far as any particular country's recession and world-wide depression is concerned, it depends upon efforts to avoid the effect of conditions outside. Here we are increasing the membership without anybody pointing out a reason, what I mean by reason is a sound reason. There are reasons such as population increase, yes, but we do not ask for seventy-two members, we only ask for thirty-three when the Bill was introduced, and it is now up to thirty-six within a week. I say there has been no sound reason advanced, because the membership of this House, I feel, are all doing a good job. I have not heard any complaints about them as representatives, and I do not think the members on the other side could say anything different about the members on this side, as far as representation is concerned. Naturally the Government has a sort of inside pull and they get more assistance for their own districts than members of the Opposition. I should imagine that the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs is very much more influential in getting work done in the district of Ferryland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, is this relevant?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the point we are talking about is the increase in membership, and I am making the point there is no need to increase the membership. The work is

done by the number of members we have at the present time. If the work were not being done satisfactorily then there would be a case made out for increasing the membership. But it cannot be shown that the work of the House or the business of the country is impeded by a lack of representation. Then I think no case has been made out for an increase in membership, not only from thirty-three to thirty-six but for an increase at all from twenty-eight.

At another time I pointed out all the reasons for that, and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has already indicated in this Committee the fact that the members today do not have the same amount of work to do that they had years ago, and the honourable member for White Bay in his forceful but short address pointed out the same. And, as I pointed out, there does not seem to be a justification for an increase in the cost of administering the affairs of the country when there is so much distress in so many localities. What is the reason for it? Let us not wait until things get very bad and until we have to do something about it, something drastic. Let us think of it now. Why increase the membership by this number when there is no need of it at all. It has been said that Humber has increased to a city of thirty thousand and Grand Falls has doubled its population since 1925. Well now, suppose we admit for the purpose of argument a case may be made out for an increase in those two districts, but what case has been made for an increase in other districts?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the honourable gentleman allow me to ask a question — Suppose we followed his suggestion and increased Humber and Grand Falls by one, what then of the

traditional balance? Would he have the thing spelled out. Follow it right through. Tell us, so as to leave the traditional balance.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, give another seat in St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was three Roman Catholics to two in a Protestant city. Now you make it four to one in a Protestant city. Would that make for peace and good will?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Premier when he refers to St. John's as a Protestant city I presume means a city in which the majority of the people, and he does not mean only the city but the whole area, the district between Big Pond and Cape St. Francis?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: All that area, taking in Mount Pearl, Glendale and over to Conception Bay and take in St. Phillips — it was regrettable he was not able to give some figures to show the justification for that statement he has made. We have not the figures available.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The figures are there showing a Protestant majority.

MR. BROWNE: In these?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, for the actual city wards, the city within the municipality, the figures are not broken down by districts, by areas, by streets or wards or section, the figures are there for the city of St. John's as they are for the suburban areas broken down. We have the broken down figures for the suburban areas, we have only the total by denomination for the city, and putting the two together there is a Protestant majority.

MR. BROWNE: Well I must regret to say, I had not noticed that among the figures here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are there.

MR. BROWNE: This is a very difficult position, Mr. Chairman, we only get this information when I am in the process of making an argument. They should be available to every member.

MR. MURRAY: They are public information, and are available. That book you have there is a public document.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The book from which those figures were taken. From the book published by the Government of Canada, and widely circulated.

MR. BROWNE: I did not get a copy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Whose fault is that. I did not tell them not to send the honourable gentleman a copy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might say here now for the guidance of the Committee any passing reference to St. John's or White Bay or Gander or Grand Falls is quite in order, but I do think that a detailed examination of these districts, their boundaries and occupations, etc., should wait until they are being dealt with as a district, under the clause which deals with them. An honourable member, of course, may refer to them to bolster his argument. Yet I do think a detailed examination should wait until the Committee is considering that specific clause.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I think, it should be appreciated that I have not seen the figures before. While they are available, I had not known.

I understood from the remarks of the Premier, and also from figures he gave us that he had not any breakdown for the figures for St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say that.

MR. BROWNE: No, but I understood that. Now I have here the figures for St. John's city. St. John's East and St. John's West. Now these are as they are today, I take it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: As they were according to the last census. They could not be otherwise.

MR. BROWNE: Yes. That is very important. I am glad he drew that to my attention — As taken in the last census, 1951. Because there may have been a change in the population since 1951.

MR. MURRAY: The religious figures are as in 1951.

MR. BROWNE: I take it St. John's East and St. John's West means the whole area including the five presently under discussion, 12,432 total for St. John's West; 14,018 for St. John's East and a total for the city of St. John's of 78,800. That is 74,000 and the figures given here for 1952 come to 78,879, a difference of four or five thousand. That would not make much difference if located outside the city. I have a feeling that perhaps the honourable member for St. John's East could tell us where the boundaries of the city have been extended since 1951; they have been and therefore the figure would not be correct only insofar as the total is concerned. But of that total the number of Catholics are 37,000, just about half.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Less than half.

MR. BROWNE: For the city itself.

In any case that difference is not so great. I have here the figures for 1911 when St. John's East and West, and at that time there were 15,954 Catholics, which is, I see, a little short of half then. The difference was not very great. Well, at that time we had three Catholic members for St. John's East and two Catholic members for St. John's West making five Catholic members. But through that time and up to 1925 Bell Island was included. But the population of Bell Island was not very great up to 1925. Bell Island now has a member in its own right. It seems to me, in fairness to the city of St. John's, it should have an additional seat.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, will Your Honour allow us to debate St. John's when we come to it? If Your Honour will, will Your Honour also allow us to debate it before that, and if so, why not so with all districts?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The clause under consideration is that the House of Assembly should consist of thirty-six members. I don't think, unless the honourable gentleman is suggesting more members — I mean the distribution at this point is not under consideration. The number of members in the House of Assembly is the point under discussion at this time.

MR. BROWNE: But, Mr. Chairman, I was asked the question by the Premier, how would I get the balance of 12—12 and 12, or 11—11 and 11— by giving one member to Humber and one to Grand Falls—how would the balance be suggested? I suggested that an adjustment should take place here in St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is rejected. We reject it without a moment's hesitation.

MR. BROWNE: I know! I know! Anything I say is going to be rejected. As I speak I know everything will be rejected.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We reject that.

MR. BROWNE: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition was not far out when he drew attention to the fact we have made so many districts. Look at the trouble the Honourable the Premier went to when making these districts, to carve up St. John's. Look how he did it, all the time and care he gave to making that district to deliberately make them Protestant districts.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, quite deliberately. We went to considerable effort to get two Protestant districts out of five in St. John's. That is obvious as a sore thumb. It was also difficult to make three Roman Catholic Districts.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Try it sometime. When the honourable gentleman tries it — Now he is in the Opposition he objects to thirty-six. When he was in the Government he made it forty. That is what the honourable gentleman did in the House before, he helped to make it forty, but he is now arguing about thirty-six.

MR. BROWNE: It was opposed to making it forty.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, let us give all to St. John's.

MR. BROWNE: Let me draw to the honourable gentleman's attention that the Liberal Party was also opposed to it at that time, although not the same party as is in existence today. Mr. Chairman, the Honourable

the Premier knows perfectly well that since last year he changed this map of St. John's from Torbay North down to Shoe Cove Island. Why did he do it? Would he explain why?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I just explained, it was to make two Protestant seats in a total of five.

MR. BROWNE: It was not to make two Liberal seats? At the present time there are four Conservative seats representing St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the honourable gentleman confuse Conservative with Roman Catholic or Protestant. I thought he was discussing the denominational division.

MR. BROWNE: I asked the honourable the Premier if it was his intention to have two Liberal seats?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The intention of the Government was, in the city of St. John's with a Protestant majority, that at least two of the seats should be Protestant. The reason for three Catholic seats out of five was to give the Roman Catholic people a fair deal; i.e. that one-third of all the seats. To do that we had to give more in St. John's than it was entitled to by number. We had to divide Harbour Main into two, or at least make two seats. We had to do that to make up the number.

MR. BROWNE: Why could you not do it for St. John's?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course do everything for St. John's.

MR. MURRAY: Is the honourable member seriously suggesting to have four Catholic seats in St. John's, against two in the Protestant areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if the honourable members of the Committee

on both sides would remember Standing Order 44 which says that the debate shall be strictly relevant to the clause under consideration. We have not yet come to St. John's. I do not mind references to St. John's in passing, but St. John's seems to have been taking up so much of the debate. That can be taken up in Clause 20, or I think somewhere around about there. Shall this Clause carry?

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Chairman, the Premier won't admit what he should have admitted, because of the alterations made in the District of St. John's last year, the district was drawn across Torbay North.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, did Your Honour not just rule something? The honourable gentleman apparently is deaf.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Personal remarks are out of order. Shall this Clause carry?

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here listening to the explanation for this amendment, to change the number from thirty-three to thirty-six, and it is rather difficult to reconcile the reasons for the change from twenty-eight upwards. It was that away back in 1855 we had thirty-six members and we continued to have that until it went to forty and then when economic stringencies made it necessary it was reduced to twenty-seven, until at the time of Confederation it became twenty-eight. Now times have gotten better so we need more members. But against that argument, Mr. Chairman, you have definitely got to face the fact that governmental services have improved tremendously; that today you have a great deal of work that used to formerly fall on the shoulders of the individual representative of the dis-

trict handled, and I think I can truthfully say, more efficiently handled, by the different government departments, Welfare, Health, in particular, are administered now to a degree where there is little or no call upon the individual member. So much for that aspect of it. Then we are told of course the reason for the additional three members that we now have in the amendment as suggested today is that we must respect the traditions and Port de Grave is cited as a case in point. Port de Grave away back in 1855 had representation in this House. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would have accepted that with a great deal more grace if that thing had been evidenced when the Bill was first presented to the House. But there was no mention made of the traditions in regard to Port de Grave when the Bill was brought in. When it was introduced here, we were told it was unfortunate but necessary that Port de Grave and Harbour Grace be amalgamated, that neither would lose its identity and would still have the same recognition. Still within a very short space of time it became necessary to recognize Port de Grave, and in order to recognize the traditional balance and be true to it, it became necessary to find two additional seats.

Now, Sir, I appreciate the ruling just made. I don't want to go into particulars as to how these seats are to be allocated or where at this time, but following the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs, I point out, and point out very reasonably, that Humber which has grown from a little village—or Corner Brook—of a few hundred to a city of thirty thousand, must of necessity have increased representation; by the same thinking I still say that perennial hot spot, St. John's has also increased and

should be given some consideration. I do fail to see, adopting that reasoning, how it can be seriously suggested that Harbour Main, which has only something less than ten thousand people, should have two members as opposed to the mighty Humber which only gets two. The point is this, Mr. Chairman. I have not yet heard any valid reason for the increase from thirty-three to thirty-six. I am not arguing about the thirty-three at all. Let us assume the principle of the thirty-three has been adopted. How then can we justify the increase from thirty-three to thirty-six, if it is not simply a sop to the good people of Port de Grave who want to have their traditional seat preserved. That is the only reason. Then, Mr. Chairman, I say the Government has been manoeuvred into a position inconsistent with its previous stand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall this Clause carry?

MR. HOLLETT: No, Mr. Chairman, we still think, Sir, and will always think that this Bill is a most unfortunate one from the point of view of Newfoundland. The way the country has been carved up in order to get these thirty-three seats is, I am sure, most ludicrous to the people of this country. What is to prevent future governments, if they want to, from dividing up certain districts into four parts instead of two and getting four members instead of two? That is done now, in order to divide small districts in two in order to make two districts and bring in two representatives. What is to prevent any government in the future from remaining in power if elected for all time by a process of dividing the districts. The section now we are to put here divided them in two and gets two in the House. Divide that and cut out that place — there is no reason any government

could not do that if they wanted to. We could charge the present government with doing that now. But we are not going to do that. They are establishing a precedent, I think, dangerous. That precedent is that they are taking districts which have only small numbers in the first instance, and dividing them up into two in order to get double the representation here in this House. I am not saying they are doing it for that purpose, but that is what the end result is. I say there is no reason in this world why a future government, going by this precedent which will be adopted, should not keep on dividing the districts as they see fit for no other reason than simply to remain in power. I don't want the government to misunderstand. I am not charging that. But I say establishing this precedent is a dangerous one. If they cannot divide the representation of Newfoundland in a better way than they have done in this Bill in order to get thirty-six members, then I suggest they had better leave it alone and make minor amendments which would be reasonable. It is certainly not reasonable to have seventeen thousand people in one district electing one man to this House and have three thousand elect a man from another district to represent them in this House and have another area with four or five thousand electing a man to this House; and have two or three districts with seventeen and eighteen thousand in them electing only one man to this House, while three, four and five of the districts with only the same population sending in five or six men in the House. It does not seem sensible. It does not seem at all sensible in my opinion. Take the industrial areas which we all know about, certainly they should be given a good representation in this

House because upon their production, of course, depends the prosperity of this country and their proper functioning in a large measure depends on the sort of laws made in this House. It is essential therefore that they should have adequate representation here. I say this with all due respect to areas where there is not the same industrial potentiality as there is in these industrial areas. I think they should have a bigger representation than they have at the present time. Mr. Chairman, if the government had combined populations with the idea of industrialism in mind, keeping industrial populations together, then I think they would have gotten fair and adequate provisions in order to get a certain number of members. I do think it is a mistake for the Government to divide the country up as it is at the present time. I am quite sure that 90% of the people of the country agree with us on this side of the House. I have here a telegram from certain people in Grand Falls area and they ask us to fight this strongly, and protest, they say, right to the bitter end. They are not agreeable in Grand Falls to the present number of thirty-six members as it is divided.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member cannot discuss that at this time.

MR. HOLLETT: No, I think not, Mr. Chairman. I agree with you. I think that is all I have to say at the moment on this particular point Sir.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, when the Premier introduced this Bill he gave us certain information. I said at the time that we should have had a lot more information. But for the divisions in St. John's he gave us round figures, St. John's North fourteen thousand, St. John's South fifteen

thousand; St. John's East fifteen thousand and St. John's West seventeen thousand and St. John's Centre seventeen thousand. I would like to ask him now that I have gone through the figures he drew my attention to here, which I did not know we had in our possession I would like to see now where he gets for St. John's North.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, is this in order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if the honourable gentleman might just defer that question until we come to St. John's? Quite a bit of this debate, I confess, has not been relevant to the clause, and the time comes when there must be a deferment of St. John's until we get to St. John's. The point is the thirty-six members.

MR. BROWNE: The point is that I was asked how to find the three members I said in St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Whatever the honourable gentleman asked, does that justify him in defying Your Honour?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable gentleman asked that question. That too was premature. I do not rule out just a general reference to St. John's. But I do not think we should have a detailed discussion on St. John's, Grand Falls nor Bonavista North at this particular time, because we have quite a bit about St. John's in Clauses 16 through 20.

MR. BROWNE: Do I take it, Mr. Chairman, your procedure would be to take each of these divisions sub-clause by sub-clause?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, because of the importance of this Bill, and the importance that each sub-clause as a unit has, I had intended to put it in

sub-clauses. I think that would be the wish of the Committee.

MR. BROWNE: I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, your anxiety to keep the discussion to the particular clause. It is very difficult, I think you will also appreciate, to refer to sections as important as this, which increases the representation without making some reference to how it has been done. I said at the beginning that it was an afterthought. The Bill itself reads thirty-three, and there is an amendment to make it thirty-six. Now the honourable members on the opposite side cannot escape their responsibility for increasing this. It does not matter what people did twenty-five years ago. We have to take the responsibility for what comes out of this debate. Is there justification? Members should be anxious to express their own views as to whether there is justification for the country today to increase the membership from twenty-eight to thirty-six. I have no doubt what the decision is going to be, but I repeat, the arguments put forward here show there is no need for it, no one is demanding it, no urgency for it at all. It has not received the consideration I consider it deserves. It seems to me that the time may not be too far distant that the public will hold those responsible for doing that to account for inflicting upon this country this unnecessary expense. I do not see how the members on the other side of the House can justify this increase — I don't see how they can justify it.

Clauses 2 carried. Clause 3:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I notice that the whole of section 4 of the Act is repealed. I think on that particular one it should be a general discussion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chair-

man, I hold that would be entirely out of order. I hold it would be improper and contrary to the rules and just repeating ad nauseam what has already been said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Premier has something there. I think it would be tedious repetition and would tend to confuse the debate. I think it would be better to debate St. Barbe under that clause, and Fortune Bay under the clause dealing with Fortune Bay.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I answer that argument? I have here the Act which is being amended, the House of Assembly Act. It says here Section 40 of the Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor: In other words all this section is repealed and we are substituting now a new section. So I submit, Sir, logically I am entitled to deal with this whole section that has been repealed before we come to the details of how it is made up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But any honourable member who does that can't expect to repeat himself when it comes to the clause. As everyone knows there is a rule against repetition, tedious repetition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not only, Mr. Chairman, is there a rule against tedious repetition but there is a rule saying what may not be done in Committee of the Whole and what may be done. No body of rules affecting parliamentary procedure is more definite and categorical and unmistakable than the body of rules laying down what may be done and not done in Committee of the Whole. If the honourable gentleman were permitted and if the Committee were permitted to debate that on clause 3, the whole part

of the existing Act that is about to be repealed and have this substituted for it, then that means having it all over again. What is the purpose of it? If the Bill is passed in second reading why have Committee of the Whole if it is not to debate it section by section and line by line in Committee of the Whole. What is Committee of the Whole for? If a matter is disposed of in second reading why are we now in Committee of the Whole to debate the whole principle over again?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I draw your attention to the Premier's argument. The Premier made a categorical statement which he did not back up by any authority in the book of rules or from any other authority on parliamentary procedure. The effect of discussing this would be to have second reading all over again. But we are dealing with certain sections now to be repealed. Although this is a long and complicated and highly important section the same rules apply to it as to any other section. As long as it is within that section I contend it is debatable. I can debate, or any member of the House can debate, any point involved. For instance; Section 4 of the said Act is repealed. Now am I precluded from making any reference to the Act, with the section of the Act which is repealed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that has been accepted by the House. This Committee is only part of the House. It is a Committee of the Whole House, but it is not the House. And the House has passed that, that section 4 shall be repealed. Now the details of the repeal the redistribution now follows, section by section, which is to be debated section by section. But the principle was passed in second reading and is not debatable in Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we do take each of these sub-sections by itself and debate it, I do not think it restricts freedom of speech but would tend only to orderly debate. I believe it is that these sections shall be changed, that there should be redistribution, therefore that would have to be repealed in order to do that.

MR. BROWNE: I see your point Mr. Chairman, and agree with it to a certain extent. But as long as that would not deprive reference from one section to another — because I do not see how we could avoid making references to other sections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To bolster the arguments, of course.

MR. BROWNE: I mean paragraphs within the clause itself, I believe that there will be some sections to which there will be none or very little reference, because there is no change from the previous Act, where there are changes, then these changes, I submit, are interrelated, and it is in order to make references.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would accept that point, yes. This is a Bill where in Committee we are to give it careful study and scrutiny and debate, within the rules of parliamentary procedure, and if an honourable member in speaking of St. Barbe happened to mention Gander or bring out some point in which he bolsters his debate it is not out of order. It is a matter of reference. Of course, if he began to debate the boundaries of Gander or any other district it would be out of order.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, if the following is substituted therefore then are we going to get in the amendments suggested here and not yet brought forward, if we have already

passed the principle of thirty-three members. If this is to stand then it is not in accordance with section 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Each sub-clause will be put and discussed.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Premier knows as well as anybody else, while he has in his mind the idea of preserving certain districts he has not hesitated to change others, and he could have changed them in the northern part of the island as well as in the eastern if he wanted to get a redistribution as a result. For instance St. Barbe here is not going to be touched at all. But as we will see later on, others are going to be changed. We know perfectly well the Minister of Provincial Affairs is going to get up to move amendments at the proper location, he is going to put them in. But any other member of the House has the same privilege of moving an amendment as the Honourable Minister for Provincial Affairs, therefore I would say it would be in order to discuss it right here. Let me draw this to your attention, Mr. Chairman, this Bill contemplates thirty-three districts, but when the alteration is made we are going to have thirty-five districts, with thirty-six members because one is made into a two man district. One of the things we were told the Government was going to do was to get away from dual member districts and have all single districts. Nevertheless we are going to have two now, two divisions in White Bay. So I can hardly see how we can escape discussing once again the question of two-man districts, and is it not reasonable to suggest it right at the beginning as it is on any particular paragraph?

Clause 3 (1) read.

(1) The District of St. Barbe shall consist of and include all that part of the Island extending from the centre of the mouth of Gregory River north-easterly following the coast line to West Point of Open Bay in the Straits of Belle Isle, bounded thence on the east by a line running south 24 degrees west until it intersects a line running due east from the centre of the mouth of Gregory River and thence west by said line to the centre of the mouth of Gregory River aforesaid, together with all islands adjacent thereto. True bearings.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact — I was going to suggest, Sir, it might not be necessary to read all these things through.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think they should be read.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, now let me draw your attention to this paragraph. That district is not interfered with in any way, but the Premier and the Minister for Provincial Affairs know, if really anxious to keep down the number of members, that district could easily be brought around Cape Norman and Cape Bauld and brought down to the other coast towards St. Anthony, and make it a little larger. Between the two districts there are twenty-one thousand people, and could be split to ten thousand five hundred instead of making three districts there and could have two for the same area. When we come to White Bay there is to be a division into two although there are only thirteen thousand people. I just want to make it clear that in a redistribution there are a great many arbitrary lines drawn. The area is cut in two by a line running south 24 degrees west. But another line has been drawn in St. John's West where it is drawn

northeast and south and east again, curving around. Here it is very simple to make the two districts where at the present time we have three. I do not know at what stage in the proceedings it would be in order to make a motion that there should be two districts here instead of three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There has been no motion yet. The Chair cannot accept a motion until it hears the motion. There has been some talk of it, but we have not heard of it in Committee.

MR. BROWNE: Well, will it be in order to make a reference back to White Bay?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I suggest, Mr. Chairman it would not. The Committee now passes each one as it goes. One or two may have to be deferred. We deal with each one, pass it and be done with it. Otherwise we will be here all summer, and we are not going to be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we pass St. Barbe we could divert back to it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on that point, my honourable friend on my right suggested that it might be possible that St. Barbe and White Bay be so divided that two members would represent them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Make an amendment.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not in order to make a motion. We would have to refer to White Bay and we cannot do that. If we are on White Bay and want to make a motion we cannot refer back. We are so used to being hemmed in by extra-curricular rules and regulations, I call them. The Honourable the Premier puts in rules and regulations which may be par-

liamentary law but certainly designed to suit his definite objects.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a new one — Parliamentary law designed to suit me. Now the honourable gentleman should not be such a defeatist, such a pessimist.

MR. BROWNE: Just a moment. Mr. Chairman, I move, in order to put the situation before the House to discuss, that the present districts of St. Barbe and White Bay be so divided as to return two members. Or do I have to make another motion at the end of the Bill to say these districts of St. Barbe and White Bay will have two members, the same as my honourable friend the Minister for Provincial Affairs will have to do in regard to Harbour Main-Bell Island. I don't know what form he has followed.

MR. MURRAY: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, such a motion is completely out of order. The number of members shall represent a district is governed by sub-clause 2.

MR. BROWNE: Now who is referring back.

MR. MURRAY: I am not referring back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has taken a point of order — Was the honourable member for St. John's West making an amendment there or was he making a suggestion?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That the district of St. Barbe and the District of White Bay be amalgamated to return two members. Now I may not have the correct wording, as approved by the Honourable Minister for Provincial Affairs, but I think the honourable member appreciates

the point I am making. The population of St. Barbe and White Bay total 21,448, which would return two members, giving an average of about ten thousand seven hundred or somewhere around there, which would be an average for thirty-six members.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. If you will turn over to the end of the section here, sub-clause 2 of the section, you will see that sub-clause 2 of this section governs what members shall represent each district. I am opposing the amendment on the grounds that it is premature. If such a motion is to be made it should be made when this clause comes up, page 24, sub-clause 2 of this clause.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, I have the clause here, and draw the honourable member's attention to it. Each of the districts named shall return one member. I asked for guidance on that. My honourable friend, the Minister of Provincial Affairs is going to make the same sort of motion when we come to Harbour Main-Bell Island. I hoped I would have the same formula as he has.

I move the present districts of St. Barbe and White Bay be amalgamated. My reason for doing that is that the combined population of the two districts is 21,448, which is an average. Mr. Chairman, that seems not to be too great an area for two members to cover. In the time that my honourable friend, the Minister for Provincial Affairs, has referred to, back in 1855 there was only one district, the District of St. Barbe. I am not sure whether it was changed in 1925 or changed in 1932. The developments which have taken place in the District of St. Barbe around Hampden and Sops Arm brought an increase in the population

in that area, and I presume too, the building of the Grenfell Hospital and the expansion which took place as a result brought an increase in population in that particular section. However, for at least seventy years that was all one district. Now the difference that this amendment would suggest is that it should be one district all right but that it would have two members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where would that amendment go?

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose that this motion would have to be considered, and then we would have to make a wording for that. We would have to change, I admit, the wording of both of those and leave out certain sections where the line runs south 24 degrees because the District of St. Barbe at the mouth of Gregory River and runs northwesterly to the west point of Open Bay. I have to look at the map Sir. The line runs northeast right down to the Straits of Belle Isle until it comes to Open Bay and then runs south 24 degrees west until it comes to a line going due east and west, and then across to St. Gregory. Quite obviously it is in order to make one district of it just by removing this line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must inform honourable members, our Standing Orders say that a Committee must report progress. We do not have the power to recess.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again presently.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to it referred, has made some progress and asks leave to sit again presently.

On motion report received, ordered to sit again presently.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to draw the attention of honourable members to items five and six on the Order Paper. They should read "Committee of the Whole" as they have received second reading.

It being now 6:00 I do leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock.

TUESDAY, April 12, 1955.

NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

First Reading: Honourable the Attorney General ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Registration of Deeds Act." On motion read a first time—Ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act."

MR. SPEAKER: Leave was given earlier for this committee to sit again. I do now leave the Chair.

Mr. Courage Chairman of the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee was considering sub-clause (1) of Clause 3: Shall this clause carry?

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Chairman; At the time the committee rose I was about to move an amendment but I did not have the material at hand to make the amendment very easily at that particular juncture. I now move an amendment as follows: That sub-clause (1) be stricken out and the following substituted therefor:

I should explain how it does arrive: Just a glance at the map is sufficient to show how it was done. Actually just join that line down there. That is the only difference. If we go here to Cape Norman easterly to Cape Bauld and down to St. John's, we take in the whole two districts. In the bill at the present time it begins at Cape Gregory and on to Open Bay and down along this line to a point here and then across to Gregory River. Now then, leave that out, and you have to go east to Cape Bauld then come practically due south to Cape St. John, because the other district, the description given for White Bay, begins at this point and goes north to Cape Bauld and goes around here to Open Bay and then comes down this line and then goes on forty-one miles due east and then along this line here north and east until it goes out to Cape St. John again. Just revise the bearings, that is all. Put it south instead of north and west instead of east to make that district.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do that because it is a way of eliminating one of the proposed districts. The District of White Bay, we understand, is going to be divided into two. Now if the government really had economy in mind they could have extended the District of St. Barbe around to St. Anthony on this side, so as to get an equal population in St. Barbe District as in the other. We might have to go to St. Anthony or Goose Bay or some other point along the coast, but figures are available to enable the drafters of the different districts to get a fairly even distribution of the population. What happens now is that St. Barbe has 8,300 population, according to the figures, and the later figures supplied by the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare are not

very different, and the District of White Bay, in the new figures supplied me, has thirteen thousand five hundred, an increase of about 430. In this way they will be divided into two with 8,700 in each district, approximately. I do not know how that is made up there. Perhaps when the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs replies he can explain how many are to be in each one. But it seems to me that this has been decided as a sort of a last resort to divide the District of White Bay. They looked around to see where they could divide up and get two members and this one seemed to be the most obvious. We really could have made two districts out of it instead of making a two man district like I am making or suggesting now. Put it into two districts and have the populations evenly distributed and save the extra expense of having a third district out of that. Because, while I realize that that district is an extensive one, yet the population is not so very great. It is great enough, of course, for two members, and a two man district probably would be a good arrangement for the district. It might be worth while trying. So, Mr. Chairman, I move that amendment.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to that amendment. I cannot see that the honourable and learned member opposite has given any valid reason for such an amendment. In the district as it exists for St. Barbe, the natural boundary follows along one side of the Great Northern Peninsula. It is a homogeneous district, and considering its wide-spread nature it is not over represented. It has a population of something like 8,500. It stretches along a long coastline, which looks to be something of about one hundred miles.

The boundaries make the district homogeneous as it stands, and in its present form the district has stood for quite a long period. On these grounds I oppose the amendment.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of my learned friend, if for no other reason, for the reason of population. According to the census returns in 1952 the population is 361,500. If we are going to have thirty-six members, that would make ten thousand in each district or there would be one representative in this House for ten thousand people. That is one reason why, if we weld these two districts into one, you would have 21,000 people, which would warrant a representation by two men in this House.

The Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs said "homogeneous". I don't know exactly what he meant, nor in what way, but I do know the people in a great measure depend upon the same kind of work, the same sort of work, they are all related closely to each other except for the fact there are no roads. Probably if two members were to represent the whole of the Great Northern Peninsula, some effort might be made to get greater facilities as far as roads across the Great Northern Peninsula. In regard to other matters pertaining to their welfare, although I am appreciative of the fact that very little has been done for, shall I say, either of these districts in the past five or six years — I believe in the second half, at least on the south side, my honourable friend from White Bay has been trying to get some hospital facilities.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, is this in order. This is an amendment to this clause. May we have

a discussion as to the work of the government or anyone else, in the last few years?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point is well taken. The honourable member is getting away from the discussion.

MR. HOLLETT: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, we can talk about the population and the homogeneity of the district?

MR. CHAIRMAN: But I don't think the honourable members should go into hospitals and matters of that nature.

MR. HOLLETT: My argument, was, with two members fighting the cause there would be a better chance in this House to have these matters arrived at, whether roads or hospitals. Certainly a representation of two men from the area would carry a greater weight in the House of Assembly than would one lone individual.

On these grounds and on the grounds of population, making them as nearly as possible equal, dividing the country up into areas whereby ten thousand people would elect one man to come into this House of Assembly; then I think we are getting nearer the objective which we should aim at. After all, Sir, it is not territory we are concerned with, it is not with souls, it is with the peoples lives that we have to deal in this House of Assembly and their welfare. Therefore it is people who must send us here and not large areas like Labrador sending more than somebody else or smaller areas like some others sending less or more as the case might be. I should think every ten thousand people of this country should have approximately the same say, the same authority in this House as any other ten thousand or any other part of the

population. On these grounds, sir, I am very much in favour of this amendment. Besides, as I have already stated here, and it may be a re-hash, as I believe CJON stated, we on the Opposition were re-hashing our arguments. I still think we ought to think of the cost to the country, the cost to the Treasury, the expenses involved in increasing the membership of this House by this bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order — That has already been decided, that the membership in the House will be thirty-six. Any reference to that will be out of order.

On motion the amendment was lost.

On motion sub-clause 2 deferred until later.

Clause 3 read: Carried.

Clause 4 — Gander:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, we have here the figures for Grand Falls, is this the one the Premier referred to as being an error? We have here 28,238 for Grand Falls. Is that correct?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Does that include the Gander?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Now then, have you got the list?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What list?

MR. BROWNE: This list here. Maybe you can tell us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can give the figures for two districts, if that is what is wanted.

MR. BROWNE: What I want to know is the places left out, Badger, Bishops Falls — Hotwood is in Gander,

Browns Arm is in Gander, Buchana is in Grand Falls.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think Exploits is in Grand Falls.

MR. BROWNE: Then Gander is the biggest settlement. Gull Pond?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think is in Grand Falls.

MR. BROWNE: I take it Lawrencetown and Lewisporte are in Gander. Norris Arm and Millertown, I take it are in Grand Falls.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Norris Arm is in Gander.

MR. BROWNE: Now do the settlements add up to about an equal amount, does the honourable the Premier know?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of what? Places? No there are more places in Gander District.

MR. BROWNE: What about population?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The population of Grand Falls District is 12,599 and Gander 15,639.

Clause 4 carried. Clause 5 read:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, in spite of re-hashing again, I want to register our opposition to this particular division in the great industrial heart of Newfoundland, where you have people, as my honourable friend, the Minister of Provincial Affairs says, homogeneous, who are practically all dependent, apart from those in Gander Town, on the woods business. There are in that area some 28,238 people, or there were in 1951. I should think we could probably add another ten per cent on that now bringing it up to over thirty thousand people. I maintain, sir, if there are any people

in this country who need to have representation greatly increased it is in that particular area. Now I grant you there are to be two members, one for Grand Falls and one for Gander, but I feel it should be divided into three, at any rate of about ten thousand people per member. What I would suggest: I know it is only a suggestion, and it won't get us anywhere, it won't get anybody anywhere, but I am in duty bound to suggest that there should be three men representing that huge area of thirty thousand people. There is no reason whatsoever that it should be changed to two districts. Leave it in one district as before, but give them three men instead of one, as they had before. I am inclined to think my honourable friend, the Minister of Public Works would be inclined to agree with that.

DR. ROWE: And three for Humber too?

MR. HOLLETT: We have not come to Humber. We are not supposed to talk about that. If the honourable minister wants to get up and talk about Humber I am perfectly satisfied. I am quite sure people of this particular area are not going to be satisfied, and I am duty bound to read a telegram received from the Conservative Committee in Grand Falls. They say: We respectfully request you to strongly protest on our behalf the re-distribution bill presently before the House of Assembly. Average representation is practically double that of Grand Falls and some districts more than three times our representation which we submit is rank discrimination, they say; with upward of twenty thousand population and with our tax-paying potentiality the proposed representation is grossly unfair. I certainly do agree with them: Not because the areas

pay a lot of taxes into the Treasury. No. That is not a particular reason for having increased representation. But at least it should be recognized. But I do say when we get twenty thousand people in a huge industrial area like that, contributing so much to the welfare of the people as a whole, then I say, they should have more representation, much more than they have at the present time. I grant you the Honourable Minister of Public Works represents the district in a highly satisfactory manner, I have no doubt. But I am quite sure there would be more power to his elbow if he had with him a couple more men for that particular area where there are so many people living.

I don't see any point in making any amendment. I put it out to the government, that in justice, or as near as the government can get to it, they should, if they are going to have the particular numbers they speak of divided up by ten thousands or as near as possible, in some cases eight thousand or twelve thousand or fourteen, but getting as near as possible to ten thousand people to elect one member in the House; then they are doing something worth while, something likely to last. The bill we are passing now, sir, relative to this particular district is not going to hold water. It is not going to stand. Unfortunate as the case might be, the government will have to bring in another redistribution bill and divide up that particular area. But this government now has the opportunity to do it fairly, without any detriment to themselves politically — as a matter of fact it would redound to their political credit, I should think, if they could see fit to amend this particular clause whereby instead of one man they would bring in three men.

I throw that out as a suggestion anyway.

Clause carried: Clause 6 read, carried. Clause 7 carried. Clause 8 carried. Clause 9 carried. Clause 10 carried. Clause 11 carried. Clause 12 carried. Clause 13 read:

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to Clause 13. I move that Clause 13, as it stands be deleted, and two new clauses be substituted therefor: One which sets up a separate district for Harbour Grace and the other clause a separate district for Port de Grave, the boundaries to be set out in the Act:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, this is Harbour Grace, I take it. I would like to know from the government why in the first place they were going to join Harbour Grace with some other district. Looking back over the old records I find Harbour Grace was one of the oldest districts and had two representatives in the House back as far as 1855. How long that went on I have not had an opportunity to look up. But I would like to know from the government just why the government took upon themselves to add Harbour Grace to the other district. I certainly agree with the amendment introduced by the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs that it should be two districts not one. I can see on the face of it no reason whatsoever for adding on another district to Harbour Grace in order to make one of 15,157 people, according to the 1951 census. I wonder could the minister who is directing the bill through the House tell us why the change was made in the first instance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall this clause as read and amended carry?

MR. HOLLETT: No, Mr. Chair-

man, — I am wondering if anybody on the opposite side of the House would condescend to give us a reason for joining up Harbour Grace and some other district.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the amendment we are debating now.

MR. HOLLETT: The Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs moved an amendment. But I want to know why in the first instance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are speaking to the amendment and not to the clause as amended.

MR. HOLLETT: Goodness Gracious! Mr. Chairman, surely we must refer to this bill here, the bill we are amending. I must refer to it even though I am speaking to the amendment made by the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs. I fail to see how I can speak to that unless I refer to this particular bill, the bill before the House. I am asking the government to tell us why they in the first instance wanted to amend that? Why not tell us now? Why they could not let it stand as Harbour Grace and Port de Grave? Will the honourable minister condescend to tell us that? Mr. Chairman, if I have to speak here all night I am going to get an answer to that question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman might well take all night and all tomorrow morning if he likes.

MR. HOLLETT: But won't get any answer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: I am just asking. The question I am asking is: why is it the government have taken it upon themselves to bring a Bill into this House which would put two districts,

the district of Harbour Grace and the district of Port de Grave into one, and then tonight introduce an amendment whereby they put them back again into two, as they were in the last election? I am asking a question which I think is a fair question. What was behind the thoughts or in the minds of the framers of this Bill when they decided that they would unite these two ancient districts of Harbour Grace and Port de Grave? I go back again to 1855. At that time they had thirty-six members and fifteen districts, and Harbour Grace had two representatives and Port de Grave had one. That is three representatives. I strongly suspect there were just as many people in Harbour Grace and Port de Grave then, if not more, than there are now, and they had three representatives in this House. Then the framers of this Bill decided they were not going to let them even have two, just have one, Harbour Grace and Port de Grave, put them together with one member representing them in the House. Now I ask the government to tell me why? They have to be perfectly logical in their reasoning when doing that, I am stating here that in 1855 Harbour Grace and Port de Grave, with just as many people there then and probably more, had three men representing them in this House. It was the intention of this government to break up that arrangement and put the two together and give them one representative here. Now we want to know, and the people want to know, and the Opposition certainly wants to know, what was behind the reasoning of the government when they did a thing like that? Certainly I cannot see any rhyme nor reason in it. As a matter of fact I can see very little rhyme or reason in this Act anyway. Here were two districts added together which in 1951 had 15.

157 people, and they had two representatives here. Then the government decided to introduce this Bill which would join them up into one district and call it Harbour Grace-Port de Grave, and give them one representative here. Yet the Labrador, (if I may refer to the Labrador, or shall I say some other district) they divided a small population of seven or eight thousand people into two and gave one of these districts with a total of 3,800 people one representative here. In other words, one representative here in this House represents 3,800 people in one of the districts, whereas the government intends to put one representative in this House for fifteen thousand people in Harbour Grace and Port de Grave. I am asking, in all fairness, again, will the government state to us now just what was behind the reasoning for that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall this clause, as amended, carry?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman. If they don't feel inclined to answer that question, will they tell us why they are separating them again. Because I see here by population that Harbour Grace has 7,547 and Port de Grave 7,810. Why have they split them up again? Why have they changed their minds?

MR. HOLLETT: There must be some mystery behind all this. There must be a mysterious reason why the government does not want us of the Opposition to know. That makes us all the more curious. We are curious people but we are getting more and more curious about it. Nobody has to answer any questions. That is what we have been finding out. The government has not to answer any questions to the people. It is the policy, definitely the policy — They do not have

to answer any questions. Mr. Chairman, I ask a very simple question to satisfy my own curiosity and the curiosity of the people of the whole country — why and what was behind the government's reasoning when they decided they would put the two districts of Port de Grave and Harbour Grace into one district? I point out again, at the risk of repeating myself that away back in 1855 when we first got responsible Government in this country the District of Harbour Grace was given two members J. L. Pendergast and John Hayward and Port de Grave was given one. Three men represented these two districts in this House one hundred years ago. Yet this government had the audacity, Sir, to go to work and group the two districts together and say we will give them just one member, one hundred years later, Harbour Grace and Port de Grave are two ancient districts. Ancient not only as districts but ancient traditionally. They have contributed as much or more than most or more than any other part of the country to the culture of this country. I would say there are no more men and women there now than there were a hundred years ago, yet the Liberal Government has seen fit to group the two of them together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must ask the honourable member to remember the amendment. The amendment does not group them together.

MR. HOLLETT: No, it does not. But I want to know why the amendment now, having once grouped them together? Surely the government must tell us why they make this amendment to a Bill brought in here. Surely they must tell us that. I am asking the government, will they not tell us why, having grouped the two of them to-

gether they now want them apart again, and have them in the last election? The government said we could talk all night and they won't tell us. I will talk all night and try to be as relevant as I can.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And be strictly relevant if the honourable gentleman knows how.

MR. HOLLETT: I will do the best I can.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It may not be good enough.

MR. HOLLETT: Unless I get led off by interruptions or interferences of some Ministers on the opposite side. I maintain, Sir, a Redistribution Bill, in the history of any country —

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: I say Mr. Chairman, that a redistribution of the votes in the district of Harbour Grace and Port de Grave is a very, very serious problem for any government, and to think that this great Liberal Government, which aspires, I strongly suspect, to be sitting on the right hand bye and bye, would break up anything that is traditional in this country, the old traditions. These two great districts of Harbour Main and Port de Grave — to group them together and say they are only to have one man here in the House. That is what they said in this Bill. Whereas I pointed out, and I point out again and will keep on pointing out, a hundred years ago these two areas with no more people had three men here to represent them. I ask the government why do that? Why do what I think is unfair? Why do what the people of Harbour Grace and Port de Grave thought was un-

fair? Why do that? Why will not the government tell us? I see no reason why they cannot tell us. If they made an error in judgment, lots of governments make errors.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: It may be carried, but I say, Sir, the whole principle of the redistribution of seats, the whole principle of the election of members —

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is not discussing the principle now.

MR. HOLLETT: Sir, I am not referring to the principle of the Bill but to the principle of grouping a number of people into one district.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In this particular clause?

MR. HOLLETT: In this particular clause, yes. I am saying that one of the most important functions of government and one which should be attempted with the greatest of care is this matter. Remember, Mr. Chairman, that when we asked that this whole Bill and particularly this section should be put back into a Select Committee whereby a proper division could be made of the voters into groups, that was turned down. Today they flippantly bring in here an amendment which would tend to do the very thing which we asked them to do a few days ago; which is one of the reasons why we asked to have this Bill go back into a Select Committee, so that the Bill might be given more time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, again, Mr. Chairman. Can the honourable gentleman refer to a former debate in this same session.

MR. HOLLETT: I shall have to refer to the debate of last session. I think we had some debate last session. I will refer to that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: The government is in a great hurry to carry that. There are certain things, Sir, which we have to take into consideration when we speak about the division of the people into groups, certainly one part of the community, nor one set of opinions or interests, should be distinctly over-represented at the expense of another. I was going to refer to another matter relevant to the distribution — Take the District of Harbour Grace, for instance, take a statement given us by the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare, that the ancient and honourable district of Harbour Grace in February last year was paid out \$706 for sick relief.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not see what that has to do with the boundaries of Harbour Grace District. I must say I cannot decide whether the honourable member is in favour of the amendment or is opposed to it, but we are discussing the boundaries of Harbour Grace District at the moment, as amended. I don't think the matter of sick relief has very much to do with it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, the only thing is, there are too many people sick in the District, I am not anxious to refer to this but I do think everything relevant to the decision of an area ought to be considered by the government. It is quite apparent to me they did not consider the feelings of the people in Harbour Grace District and Port de Grave. They did not consider here how long both these districts had been represented in this

House. They could not have, else they would never have decided to weld the two districts into one and make of them one district of fifteen or sixteen thousand instead of two as they had before. (It is probably twenty thousand now). They could not have thought about it at all else they would never have decided to weld the districts into one and make one district of fifteen or sixteen or seventeen thousand instead of two as they had before. Now we ask why they did it? They will not say. They will give us no information. Well, Mr. Chairman, I see I am dealing with a stubborn group.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Just patient.

MR. HOLLETT: I am delighted to see they are beginning to get some little patience. I have said that I could talk all night on this thing, but I think I would prefer to let the good people of Harbour Grace and Port de Grave decide on the issue.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is very smart. That is wise.

MR. HOLLETT: They know very well what this government tried to do. And they know very well what they told the government they must not do. The government knows very well how meekly they have given in. Unwillingly they come in here now and make an amendment. But they can not very well wipe out something which was done wrongfully. I say, Sir, it is really a crime, a political crime at any rate, to have even suggested that these two districts should be molded into one and have just one representative here in this House. That is all I want to say on the matter. I asked a simple question. If they don't want to or don't see fit to answer.

Sub-clause 13 carried.

Sub-clause 14 — Port de Grave.

On motion, clause (as in original Bill) carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee, will not the numbering Bill have to be changed.

MR. MURRAY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. District of Harbour Main.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honorable Minister in charge of the Bill could tell us where Simpsons is?

MR. SMALLWOOD: St. Catherine's Street.

MR. MURRAY: I am afraid I can't.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In Toronto, next door to Eaton's.

MR. BROWNE: It is somewhat difficult from the description of Harbour Main where it extends at the present time.

MR. MURRAY: That might very well be somewhere out around Glendale area in the Mount Pearl Park. They found on looking at the early photographs that the existing line ran through the park and through actual homes. So it was moved back some, so that all Mount Pearl area would be south, but in St. John's North.

MR. HOLLETT: Does that make sense — To take it from Harbour Main and put it in St. John's North?

MR. MURRAY: Well it makes sense to have all one settlement or community in one district, and more sense to have one house in one district rather than have a line drawn through it.

MR. HIGGINS: That is not unusual, Mr. Chairman. There is a house

out on Topsail Road, just where General Motors have their old used car lot, where the eastern portion was in St. John's West and western portion in Harbour Main. I remember my old friend, Joe Fitzgibbon told how the family used to vote in St. John's West in the morning and in Harbour Main in the evening.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Honorable the Attorney General and the Minister of Public Works and I saw the Iron Curtain going through a house, and we talked to people looking out the widow of the house on the western side, chatted away with them, and the people in the eastern part of the house were looking out the window chatting also. The people in the same house were in the east and west sectors.

MR. HIGGINS: I think this is a terrible disregard for tradition. We talk about preserving tradition and are now destroying the finest tradition we have.

MR. HOLLETT: Now I fail to see where the relevancy comes in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I remarked on that.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, but the damage was done before you remarked on it, and the Honorable the Premier had told us how he had gone inside the iron curtain; or did they peep under, just forget which, at any rate —

MR. SMALLWOOD: We could have brought back pieces of the iron curtain. We could have chipped it off with a penknife. It was a wooden fence.

MR. HOLLETT: Why do that — Very good, getting back to Harbour Main; could the government show me some reason for taking Glendale away

from the district in which it had been for some time and planking it down along with Pouch Cove and Bauline? I would like to know what was behind the reasoning.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is it not pretty obvious.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not obvious to me, certainly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "None so blind."

MR. HOLLETT: As those who refuse to look, or see, or something. Obvious? Oh now I see the reasoning behind this design. In other words it sort of separates the sheep from the goats. I won't say which are the sheep and which the goats. That is what they were trying to do. That is a thing I say this government has no right whatsoever to do, split districts up denominationally as they see fit. I think it is highly dangerous and something which should not be allowed.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw attention to this map I have here — Part of the old District of Bell Island — In this section here St. John's West is, although it does not continue on this map, I presume went around somewhere in that area, and then went out towards Portugal Cove up there. The two districts of St. John's and Harbour Main were contiguous, and they no longer are, because St. John's West is now very small, and St. John's North has taken the place, partially, of St. John's West and St. John's South has taken another part of it. But it seems to me that it does not appear to be a justification for altering all the boundaries of Harbour Main anyway. I don't know why this has been done. I don't know what the effect would be. I don't suppose any member on

the opposite side could tell me how many people would be taken out of St. John's West and put in Harbour Main. I don't think anybody knows.

Carried.

Bell Island clause read.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, here again I must point out the inconsistency of this government. We just finished with Harbour Main, with 9,800 people, and we know what the intentions of the government are with regard to that. Yet Bell Island, with ten thousand, has only one representative in this House. We probably will be able to talk to that, I think, on another amendment. But I would point out, I think both these places should be represented here in the House and I think they should be represented equally. If anything, Bell Island, which has slightly more population, and certainly they have homogeneity of population, should have a greater representation perhaps, but we will come to that under sub-section 2. Carried.

St. John's North — clause read.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could make my observations and have my say now at the beginning, because what I have to say really applies to all St. John's. Because the boundaries of St. John's have changed so considerably it is very difficult to deal with any one particular section.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I gather from that that the honourable gentleman has the intention of having a sort of review of all these five constituencies. I just wonder if that would be in order. I can understand that the five of them in a certain sense must be looked at as St. John's, but surely that would be done at sec-

ond reading. We cannot look at the five sections here together. We have to pass them one by one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that the Clerk read St. John's North and then have the discussion take place on the motion.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, may I point out we were not allowed to talk on second reading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we must discuss each clause as it comes up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, if it pleases Your Honour and if it pleases the Committee, perhaps the way to do it is to read all five sections and have the debate on all five of them. That is for the St. John's area only, and not for the whole of the Bill. Just the St. John's Constituencies, because it is a case of dividing up a city. So if the Committee were agreeable to that — read all five, and then debate all these as one instead of having five debates.

MR. HOLLETT: See how reasonable we are.

MR. SMALLWOOD: See how reasonable we are!

Clauses read by Clerk.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am very puzzled to find out how the figure of fourteen thousand has been arrived at. I have here the figures supplied by the Premier and they include each settlement, such as, Bauline, Pough Cove, the old Broad Cove Road, Shoe Cove and Thorburn Road; thence from St. John's West the following, which comes to 2,300 are taken. Mundy Pond, Mount Pearl, Portugal Cove and St. Phillips, which comes to 4,000, leaving a balance of nearly eight thousand which are sup-

posed to come from other sections. I would like to know on what basis the figures were arrived at that there is a population of fourteen thousand in this district of St. John's North?

MR. MURRAY: I think, Mr. Chairman, I am in a position to answer my honourable and learned friend. The honourable member, I think, stopped reading at Mount Pearl. Also to be added into that is the population up on the Southside Hill, the "Brow," a very heavy population.

MR. BROWNE: That is another district, St. John's South.

MR. MURRAY: Yes — the actual figures for the areas outside the city, the boundaries of St. John's are extracts from the 1951 census. In St. John's North also there is a considerable portion of St. John's East, and the estimate has been obtained from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, enough population was taken from the city, St. John's East, to make up a total population in the district of something in the nature of fourteen thousand.

MR. BROWNE: Would the Minister tell us how he estimates eight thousand from the city of St. John's? As far as I can see from there, the part of the city of St. John's runs along Topsail Road, Cornwall Avenue and takes in Cornwall Crescent and that section there as far as Bennett Avenue and Cornwall Avenue and then Topsail Road. That seems to be a large amount, eight thousand people, to be in that section, because Mundy Pond is given here, which has quite a considerable population, as 1,798. I don't know how it is figured.

MR. MURRAY: I think the honourable member will agree the area of St. John's is very heavily populated.

MR. BROWNE: I would not say it is heavily populated in that section.

MR. MURRAY: Anyway the figures, as I say, were obtained from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

MR. BROWNE: That of course is not my chief objection. My chief objection is that this offends against the principle talked about here, the principle of homogeneity, of putting people from Mount Pearl with people from St. Thomas's and St. Phillips and Bauline and Pouch Cove, where they do not seem to have anything in common.

MR. MURRAY: The denominational factor has to be given a great deal of consideration.

MR. BROWNE: Of course, and the political factor, was not overlooked. Someone expressed astonishment at that. I don't think an examination would show I am far out in that interpretation. However, Mr. Chairman —

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman's mind is so preoccupied with politics he can scarcely think of anything else.

MR. BROWNE: Well I am so preoccupied with the working of the mind of someone else, I have to concentrate on it. I have an idea whose mind worked on this design, this fancy pattern here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not think the honourable gentleman had such an interest as that in it.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, I have some considerable interest in it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I refer to the honourable gentleman who designed this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. BROWNE: If the Premier says he has no part in designing it, I would find it very difficult to believe. Here we have a district which begins at Shoe Cove and comes on east and runs around Cape St. Francis and up as far as Broad Cove in Conception Bay then comes on to the District of Ferryland, then comes on in to the city of St. John's, as part of the outskirts of the city of St. John's, and part of Conception Bay, and part of St. John's East. It is an offense, I say, against homogeneity and an offense against the principle of the traditional occupations of the people. I know we have gone over that. But it does seem to me a purely artificial concept which was designed deliberately from the point of view of getting a representation of three-two, three Catholics and two Protestants. Then in regard to St. John's East, apparently the same idea was followed, so that St. John's West and St. John's North are supposed to return to Protestant seats, and St. John's East, Centre and South will return three Catholic seats.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have the opportunity to do so. That is all we can do.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Alder-dice once got elected in St. John's East, yes in St. John's West too—both places. There is no reason why a Catholic or Protestant should not be elected in St. John's East or in St. John's West. The division prior to 1925 was three men for each district, St. John's East and St. John's West, and in 1925 it was the late Sir John Crosbie, Mr. Linegar and myself and in St. John's East, Higgins, Fox and Linegar.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is when St. John's West was "CLB."

MR. BROWNE: At that time they had Bell Island. Now in 1925 Bell Island was made a separate district. The city of St. John's was two districts, with two men each, East and West, and the two externs St. John's East extern returned a Catholic and St. John's West extern returned a Protestant. St. John's West returned Frank Bennett, Church of England and St. John's East returned Mr. Alderdice and Mr. Burn, and St. John's West returned Dr. Campbell and Mr. Fitzgibbons in the 1928 election. As far as we are concerned this is a more natural division. Yet the Minister of Provincial Affairs used that argument, with considerable effect, I imagine, in regard to the splitting of St. Barbe and White Bay, some time ago — These two districts were created by a line dividing them, going right down the middle of the peninsula. It is the same with the traditional boundaries of St. John's East and West. They have never been disturbed up to the present time. Now the government proposed to take some of St. John's West and put it into St. John's Centre and some of it will remain in St. John's West and some in St. John's South and some in St. John's North. Some part of St. John's West will now be put into the four districts and part of St. John's East will go into St. John's Centre and part into St. John's West and part in St. John's East and part in St. John's North. It seems to me that it is not a logical division. It is a purely artificial and arbitrary division created for the specific purpose, and is not a logical arrangement, as it existed either prior to 1925 or as it exists at the present time or between 1925 and 1932. At the present time there are two representatives for St. John's West and two for St. John's East. For St. John's East there are two Catholics

and for St. John's West a Protestant and a Catholic

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is that again?

MR. BROWNE: St. John's East two Catholics and St. John's West a Catholic and a Protestant. Now the Premier knows, of course why the Catholics have been given traditionally a greater representation in St. John's than the number warranted. I admit that that is out of proportion to their number. But, according to figures supplied me, the two districts of St. John's, East and West, I don't know where they are outside the city: Blackhead, Waterford Valley, Goulds, Mundy Pond, St. John's West, Mount Pearl, Petty Harbour, Portugal Cove. St. Phillips: total 12,432, of whom 6,339 are Catholics and 6,000 Church of England — This is a reasonable size district because most of the people of the district live outside the city, and according to the principle they should have a representation on a smaller scale than people living in the city. We have 12,400 there, which compares with 12,300 in Trinity North, 10,682 in Trinity South, 12,000 in Carbonear, etc. It seems to be a natural division to have. St. John's East has a lesser number 9,000. Bauline, Flat Rock, Freshwater Valley, Logy Bay, Murray's Pond, Nagel's Hill, Old Broad Cove Road, Outer Cove, Pouch Cove, Quidi Vidi, Shoe Cove, Thorburn Road and Windsor Lake, total 9,000 of whom Catholics comprise 5,460, over fifty per cent. Church of England 2,059; and United Church 1,291; Salvation Army 132 and others 143. These are traditional districts, one of which was part of St. John's West since 1855 and the other part of St. John's East for about the same time. They were districts of their own in the elections of 1929, so

that it seems reasonable that they should be made into districts again.

Now the City of St. John's: The figures I have here shows a population of 52,873 of whom 24,565 are Roman Catholics; 12,544 Church of England; 12,466 United Church 1,333 Salvation Army; 2,535 are others. So that now, in order to bring about the result that we see before us someone had to go to work and take part of St. John's East and part of St. John's West and part of the city to make this strange district called St. John's North. Then they had to do the same thing in regard to St. John's West and St. John's Centre. They had to ignore traditional boundaries. As long as I can remember the boundaries between St. John's East and St. John's West were Carter's Hill and Freshwater Road. That boundary is now no more, according to the scheme we have before us. The boundary for the West end goes to Cashin Avenue, Bennett Avenue and comes along to Freshwater Road but then goes across into the East end and at Mayor Avenue and goes East on Elizabeth Avenue taking in portions of the East End. Then we have a district of St. John's East which is half city and half country. If there are nine thousand people in the outskirts, outside the city of St. John's between Banline and Windsor Lake and Quidi Vidi, then there must be approximately eight thousand in the city. So that eight thousand city residents are put in with nine thousand persons who live outside to make this one district of seventeen thousand, which would be the largest district in the country. In St. John's therefore you would have greater concentration of population in these districts, two of which are seventeen thousand—Those figures are an estimate. They are not

accurate. It is very probable that the total is much higher than that. At any rate, I would say is higher than that.

Now we object to that arrangement. We feel that it would be better to leave the districts as they are at the present time and go back to the system prevailing to 1925 or 1928, with St. John's East and West returning three members each. There seems to be no reason why, as I have already shown in some of the Provinces of Canada, where cities are concerned they have two, three or four members and even five members. I am not sure, but I think in some places there are six, but certainly there are five members returned for one district. There does not seem to me to be any reason why we could not return to the system we had before of returning three members for St. John's East and three members for St. John's West. Now if the great principle was being adhered to in all the districts there would not be much strength in our argument, or not as much strength in our argument as there is. But the government has abandoned the principle of single constituencies.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In one case out of thirty-five.

MR. BROWNE: In one case where the population is ten thousand there are to be two members so that one member will be elected by five thousand people, we might say. Anyhow there will be two members for ten thousand people whereas in the large districts of St. John's some of which are very extensive — I imagine the district of St. John's East is about thirty miles and I imagine the district must also be as wide, and as hard to get around as the district of Fogo.

MR. G. JANES: You are not

thinking of going down there by any chance?

MR. BROWNE: Although they have not the facilities for travelling around we have here.

DR. ROWE: It makes a difference.

MR. BROWNE: I don't dispute that at all. But Mr. Chairman, I don't see what is to be gained by dividing up the city in this fashion. I notice here a very peculiar thing the people on the one side of Old Placentia Road are in St. John's North and the people on the other side of the road are in St. John's South.

MR. MURRAY: Of course.

MR. BROWNE: I know what my honourable friend is going to say — there must be a boundary somewhere — but not have them in one district on one side of the street — But you are following along the old Placentia Road to Cowan Avenue and LeMarchant, Hamilton Avenue, Cornwell Avenue.

MR. MURRAY: Surely street lines are natural boundaries.

MR. BROWNE: No, I would not say natural boundaries. They are artificial boundaries. The traditional boundary has been Freshwater and Carters Hill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are they not streets?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, but there is only one place where that sort of division exists. It is not easy, Mr. Chairman, to try and convince a government that appears to be so determined on its policy as this government appears to be, I have already said, and I think it is true, a redistribution bill should be approached in a differ-

ent spirit than this one has been. This one has been put down before us — There it is — It is not going to be altered. We ought to be able to sit down around a table as a group of people and talk and explain why the boundaries should not be here or there, and see if there is a number of things which should be straightened out.

Now bearing in mind that the Premier told us they carved up the districts to make sure he gets two Protestant seats and gets three Catholic seats, as far as they can — and now the majority in these places are such and such. That does not seem to me to be the correct attitude to adopt, and it has never been the policy in the history of St. John's to follow what out all the time, because, as I have shown, St. John's East has returned Protestant and Catholic members and St. John's West has returned Protestant and Catholics, and at one time all of the seats in St. John's were held by Catholics. So there has never been an attempt, as far as I can see, to divide up the districts and say we should have definitely two of that kind and three of another. I am not so sure it would be divided along these lines. I don't know how anyone could.

MR. MURRAY: You can be quite sure about it.

MR. BROWNE: I can be sure? Is the minister in a position to tell me how he can be sure, what about St. John's Centre and St. John's South?

MR. MURRAY: St. John's South certainly.

MR. BROWNE: Well, St. John's South takes in most of St. John's West. From the figures here there are about 12,400 in St. John's West of whom

4,000 are taken out as St. John's North. They are then left with eight thousand. That leaves Blackhead, the Goulds, Freshwater Valley and Waterford Valley — I will agree that the majority in those places are Catholics. But when we come back into the city again we find quite an area there on the southern side of the Old Placentia Road and the part of the city that is west of Springdale Street; has the minister any figures to show what the population is there?

MR. MURRAY: It is impossible to get the exact denominational figures as far as the city is concerned. As the honourable member will know, it is impossible to get complete and accurate figures for denominations as far as the City of St. John's is concerned, for any given section of the city.

MR. BROWNE: How do you do it then? How are you quite so sure?

MR. MURRAY: We got parish registers from various parishes in the city. But there had to be a certain amount of guess estimates, and we left a very large margin there.

MR. HIGGINS: I was just wondering, St. John's Centre, taking your guess estimates breakdown of the major denominations —

MR. MURRAY: The information was given to me. I did not check every detail myself. But it would show St. John's Centre has a majority of Catholics of about three thousand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not a plurality but a majority.

MR. BROWNE: Have you got the figures for that.

MR. MURRAY: I have not them with me. But we have been considering this for some months. I only act on information given by people in my

office. I have made no cross-check on them myself, but it is in good faith.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we could have these figures to scrutinize, particularly in regard to St. John's Centre.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman can have any figure published and official, of course he has these.

MR. HOLLETT: These are non-official.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman has all the official figures now in his possession.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to know what figures the honourable minister of Provincial Affairs refers to?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Figures not official.

MR. HOLLETT: How accurate are they? That is the point. The honourable minister says, Mr. Chairman, that St. John's Centre as shown on that map is predominately Roman Catholic. Now we would like to see where on first glance as far as we can see it is not that way. We ask for the figures and are told they are not official and we cannot get them. I would like to know if they are accurate.

MR. MURRAY: There are no official figures denomination wise.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words, it is just a guess.

MR. MURRAY: More than a guess.

MR. HOLLETT: The whole redistribution bill is just a guess; and certainly the one about St. John's is not as good as a guess. Not as good as a guess.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is violent language.

MR. HOLLETT: But what I said is absolutely correct. We have a note here on St. John's City showing a total of 52,873 people of which twelve thousand five hundred and forty-four are Church of England; twenty-four thousand five hundred and fifty-five are Roman Catholics and twelve thousand four hundred and sixty-six United Church, and one thousand three hundred and thirty-three Salvation Army, 324 Pentecostal. That is practically fifty-fifty Roman Catholic and Protestant in St. John's City. I know that all St. John's Centre is in the city.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but take out of the city the area of St. John's West and North and what have you left? You have quite a substantial majority of Roman Catholics, by taking out St. John's West and St. John's North, the city part.

MR. HOLLETT: You are speaking of the new St. John's West and not the old.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not yet.

MR. HOLLETT: I cannot agree it is predominately Roman Catholic now. Let me make myself clear with regard to this idea of Protestant and Roman Catholic. I am not in the least interested in one way or another as long as the people are properly divided up. Here we have in St. John's a total of 78,000 in 1951 and if you put three per cent on to that, that is over 2,400 more, giving you more than eighty thousand people now in the district, or in these five districts, which would work out at sixteen thousand per representative on an average. Now I maintain St. John's should have a greater representation

in this House than that would give us. Take eighty thousand people in an area so homogeneous as in St. John's and I think they should have more representation here. Certainly if you go back to 1855 when the population was probably not more than one-third what it is now, St. John's East had three members and St. John's West had three. I grant you Bell Island was in St. John's at that time, but Bell Island a hundred years ago had very few people living there. In other words you take the same area and adopt the same principle as they adopted a hundred years ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have no doubt that five members in this House for St. John's would be adequate. St. John's would be adequately, competently and generously represented, yes, generously, handsomely and adequately and efficiently represented. We have no doubt of that whatsoever, whatever side happened to elect them.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words, eight thousand people on Labrador will have two, and eighty thousand in St. John's five.

MR. SMALLWOOD: St. John's then will be probably more represented and the St. John's viewpoint more represented in this House than will the Labrador viewpoint.

MR. HOLLETT: I fail to see where the Honourable Premier works that out.

MR. MURRAY: My honourable friend has certainly heard that where there is rural and urban representation rural districts are always represented more generously than urban. I could give you innumerable examples of such an established rule not only in Canada but all over the British Em-

pire, that principle is so well established

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to know further Mr. Chairman, why the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs dug up that old principle and what is the reason behind the fact, as you say, that rural areas should have greater representation in the peoples' House than the urban. Is not a man or woman in the city of St. John's or the town of Grand Falls or the town of Corner Brook, is not his vote or her vote as valuable?

MR. MURRAY: Sure.

MR. HOLLETT: As valuable as the vote of a man in Goose Bay or in the centre of Green Bay?

MR. MURRAY: I could cite examples.

MR. HOLLETT: I know the last Redistribution Bill they brought into the House of Commons in England, not the last, but the one in 1855, endeavoured to divide up populations of Great Britain by population. They did so by allocating to each man elected in the House of Commons 54,000 people in the whole of the country, as far as they could do it, and it was divided up on that basis. Now if it were right for England to do that in 1855, I submit that we here in this country as late as 1955 should endeavour to give these people of the country representation here and not areas, not urban, not rural, but the people themselves on the basis of around ten thousand people for one representative here of thirty-six members, based on that basis. We must remember when the Honourable the Premier speaks of St. John's city we must remember he is going far afield right out to Glendale and away down to Cape St. Francis on the north shore. Surely that is

not great St. John's. That is not St. John's city. Eighty thousand people with five representatives here in this House is certainly contrary to any concept of bringing in a Redistribution Bill. I am opposed to it on that very grounds if for nothing else.

Now if spoke before on this denominational business, I think the government are being very, to put it mildly off the track, in saying to the people of this country you shall elect two Protestants and you shall elect three Catholics.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Excuse me! We did not say any such thing.

MR. HOLLETT: That is exactly what you said, and said in this House this day. "We are creating three Roman Catholic districts and we are creating two Protestant districts."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: I maintain the government has no right to do so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Every right. The people don't have to vote that way if they don't want to, but they must have the opportunity to do so.

MR. HOLLETT: The people had the opportunity as we were divided before. Put three parties in the districts, and leave it up to the people concerned as to what denominations these men should be they wish to put in there. Certainly it is not up to the government, to this government to say how many Roman Catholics there should be in this or that end or how many Protestants in this end. That is what you say now on this thing you have here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must remind the honourable members, honourable members are abusing the word "You."

MR. HOLLETT: Now I notice in all these other districts they have the Roman Catholics, Church of England, United Church, Salvation Army, Pentecostal and others after every district until they get down to St. John's North. In St. John's North they say there is a population of fourteen thousand, marked "P," which I suppose means Protestant. Then they come to St. John's South and have that marked "RC." When I say "they" I mean the government. The government has marked St. John's East "RC."

MR. MURRAY: The marks entered on this are just supplied to members for information, to facilitate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Indeed, Mr. Chairman, this is my own private copy I handed to the Leader of the Opposition and now I am without it. I think in common courtesy he might keep to himself the notes that are written in lead pencil for me. I was generous enough to hand them to him.

MR. HOLLETT: The Honourable the Premier may be very generous. He handed me a document containing information with the request that I take it. I think we can refer to it in this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman did not request it. But go ahead, quote it all.

MR. HOLLETT: At any rate they have these letters here, and these districts are marked down as Protestant and Roman Catholic and so on. Why can I not refer to it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Go ahead!

MR. HOLLETT: Is there any reason why I cannot refer to Protestant and Roman Catholic or Pentecostal or Salvation Army. They have today about thirty-five or thirty-six thousand

people in this country, and I don't see any representation — Under the general heading of Protestants. We have all sorts of divisions of people into denominations. At any rate, Sir, I fail to see any rhyme or reason in the division of this area known as the St. John's area into five different districts. I put it to the Honourable the Premier that the division which has been made cannot stand, cannot by any rhyme nor reason stand for any length of time, and that a new Redistribution Bill will have to be brought in not many months or years hence. As I said before, I think this opportunity which only should come every once in a while, should be used to bring in a proper Redistribution Bill not only for this area but also for the whole of the country. That, I maintain, Sir, has not been done. We believe that St. John's at the present time, with a population such as it has, should be divided into two separate areas, two separate districts with a representation of three members for the East End and three for the West End and let the people themselves decide whether they shall vote for Roman Catholic or whether they should vote for a Protestant. I have a lot more to say on this yet, I am afraid.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I am rather confused listening to these remarks. When listening to the Honourable Minister for Provincial Affairs he explained the principle so well known that it does not need authority, that representation for all rural areas is always larger than for concentrated areas. Assuming that principle is correct, we have here actually in the five proposed St. John's districts only two that can be called completely urban, St. John's Centre and St. John's West. These are completely urban. But St. John's North, or rather St. John's East

is only urban as far as the city itself is concerned. It will now have its western boundary in the city at Prescott Street and go in through Rennie's Mill Road and over Robinson's Hill in along the road as far as the western side of Murray's Pond. So that St. John's city then really stops at the northern boundary of the city inside on the Cove Road. You have got then a very small portion of urban dwellers, because Quidi Vidi is not in the city limits. The city limits end, I believe at a line running from the General Hospital Road up to the top of Mount Carmel Cemetery. Now I cannot quite see how to St. John's East the rule enunciated by the Minister can apply. It can apply with full force in the city. For the purpose of argument it can apply to only two districts St. John's West and St. John's Centre, but St. John's North is certainly in an area at least as to the great majority of it which is rural. For St. John's South I think the same holds true, St. John's East in a great part is a rural district.

I am not in a position to question the denominational balance in any of these districts. Indeed I do know that as far as St. John's East is concerned, the rural portion of it is overwhelmingly in favour of the Roman Catholic denomination. I think it is something in the vicinity of about three to one. That would be going from Kings Bridge down to Shoe Cove Bridge. I think the exact figures are something like 4,600 to 18,000 to 19,000. Now so much for that part of it. But again the government said in effect that the people of that district will have the right of choice to elect in St. John's East a Roman Catholic. But it is rather interesting to remember that in the very first election after Confederation the Liberal Party ran in St. John's East a man, who did very well inciden-

tally, who was an Anglican. So that I do not think the Premier himself intends us to take it quite as literally as it perhaps sounds that St. John's East is to be a Roman Catholic District.

MR. MURRAY: It has the right to be if it wants to be.

MR. HIGGINS: And any valiant soul who wants to go into St. John's North. If the sun got very strong and I stayed out in it and wanted to go to St. John's North there is nothing to say I cannot. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the House might well give consideration to the maintaining of the two districts as they have hitherto existed, St. John's East and St. John's West with three members in each district. Now you may ask, that is all very fine, but how are you going to maintain the traditional balance then. That would be throwing the balance out. I say no. Don't go ahead with this proposed split of St. Mary's and Placentia. Let St. Mary's and Placentia remain one district. Add the additional one on to St. John's because, certain it is, Mr. Chairman, the principle of urban representation being smaller than rural is not valid because it only applies in this case to two districts, St. John's Centre and St. John's West; and I do feel, Sir, if somebody were to move an amendment it would be worthy of consideration; to maintain the districts of St. John's East and West as they have been and make each three men districts as they had been prior to the redistribution of 1925.

MR. MURRAY: In reply to my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, the overriding principle in this Bill or one of the overriding principles is to maintain the denominational balance. That was one of the things I was especially concerned with. Now

how are we going to do it. There is a Catholic minority in Grand Falls, a large minority but it is a minority; and there is a large Catholic minority in Humber but it is a minority, but the overriding principle, and that is all any people have a right to ask, is that their denomination is represented, fully represented. Now that can only be brought about by tolerance in St. John's. We have to go to our Protestant neighbours and say: This is a Protestant city but any Church of England man can say, we have twelve other of our religion in the House of Assembly and for that reason we ask you to accept a situation not quite fair, to elect three Catholics in a Protestant town. Surely my honourable friends see that by making the new division in Placentia, St. Mary's and making it two, if we have to have Catholic representation in the House it must of necessity come from the area between Capt St. Francis and the bottom of Placentia Bay. We have to carve our districts in that area in order to fulfil that division. In Grand Falls and Humber they have to yield through necessity. As long as the overriding principle is fulfilled, that is as much as we can reasonably ask for.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, ever since I came into office and indeed for some time before I came into office I have followed very carefully, very conscientiously and to the full extent of my ability to influence my colleagues and to win their support I have followed the practice of endeavouring to avoid the occasion of sectarianism. Before I was born the people of Newfoundland had divided themselves into various religious denominations, like most people of the world. Most people of the world have done that, with this difference. Here in Newfoundland our people have al-

ways taken their religious beliefs and their denominational loyalties with great seriousness. They have always, (I think they still do) taken their denominational loyalties with the utmost seriousness. That being the kind of Newfoundland we were before any of us were born, that being the kind of Newfoundland all of us found when we were born and when we grew up, that being the kind of Newfoundland we inherited, then it seems to me to be common sense either to have out and out sectarianism or else try by everything that is reasonable and sensible and just to avoid the reason or to avoid as much as possible the reasons for sectarianism or intense sectarianism. I feel now, I am as sure as I am that I am alive, that if we brought into this House a Bill, a Redistribution Bill which did not recognize the denominational balance and give the people of Newfoundland the opportunity, it is not ours to force them to take the opportunity, but it is ours to give them the opportunity in our legislation. If we did not give them in this Bill the opportunity to elect to this House representatives who would be like-minded with themselves denominationally, if we did not do that, if we did not give the people the right to be represented in this House by men who would constitute the same proportion of the House as they who sent them here constituted of the population as a whole then we would be causing sectarianism. We would be the cause of it. We would be the cause of ill-will. So that the sensible thing to do, if you know that one-third, exactly, precisely, mathematically, almost to a fraction of one per cent, one-third of the people of Newfoundland are Roman Catholic—all right, create one-third of the districts in such a way that, if they want to, they

can elect one-third of those who are Roman Catholics. If you find precisely one-third of the people of Newfoundland are Anglicans, do the same thing with the seats. Make it possible for the Anglicans to elect one-third of the House as Anglicans. If you find, as you do, precisely one-third of the people Nonconformists, constitute the constituencies one-third Nonconformists.

Now having done that we have done our duty. If the people subsequently want to elect Anglicans in Roman Catholic seats and want to elect Roman Catholics in Nonconformists seats and Nonconformists in Anglican seats, that is their business. But we must — surely, surely every member must know it — he may make propaganda — but nevertheless he knows it. I am willing any time at all to have it submitted to the people of Newfoundland. I am as sure as that of what I am doing. I believe the people of Newfoundland will approve. They will agree, although some people will pay lip-service. We must not take it denominationally — innocents abroad. That is what I think — Innocents abroad. The way to make trouble is to pretend it does not exist, then you will fan it. But if you face it frankly and say, in this House you will have one-third, one-third, one-third so long as the people are one-third, one-third, one-third. In the Cabinet we will have one-third; one-third; one-third so long as the people are one-third; one-third; one-third; one-third and in the civil service one-third; one-third; one-third also in the various boards appointed. So long as the people are that way, then you avoid, you escape, you walk away from the opportunity, the occasion for sectarianism. Now if I am wrong in that I cannot help it. That is what I believe. That is what we

believe over here. And that is what they believe, Mr. Chairman. They will make propaganda out of it, but if they were here drafting this Bill, piloting it through this Committee they would take the precise approach we have. We have some responsibility. Of course on the Opposition side they can take any stand. They are not responsible for governing, for the drafting of the legislation nor for piloting it through the House. Although an honourable gentleman was able, of course, when on this side to get up and vote for making a House of forty with a population of less than a quarter of a million, an island poverty-stricken. Today with a population of over four hundred thousand and prosperity he is only able to argue for twenty-seven or twenty-eight. Because he is in the Opposition and not responsible for governing.

Finally, as the honourable and learned member so rightly said here earlier tonight for the reason pointed out by my honourable colleague, the Solicitor General, if your population is one-third exactly Roman Catholic and if you decide that they shall have the opportunity to elect one-third of the members of this House as their fellow-religionists you are immediately in serious difficulties, because they are not distributed geographically, they are distributed denominationally. Thus you get as my honourable friend has pointed out, a big Roman Catholic minority in the District of Humber and again in the District of Grand Falls. In my own district of Bonavista North there is a substantial Roman Catholic minority as there is in White Bay, in Fogo, in Bonavista South, in Trinity South, in Carbonar-Bay de Verde, in the District of Harbour Grace, in the District of Port de Grave. You get just as great a Protestant

minority in the District of Placentia West, and in Burin again you get a substantial Roman Catholic minority. Now you cannot have minorities electing members to the House. If you do you cause sectarianism. In the past they gave St. John's more Roman Catholic representation in this House or at least so arranged things that St. John's could elect more Roman Catholic members to this House than St. John's denominationally would ordinarily be expected to do. Why did they do that? They did that because by giving St. John's more Roman Catholic members they were really giving representation here on this floor to the large Roman Catholic minorities scattered all over the Island. But we said: no, let us put an extra one in Placentia-St. Mary's, an extra one in Harbour Main and an extra one in Port au Port. These Roman Catholic minorities should get representation, but must it be St. John's that gives it to them? We say: no. Like it or not! Like it or lump it. We say on this side of the House, the additional Roman Catholic representation for minorities all over the island we will give by making Bell Island an extra one, by itself, by making Harbour Main a district with two representatives and have an extra one in St. Mary's and an extra one in Port au Port.

Now I won't even bother to deal with the point that St. John's has grown in population. Of course it has. But so has the whole island of Newfoundland grown in population. So has Humber District.

MR. BROWNE: Not Placentia-St. Mary's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If my honourable friends opposite expect that every single inch of a constituency will be a perfect exemplification of every

principle, the principle of more representation for rural than for urban areas, the principle of an equal representation for an equal number, the principle of denominational balance, if all of these and many others exemplified, if for each and every constituency that is to be done, would have to be passed, then to go and force people to move physically from one area to another area. That is what would have to be done. But we do not propose to do that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are the only points the Opposition have made. They won't listen. They won't accept them. They say we are a stubborn government but what are they? They do not accept the principle that all around the world it takes more people, more voters, more population, to elect one member in urban areas for the peoples' Houses than for a rural area. They won't accept that. They are blind, deaf and dumb. They cannot see. They don't understand. They don't want to understand. They are not going to understand. So they are going to vote against it. We are going to vote for it. We had our debate on it.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not finished yet. It is all very well to get up and spout about sectarianism. I maintain all the government is doing is bringing up the matter of sectarianism. That is exactly what they are doing. They go to work in St. John's and carve out two districts, St. John's North and St. John's West and figure out how many Protestants there are in that area and mark them "P" and where they think they have more Roman Catholics than Protestants they mark "RC" — if that is not sectarianism, what is it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a new definition.

MR. HOLLETT: We had before one line drawn through the district and any party concerned could put in three members in each, three of any denomination they liked. That gave the party a chance to put in the men they thought right and proper and gave the people a chance to vote for these — Talk about minorities: Here you have Grand Falls and Gander with over seven thousand Roman Catholics in that area. I do not see any representative there for a Roman Catholic candidate. I suggested this afternoon it might be three men and then there would be a chance to get a Roman Catholic.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In what part? Where would the boundaries be — We don't believe in three man districts.

MR. HOLLETT: We often had three men districts.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not any more.

MR. HOLLETT: No? According to the Honourable the Premier, we may have them yet. But here there are seven thousand Roman Catholics there. How are you going to make up to them? You are going to split Harbour Main in two and put two more, one in Port au Port and one in St. Mary's, to make up for the seven thousand in Grand Falls. In other words the Roman Catholics in Grand Falls, their man in this House has to be elected in St. Mary's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You would like to have it St. John's?

MR. HOLLETT: Of course we would. We have eighty thousand people here in St. John's and thirty-two hundred in Labrador South with one man. I repeat it is the most outrageous Redistribution Bill ever brought in this House, and if I were

a member of the government I would be ashamed to support it. It is ridiculous in my estimation. It is all very well to get up and prattle about hush hush about denominationalism and all that sort of stuff and try to put the onus for that over on this side of the House. Everybody knows what this present government has done. They play politics with religion. They are using denominationalism to try and split up the government into more districts. For what reason they know better than I probably. There is no point whatsoever in dividing up the country as they have and then come back here and plead they must do it to preserve the denominational balance. That is why we are to have thirty-six seats instead of thirty-three and thirty-three instead of twenty-eight, to preserve the denominational balance. If that is not the most ridiculous argument I ever heard of, I do not know what to think. To me, Sir, it is a crime the way this Redistribution Bill has been framed up. The idea of dividing Placentia and St. Mary's into two districts in order to make up the denominational balance. They could easily have put another man in the big industrial area of Grand Falls and Gander and give those people a chance to elect a Roman Catholic. They have seven thousand, one third of the people over there. For the people of Humber area — I have not the figures here at the moment. No, they would not do that, nor would they allow St. John's to elect another Catholic or another Protestant. We are only asking for six men. We are not particular about a man's religion who stands for us in St. John's or elsewhere as long as he has the goodwill of the people. The people are not going to follow him into church and see how he worships. They are just laying the whole blame on an

endeavour to preserve the denominational balance — eye wash — as far as I am concerned I do not believe for a minute that the government had that in mind in the first place. If so, why in the name of goodness did they want to divide or put two men in Harbour Main when they could have done it much more easily with twenty-eight members, and while they put two districts together and made one of it. Then they got scared over that. I want to tell the Honourable the Premier and this House I have as much regard and respect for every denomination in this country as any man on the opposite side, and I am not raising the issue as far as that is concerned, but I charge now that the government is using denominationalism in order to cover up the multitude of sins in this Redistribution Bill, and they cannot deny it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is beneath contempt.

MR. HOLLETT: That is beneath contempt, I say, yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What the honourable gentleman has said is beneath contempt, and I treat it with silent contempt.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, but the Honourable the Premier gets up and can say what he likes, anything he designs is lauded right up to the sky, up into Heaven, but anything we say on this side of the House is beneath contempt.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That remark was.

MR. HOLLETT: In my opinion it is correct, and I am entitled to my opinion. If the Honourable the Premier thinks it is beneath contempt he may think so, but I know whereof I speak, I know the crocodile tears which

were shed on the opposite side of the House when it was suggested to my learned friends on both my right and my left, "Why should you worry, Hollett will never get elected in St. John's" — by members on the opposite side of the House. Is that not beneath contempt. I would ask the honourable members on the opposite side to chew on that one for a moment and see if that is beneath contempt. I am prepared to face any man they put up either in St. John's West or St. John's South. If I get licked that is the people. But I do say there is no sense nor rhyme nor reason in taking a handful like St. John's and taking a handful out here and a handful out there — you be a Protestant district and another handful, and say: you are "RC," that you got to elect one. That is what you are saying. Then, say you are not bringing in sectarianism! It is the height of sectarianism, the most ridiculous thing I have ever seen brought in here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion the Committee rose, reported progress. On motion report received.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like your guidance on this point. We would like to continue, and I wonder just what the proper procedure is to do that. Would I move that the House do adjourn at 11:00 o'clock and then move the House back into Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: It is five to eleven. Move that the Committee has leave to sit again presently and then move the House do not adjourn.

MR. BROWNE: Is it in order to sit beyond 11 o'clock, by just a motion, without the consent of the House to

alter that rule? I think the rule is that at 11 o'clock the House adjourns. The Premier must be fair. We had another dose of Bills given us today. We have been given several reports. Where in the world are we to get time to do the work required in this House if the Premier insists on rushing things this way and going on until midnight or later if he wishes? He is trying to force through certain legislation. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is not fair. We are a small number over here and there is a big number on the other side of the House, and we have other obligations besides the obligations in the House, every one of us. There should be some consideration. We are not animals that can be driven. Now, how are we to consider these reports that were tabled here today, and the answers given us today? They are voluminous reports and answers. How are we to be able to study them and come in here tomorrow and perhaps at the wish of the government discuss other legislation, something completely other than we have been discussing and considering today and be in a position to deal with it? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is very hard for us to be expected to have sessions night after night and yet find time to be able to discuss new things that are brought in from day to day, such as these reports.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend opposite had wasted less time today we would be further ahead now and perhaps would not need to sit any later tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that the House do not adjourn at 11 o'clock.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have to speak again to that motion. With regard to the remark about the

Opposition wasting the time of this House. The Honourable the Premier may call it wasting time but we do not. I do remember the Honourable the Premier, on one occasion, speaking for five days on something. As my honourable friend on my right has said, Sir, we are human beings. True we have certain powers of resistance, I dare say we have equal powers of resistance with any member opposite. But we do think, having sat here from 3 o'clock to the present time, even though we are only wasting time, we cannot continue all night at the whim of one man. I am quite convinced, Sir, however the opposite side of the House votes, we are not convinced. We have work to do in connection with this. We have a duty to the people who put us here and a duty to the whole country and we cannot be treated like dumb cattle at the whim of one individual who sets a date and expects everyone else to conform to his whim.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Is it in order to set aside the rules of the House by just a simple motion?

MR. SPEAKER: That is a point we have ventilated thoroughly, I think, in every session since 1949. The rule says: "If it is desired to sit beyond 11 o'clock p.m. a motion may be made during the sitting that the House do not adjourn at 11 o'clock." Surely it is like any motion to adjourn or not to adjourn — It is decided by vote.

MR. HIGGINS: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the decision had been that the reason given for sitting on after what would normally be the closing time has been because of delay. Now it all depends, Mr. Speaker, on where you sit as to what is delay. The Leader of the Opposition has said,

and I support him, that, as we see it, we have equal obligations.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order — It is after 11 o'clock. I put it to you, we must adjourn now.

MR. SPEAKER: No. I am afraid I cannot uphold that point. The motion is before the Chair since before 11 o'clock.

Motion not to adjourn at 11 o'clock carried:

On motion the House went into Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I rise now for the purpose of moving an amendment at this stage. I understood that when we rose we were going to rise for the day. Apparently the Premier is determined he is going to force this thing through tonight. In other words, here in this House we have no say whatever. He does what he likes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. I ask that the honourable gentleman take that back. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that you order him to take that back.

MR. HOLLETT: Why, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Premier can't order you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Before the Premier spoke at all I ruled that remark out of order and unparliamentary.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, is he not doing what he likes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. We will proceed with the business in hand, and I must insist that there be order.

MR. BROWNE: Very well, Mr.

Chairman, I rise to propose an amendment to the matter under consideration at the present time. We are considering the districts of St. John's, five districts, St. John's North, St. John's South, St. John's East, St. John's West and St. John's Centre, which the government have carved out so they can get two seats representing this party in the House of Assembly.

MR. MURRAY: And probably more.

MR. BROWNE: No. Not probably more. No. The government have gone around St. John's figuring out the places, where there was a majority in the 1951 election, according to the election returns there on the desk of the Attorney General. If I had the book here, and I think I have it here, I could read it to him and show him how the division is made. Let us take St. John's East first, and take some of the places: Bauline — "Mr. Fraser 105; Peter Cashin, 0; Gordon Higgins 5." They took care to put that in the district.

MR. MURRAY: It had to go in the district.

MR. BROWNE: Now we come to Pouch Cove — "Peter Cashin, 14; Fraser, 98; Gordon Higgins, 51;" Pouch Cove North "Peter Cashin, 6; Mr. Fraser, 116; Gordon Higgins, 9;" Pouch Cove North "Cashin, 6; Fraser, 103; Higgins, 9."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, is this relevant?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, because the point I made is that you carved out the district to get representation in St. John's which you could not do under the old system. You did have a member here in 1951, but he chose to resign, and my honourable friend, the Leader of the Op-

position was elected in a by-election at that time. I doubt very much that you could get a man elected under the system that prevails at the present time. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry I should have to use that. But I will go on and give some other places in the districts. St. Phillips; "Peter Cashin 32, Fraser 74, and Higgins 12 then Cashin 4, Fraser 64, Higgins — none, Cashin 8, Fraser 51, Higgins 7." So it goes on right down the district. Make sure it is Liberal, not "Protestant" as the Honourable the Premier hinted.

MR. JANES: All good Liberals out there.

MR. BROWNE: It does not mean they always were. They were at that particular time in 1953 in Bauline and Pouch Cove and St. Phillips. In Portugal Cove the great majority of the people voted Liberal in 1953, but don't say they would do it at the present time. Certainly if they knew what was going on as well as the honourable member for Fogo, they would not. The honourable member for Fogo won't tell us what is going on.

MR. JANES: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman, Fogo is quite all right, Sir, the district of Fogo is quite all right. As far as Fogo is concerned, we think there are enough districts up in St. John's and don't want any more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think that is a point of order.

MR. BROWNE: The honourable member is trying to be funny. Actually you have made one more, or are supporting it. We say you have not made enough. We think you should make another one. Now, Sir, in 1911 (I regret it should be necessary to go back into history for examples of how this country was represented) the pop-

ulation of this country was 242,000 and the number of Catholics was roughly 81,000 very slightly over one-third.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman's leader does not like that sort of thing. He thinks it is sinister.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think there is anything wrong with talking about the facts of life. I don't see it. He has his own opinion and I have mine in that matter; it is a free country, I suppose, and we can all express our opinions. In any case the population of that time was 242,000 and the Catholics were 81,000, a little over one-third. At that time we had thirty-six members, and the Catholics had thirteen members and not twelve. Ferryland returned two members then and Harbour Main two and Placentia and St. Mary's three, that is seven; St. George's one; St. John's East three; that is eleven. Anyway we had thirteen out of thirty-six. In the election of 1949 and 1951 the Honourable the Premier was not so anxious to create the denominational balance, when he rushed into an election with his "Catch-cry" of "Give me a mandate to bring in those new industries guaranteed as to fifty per cent." The Honourable the Premier does not want to hear it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman is this strictly relevant to this clause; my platform for the last general election?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! I do think the honourable member is going astray now.

MR. BROWNE: I did make reference to the industries. It is hard to resist. Now, Sir, the proposal is that Placentia-St. Mary's will be divided into two. The population there is eleven thousand, roughly 5,500 in each

district. I would not be a bit surprised if it is within the mind of the Premier that he is going to get another seat down there. That is what he has in mind.

MR. CURTIS: Are we discussing St. John's?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The debate has been pretty wide.

MR. BROWNE: The point is made on the government side that it was necessary to put a seat for another Catholic in somewhere else. I can understand the two in Port au Port St. George's. That is in the diocese of Corner Brook.

MR. MURRAY: What diocese is Harbour Main?

MR. BROWNE: I can understand St. George's. But I cannot understand putting in two in Placentia and St. Mary's when we have such a big Catholic population in St. John's.

MR. MURRAY: The Catholic population is at least thirty-six thousand. We suggest three to two.

MR. BROWNE: I suggest it should be four to two. What you are going to do is do the thing that suits you. The Premier called me to order for saying he would do what he liked.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are the majority in this House you know.

MR. BROWNE: I know that, nevertheless, it always happens to fit in with the wishes of the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anything wrong with that?

MR. BROWNE: Why take objection to it when I draw attention to what is going on here — His wishes are being carried out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the Honourable member for Fogo's wishes are being carried out and the Honourable member for Ferryland, does that make him a dictator?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that sub-clauses 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 be removed and the following, i.e. the divisions which are shown in the old House of Assembly Act, Chapter 3 of the Revised Statutes, 15 and 16 be replaced. I am following the precedent set by my honourable friend, the Minister of Provincial Affairs. I have not had time to have it typed out, but I think everyone can follow the amendment. It is simple enough. It is that the districts of St. John's East be as they are at the present time. That there be no changes made in the boundaries. I think that can be followed clearly enough. At another stage we might have an amendment to make to another section of the Act. But that will get over having the city carved up as it is at the present time in a most incongruous fashion and would preserve the traditional boundaries that have existed, I believe, from the time when we first had Responsible Government. I believe right from the beginning St. John's was divided into St. John's East and St. John's West. Up to 1925 the way the law went was St. John's should return six members of whom three should be from the East and three from the West. That is the way it was done, and that is the way I suggest it should be done now. There is nothing here to prevent representation from the denominations should be maintained except it would mean having one member for Placentia and St. Mary's and four Catholic members in St. John's and two Protestant members. Thus the traditional denominational balance would be preserved through-

out the country, twelve-twelve-twelve. I cannot see, Mr. Chairman, why that should be unacceptable to the Premier. It would work out better in the administration of the Act when it goes through and it would be simpler for the carrying out of elections. There would be tremendous confusion if this thing goes through as it is now at the present time. I have seen confusions in elections where the people on one side of the road did not know whether they had to vote on that side. I remember in 1909, I believe it was, when the people in St. John's West were voting in St. John's East, and it was drawn to the attention of certain officials they had it mixed up they had to throw up their hands and say they could do nothing about it. People from the west end were voting in the east and from the east end voting in the west. Here, with five districts so close together, and with the traditional boundaries divided there is certain to be the utmost confusion when it comes to an election. At the last election, in 1953, it was remarkable in St. John's the large number of people who did not vote at all. I am sure that in some of the booths there were not more than 33% of the people went to the polls. If they are faced with the confusion which is sure to result from this arrangement. I think, that percentage is likely to remain the normal percentage of people who go to the polls.

So, Mr. Chairman, I move that these five sections be stricken out and the other two substituted.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, is that amendment in order? Is not that motion purely negative?

MR. HIGGINS: No. If you will allow me, Mr. Chairman, that amendment proposes to change the districts as they are at present by simply saying

we shall change the boundaries of St. John's East and West but shall elect three members rather than two.

MR. BROWNE: Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Provincial Affairs made the same motion a few minutes ago in regard to the district of Harbour Grace.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I should like to support the amendment because I feel that it is very reasonable. I don't think it is necessary to delay the House any longer because if we do we may be here all night. I submit the reasons given by my learned friend from St. John's West are quite sound. It seems to me we may be well justified in having two additional members in St. John's more easily than having them in other sections of the country. Now I am not the least bit under any misapprehension as to what is going to happen. But I do say, Sir, this amendment is worthy of support and I personally am going to vote for it.

MR. HOLLETT: Before you put the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that I believe it would be in the best interest of this country if the government would consider or reconsider the Redistribution Bill insofar as the St. John's area is concerned. Both my learned friends have given various reasons, which I think are reasonable reasons, why some heed should be given to the request which is voiced in this amendment. We have (I have to repeat myself) some eighty thousand people in this area, and to give them six representatives in this House seems to me to be very fair indeed. I fail to see why there would be any loss of face by the government in granting that request. It cuts out, in my opinion this idea of sectarianism, it gives, in my opinion, opportunity for both parties, or how-

ever many parties there are in this country, to send to this district of St. John's West and the district of St. John's East the type of men that they would require to send. We in this House would leave it to the parties to decide on the men they would send to these districts. They would not always, perhaps, have to take into consideration the colour of a man's hair or what not. It worked in the past, which is a very good reason again for adopting this method. It has worked since 1855, when there were six members representing that same area, or practically the same area apart from Bell Island. I wonder if my honourable friend, the Minister of Provincial Affairs, could tell me how many people lived on Bell Island at that time. Very few people lived there at that time, very few people were domiciled there. But there were a lot of people, I would say one-third the number of people we have here now in St. John's area, who had six men, three in the West End and three in the East End. So it went on down through the years, until now Bell Island has a population itself of some ten thousand and is therefore entitled to one representative here. The rest of the area is now eighty thousand. Surely we ought to be able to get six men in this area be they Liberals, Tories, Roman Catholics or Protestant, or what not. Regardless of that, I think six men would be a fair representation for this great body of Newfoundlanders. Another thing which my honourable friends opposite seem to forget, in making the distinction which has been made in St. John's. We have today probably over half the population in St. John's area who have come in from all over Newfoundland. They have come from fishing settlements all over the country and they are Protestants and they are Roman Catholics and this, that and the other

thing. But I maintain the people in the St. John's area represent a fair, I shall say, a cross-section of the country, more so than any other selected part of the country. Because, as I said, they come from Bonavista North and South and Trinity, from St. Barbe and from the West Coast and from all over. If you go up in the west end, as I have to go very often, you will find people from all these districts. And they are representative of the thought in the various districts from which they came.

Consequently as a group composed of people from all over the Island there is absolutely no reason why they should not be given a bigger representation than they will have from five men, or at the rate of one for every sixteen thousand. I put it to the Honourable the Premier and put it to the government, it would be only fair to reconsider this matter and give heed to it and to the amendment which has been moved by my honourable friend. I don't see any point talking any more. They will either heed it Sir, or they won't, one or the other. We put it to them fair and square it would be the just and honourable thing to do. They have the opportunity and ought to be proud of it, the opportunity to give to this country a really and truly good Redistribution Bill. My opinion, Sir, is that, as it is at the present time it is not as good as it ought to be. This amendment is aimed at trying to rectify some of the faults in the present amendment. I give whole-hearted support, Sir, to this amendment, and I would ask the government to show us some good reason why they would not reconsider it.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I know there is a rule against being tedious, and I know I must risk being so. But there seems to be absolutely

no point at all in this debate, if one gentleman gets up and expresses certain principles and is followed by an honourable gentleman, sitting on the opposite side, who gets up and blandly goes on as though such a principle were not expressed at all, it seems to me to be pretty useless. My honourable friend who just sat down, in spite of the fact that over and over again it has been stated here, the principle of rural representation against urban representation, this principle has been in existence, there is no question at all that such principle exists — but still my honourable friend, in spite of all that, in spite of it being mentioned dozens of times, gets up and makes an argument blandly ignoring it in this amendment. I repeat again, Sir, St. John's is a Protestant city. There are more Protestants living in St. John's than Catholics. Still my learned friend gets up and suggests an amendment stressing that the membership of St. John's should be six, of whom four should be Catholics. Now that is flying completely in the face of facts. I don't see — I think we are, as Catholics, extending a long way when we ask our Protestant friends here in St. John's to upset the denominational balance and expect them to elect three Catholics. We are asking them for a compromise and tolerance, I know we will get it, because they know that in the overall figure it is right. But to go from three and say put in four, I do not think it is either just nor right. For that reason I would like —

MR. BROWNE: I would like to answer that point made by the Honourable Minister. He knows the history of this country. St. John's always had a representation of not less than four and sometimes five and sometimes six Catholics. So that there is nothing in the argument he brought out here at all. I never hear any of us say,

although he may have heard it, but I never heard any one complain of lack of representation in the House from the Protestant people in the city of St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable member would not be the first to hear of any discontent on the part of the Protestant people over the character of representation in the House. He would not be the first. He would be amongst the last.

MR. BROWNE: Have you heard?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have heard, yes.

Motion on the amendment put and lost.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment to make. We have disposed of this one that there should be two districts of three men each. I propose now that we should have four districts, the district of St. John's West extern, St. John's East extern, and two city districts of two men each, St. John's city east and St. John's city west, as we had in 1925. Now bearing in mind the importance of rural representation, I think the Minister of Provincial Affairs will be prepared to acknowledge the importance of a district which has twelve thousand people living within its borders, as St. John's West, excluding Blackhead, Waterford Valley, Goulds, Mount Pearl, Mundy Pond, Petty Harbour, St. Phillips, 12,432. Why could we not have that as a district, apart from the city of St. John's. They all live outside the city of St. John's, and live in the traditional area, at least, established in 1925, and it has always been a part of St. John's West. Instead of going for the artificial creation we have here. Then St. John's East, which will take in all the settlements between Quidi Vidi and Bauline,

over nine thousand people who are living in that St. John's East area. That, between the two would give you over twenty thousand people. Then the city has fifty two thousand, or is supposed to have that amount. Now it seems to me, Sir, if the government was anxious for one-man districts, there is a local division for them to follow as far as St. John's West extern is concerned, because there is that strip of shore going down from Cape St. Francis to Quidi Vidi and into Bauffine, where the people have a great deal in common, on account of living along the same road, and are mostly fishermen or fishermen's families, and many of whom now work at the United States Air Force Base.

On the other hand the district of St. John's West extern takes in Blackhead Road, the Goukds, Kilbride, Petty Harbour and Topsail Road and Thorburn Road. That is another district that has logic behind it. Then we come to the city. To divide a city in half is a very simple method of dividing up a city. Divide it so there would be twenty five thousand in each, that is in equal sections to return two members each, as in the election of 1928. St. John's city west, St. John's West extern, returned Mr. Frank Bennett and the East returned Mr. Alderdice and Mr. Burn, and Mr. Jack Tobin was elected for the district of St. John's East extern. I had the misfortune of running in St. John's West at that particular time, and got trimmed by Mr. Fitzgibbon. But these are four districts which I suggest are very much preferable to the five districts which have been carved out of that great area. My honourable friend, the Premier, does not belong to St. John's. I believe he was born in another district outside of St. John's. He was born in Gambo, I understand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In Bonavista Bay.

MR. BROWNE: Although he lived here most of his life, I do not think he has the same regard for St. John's as we who were born and brought up here have.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a fair statement.

MR. BROWNE: I think by his outspoken statements he has show a lack of appreciation of the people who live here, and the election returns have not shown that the people of St. John's follow his way of thinking. However, personal consideration aside, I think he should recognize that these divisions are suitable, logical divisions to be made, and would be preferable to the ones we have before us at the present time. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the division of St. John's, as shown in the Redistribution Bill be deleted, and the division in the Distribution Act of 1925, Sections 28, 29, 30 and 31 be followed.

Now, I must refer to one other thing: The Minister of Provincial Affairs said, but I can hardly see how he can be in favour of putting two members in Placentia-St. Mary's, with such a small population. The division as shown here is, in St. Mary's there are five thousand nine hundred and twelve and in Placentia East, 5,400. Of these in Placentia East the Catholic population is 4,316, i.e. about 80% and they are about 90% in the district of St. Mary's. I grant you that geographically your line could easily be drawn at any place. It has been changed, Sir, since last year, for the purpose of giving you two men there. But would it not be much more reasonable in a big metropolitan area like St. John's to have a larger representation, which, even then, would

give them a less per capita representation in the House of Assembly, than to have a small district like Placentia and St. Mary's split up into two very small districts?

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, what the honourable member asks for is this: I cite the facts: There are fifty-two thousand people in the city of St. John's. He wants to have four members represent them in this House, or one member for every thirteen thousand people. He wants the same representation for St. John's as it is for instance for Green Bay. The honourable member for St. John's West says that is right. We say that is wrong, we say it is wrong, and the world bears us out. There are innumerable instances that show more rural representation than urban. I am sick of repeating it. But the honourable gentleman just plainly ignores it. He wants the same representation for St. John's as for Green Bay.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is not getting it.

MR. BROWNE: Green Bay has not ten thousand population.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Bonavista North has.

MR. HOLLETT: My honourable friend on my right does not want any such nonsense. To get up and blare about things for which there is no background whatsoever, except to cite a few places where they do have greater representation. That is true they have a greater number to a representative in urban area — but be reasonable about the thing, is it absolutely essential? They have five thousand people in St. Mary's, and then the government objects because we ask for thirteen thousand to elect one member.

There is nothing wrong with that.

Does not that bear out the principle the honourable member is talking about? In St. Mary's, if you want to call it a rural area, it takes five thousand people to elect one man, we are asking that thirteen thousand people here elect one man. Is there anything wrong with giving St. John's one man for thirteen thousand people? That is all we are asking for, and for St. John's West, one man for fourteen thousand. Is there anything wrong with that? That is all the amendment that has been introduced by my learned friend, has asked for. You the Minister of Provincial Affairs, mind you, gets up and ridicules the idea, without any reference whatsoever to what they have already done here. Certainly, Sir, we do think that St. John's ought to have more representation than it has. You must remember that St. John's has eighty thousand people, and is growing fast. As a matter of fact the people and the Government are not able to build homes fast enough to house the people coming in here day after day from all over the Province and a good many who are coming from far away places not in the Province at all. But aside from that, Sir, the population of this area is growing so fast that certainly, the Redistribution Bill ought to take care of some of the inadequacies, if you like, of the representation for a city of this size. St. John's itself is the ancient capital. It is the place where the people had first landed, I presume, and first built their houses. It has always been the centre, it has always been the capital of this country, and, if you like, the cultural centre. I don't belong to St. John's. I was born in Burin. But I was always taught to believe St. John's was and is and always will be, the cultural centre of this part of the island at any rate. There has been certain revolutions on the West Coast, and I hope they will some day

show us something here in St. John's, and I believe they can, but I do think this ancient capital should have proper representation. It has not got it now from the point of view of numbers and certainly they will not have it if you give them one more member. We are asking for six men in St. John's altogether, including the rural parts as well as St. John's city. It is not at all unreasonable and if the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs wants to get up and say he is sick of it again, we are perhaps, I could inform him, sick of the matter. I hope he does not get too sick because we have great admiration for him. But we have no admiration whatsoever for this particular Bill which he has brought in. I don't suppose there is any need for us to appeal to the government at all. They apparently have made their decision, and apparently they will not take a suggestion from the other side of the House, and I doubt very much if they would take a suggestion from members on their own side of the House. We have asked for more adequate representation for Corner Brook and Grand Falls, but these again we have not been listened to, and I do not suppose it is the intention of the government to listen. Anyway we want to go on record as fighting for this thing. I am quite sure the people of this country will one day see we were right. There is no question about it, we are right. It is all very well to, as I pointed out, I think, at another time, we are setting a precedent in what we are doing, Mr. Chairman, and if the government who happens to have a majority and a huge majority at that, can any time, at will, divide up districts into two and three and four, if they want to, and then they can always remain in power. I think it is a wonderful idea if they keep it up and that is what I think they intend to do. In

other words reduce representation in areas where there is opposition and increase it in areas where there is little opposition — that is the principle behind this Bill. That is the principle that must have been in the minds of the people who, if you like, gave birth to this Bill. I say it is wrong, it is absolutely wrong. I think that this country will one day be sorry that this Bill was passed. I am all in favour of the amendment made by my honourable and learned friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I take it the amendment is that the boundaries be as in 1925?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr Chairman.

Motion on the amendment put and lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put the motion — On motion clause carried.

Ferryland — read:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs could explain to us why he took a thousand of his population here — here the figures given in the annual report of the Department of Health gives a population of seven hundred, but I think the figures supplied us were six hundred — by taking off the population of Lower Goulds he has apparently gotten rid of a thousand people. Why get rid of a thousand people? Did they not mean as much to him as the people living in the rest of the district?

MR. MURRAY: It is an extremely unfortunate expression, to say, I got rid of them.

MR. BROWNE: As the Minister in charge of the Bill, I would like to know how he would express it. Those had been put into some other district.

I presume, in St. John's South. I wonder why he was so generous. Now the Minister of Provincial Affairs can very well argue in favour of lower populations having equal representation to higher populations in cities, but I can not quite see the force of it in practice. How it is any more difficult to represent them than to represent seventeen thousand in the city constituencies. The district is only now about eighty five miles long, I believe.

MR. MURRAY: 120 miles.

MR. BROWNE: It is 120 miles from here to St. Shotts, but take off about fifteen miles; it is then a hundred miles from the boundary to St. Shotts. But that is not a very lengthy district, and the honourable member is easily able to represent such a small area as that. Why has he taken the people from Doyle's Bridge (which was always, too, the traditional boundary) to Big Pond and left them out of the district?

MR. MURRAY: I don't know what reason there is for assuming I did so, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: Somebody did. You are in charge of the Bill.

MR. MURRAY: As a matter of fact, it was with very great regret I saw these people leave my district and going into another district. These people in the Goulds have been great supporters of mine in two elections. In the last election, as my honourable friend knows, they voted strongly Liberal. It was with great regret I saw so many friends and supporters go from my district into another. But the exigency of circumstances demanded — I guess that is the best explanation I can give. We wanted to make sure the denominational balance of St. John's South would be right. We think these people are practically all suburban

people and have very little in common with other people of the district, fishing people, from Mobile on. As the honourable gentleman knows, they are practically all fishing, and it makes it much more homogeneous if the district begins at Bay Bulls. I had nothing whatsoever to fear from those people in a political way. I made one promise, if elected: To have the road paved through the district. That is being done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Surely now the member is not going to give us a dissertation?

MR. MURRAY: I am sorry I departed there — There were other considerations.

MR. BROWNE: It is nice to know the Honourable Minister is so influential as to get the road paved nearly in to Big Pond. I hope his influence has not waned and he will continue to get it done as far as, at Wireless Bay.

MR. MURRAY: We are in complete accord on that.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I suggest the hour is late, and that poor woman, the stenographer, has been on all afternoon. I suggest to you we show humanity towards a fellow being and call this thing off for tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot call it off until there is a motion, however, much humanity I may have.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, can I suggest to you to pass the idea along to the Leader of the House. I move at any rate that this Committee rise.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You cannot do that.

MR. HOLLETT: I have done it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not take. Let us finish this one section, and then let us go home.

On motion section passed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion the Committee rose and reported progress. On motion report received. On motion Committee ordered to sit again tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move, Mr. Speaker, the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

WEDNESDAY, April 13th., 1955

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the Harbour Breton Industrial Development Committee. Harbour Breton is one of the oldest communities in Newfoundland. Some time ago, I believe it was last year, the people of Harbour Breton had a meeting and elected a number of prominent citizens as an industrial development committee. This petition is signed by the Secretary of that committee. The aim of this committee is to bring about the future development of Harbour Breton and the areas surrounding it. Last year, Sir, a petition was presented from Harbour Breton, signed by nearly all the citizens of that town, asking that a road be constructed linking Har-

bour Breton with Bay D'Espoir. This road has not been built to date. I would like to say, Sir, that this road would be of great benefit to the people of Newfoundland. The area which it would link up contains two of the greater salmon rivers, Conne River and Little River. It is also a very fine moose hunting area. The petition asks that this road be built this year, if at all possible, or if not, as soon as it can be done. And the petitioners humbly pray that the construction of this road be brought about in the near future, and that other developments beneficial to this area be instituted.

I have much pleasure, Sir, in presenting this petition and supporting it to the utmost of my ability.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

HON. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from one hundred and fifty-four voters of the community of Grates Cove in the district of Carbonear-Bay de Verde. This petition draws attention to the fact that there is considerable need for a road between Grates Cove and Old Perlican by way of Daniels Cove to be widened, so that during the snow season the road may be kept open. At the present time the road goes over the former railroad bed and whilst in the summer that road is quite passable, nevertheless it is not wide enough for cars to travel in winter time. The feeling of the people there quite generally is that the plow should operate in that area where there are many dwellers. They ask that favourable consideration be given by the department concerned to the possibility of widening the road, known as the "old road" by way of Daniels Cove. I know the road in question very well, and I

would ask that the petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department of government concerned.

On motion petition tabled for reference to the department concerned.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the followings persons: William D. McCarter, Robert F. Horwood, William J. Ryan, Thomas Lench, H. Graham Rennie, Michael J. Downey, Frederick Colbourne, John E. Hoskins, George W. Cummings, Lloyd W. Hopkins, who are engaged in the carrying on of architects in the Province of Newfoundland. This petition shows, Sir, that the petitioners have carried on the profession of architects in the Province of Newfoundland and are desirous of forming themselves into an association which should be known as the Newfoundland Association of Architects. The purposes of the application are the improvement of the profession, to promote and increase the knowledge, skill and proficiency of its members in all things relating to the profession of architecture, and to advance and maintain a high standard in the practice of architecture in the Province of Newfoundland. The association is a non-profit association of a purely professional kind and devoted solely to professional improvement. The petitioners respectfully request that a Bill may be introduced and referred to a Select Committee, for enactment during this present session, I understand Sir, from the Clerk that all requirements of the Act pertaining to such Bills have been met, that the fees which are required to be paid have been paid and the copies of the Bill are in the Clerk's office.

I have much pleasure, Sir, in introducing this petition, and ask that

the Bill which is mentioned in the petition be referred to a Select Committee on miscellaneous Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: The Clerk of the House certifies that the fees have been received. The petition is therefore referred to a Committee on Standing Orders to see if the rules of the House have been compiled with. According to Standing Order 94 the Committee may report tomorrow.

Presenting Reports of Standing Select Committees

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table of the House copies of the memorandum of agreement respecting disabled persons allowances coming into effect, and an agreement made between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland respecting the payment of disability allowances to persons qualifying under the Statutes of Newfoundland. This agreement came into effect on the 1st day of April 1955. The agreement was signed and was authorized by Order in Council of the Government of Canada, March 26, 1955.

On motion report tabled.

Giving Notice of Motion

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act."

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Trustee Act."

Giving Notice of Questions

None.

Answers to Questions

Question No. 38 — In course of preparation.

MR. SPEAKER: I would refer the honourable member and the Minister concerned to the very last question asked: ". . . Has the honourable member been employed as auditor or in any other capacity?" I am not ruling the question out of order, but it seems to me it is hardly proper to ask. It would be left to the discretion of the Minister, of course. I just draw attention to the fact to protect private individuals.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in connection with that part of the question, I am able to give the answer now. The honourable member for Green Bay was not — His appointment as director of any of these companies was not authorized by the government. Then as to the second part of the question, there was no Minute of Council authorizing his appointment. Then, as to the third part, he has not made any report to the Government on his observations. So that we cannot table

a copy, because there is no copy to table.

Has he been employed as auditor in any other capacity? I don't know. I have not the faintest notion. There are rumours that he is an auditor. I believe that is the way he earns his living. It is none of the business of this House any more than it is the business of the House to know what the honourable member for St. John's West does to earn his living.

MR. BROWNE: The Premier, Your Honour, is debating the matter. I could answer him. But I do not know if it is in order to debate it at the present time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am not in order to debate it, but I am in order to answer it, and I am answering.

Question No. 39 and question No. 40 in course of preparation:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question No. 25 on the Order Paper of March 31, directed to me by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West.

QUESTION NO. 25 (Mr. Browne)

TRAVELLING EXPENSES FOR DIRECTOR GENERAL OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT APRIL 1953

April 13/53 St. John's to Harbour Grace and Carbonear re pictures for C.I.P. Fair	\$ 3.10
April 16/53 St. John's to Harbour Grace with Dr. E. Koch	6.20
July 19-21/53 Trip to Montreal	237.07
July 24/53 St. John's to Gander and return	57.10
June 14/53 St. John's to Carbonear with distillers	6.95
June 19/53 St. John's to Carbonear re Tannery	2.83
June 25/53 St. John's to Harbour Grace re Shoe Plant site	2.32
June 23/53 St. John's to Carbonear re Photo Story on Industrial Development	5.67
August 7/53 St. John's to Harbour Grace re Shoe Plant	8.40
August 8/53 St. John's to Carbonear re Shoe Plant	8.75
August 9/53 St. John's to Harbour Grace Shoe Plant	4.64
August 11/53 St. John to Carbonear with Simpson's Buyers	5.67

August 12/53 St. John's to Brigus with German Consul General	8.50
September 12-20-23-27-28-30/53 Trips to Brigus with Eckhardt re the proposed Knitting Mill	31.44
October 3/53 St. John's to Carbonear re Tannery	2.83
October 4/53 St. John's to Carbonear re Tannery	4.64
October 12/53 St. John's to Harbour Grace re Shoe Plant	4.64
February 21—March 11/54 Trip to Toronto, Ottawa, New York and Maritime Centres re Commission of Revision of Terms Survey	823.12
May 14—June 9/53 Attending Trade Fair	809.00
January 3-8/54 Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa re Trade Fair	320.40
April 1-3/54 Visit to Montreal, Toronto and New York attending Gypsum and Hardwoods Meetings	294.80
April 28-30/54 Visit to Gander, Montreal and New York for meetings with Goldenberg re Birch Plant	223.66
July 17/54 Visit to Carboncar with Federal M.P.	2.31
July 14/54 Visit to Harbour Grace with British High Commissionier	12.36
June 16/54 Visit to Harbour Grace re plant purchase	4.64
July 24/54 Visiting plants at Holyrood, Harbour Grace and Carbonear etc. re supplying goods to the Government	11.33
August 8-9/54 Trip to Portland for discussions with Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	18.60
August 2/54 Meals at Argentia when returning from Seven Islands	6.20
August 1/54 Visit to Brigus with Premier, Heysen and Messrs Irvines	17.00
August 29/54 Trip to Brigus	6.95
September 10/54 Trip to Brigus with Grant	4.64
November 9/54 Visit to Leather Tannery	2.13
November 17/54 Visit to Harbour Grace and Carbonear re sales by new industries to Government	6.20
September 27-29/54 Visit to Halifax to attend Atlantic Provinces Council Conference	146.45
September 12-17/54 Trip to Saskatoon and return via Montreal to attend Trade and Industries Annual Meeting	460.20
August 21-27/54 Visiting Halifax, Boston and New York for meetings re Plywood	411.87
December 3/54 Trip to Harbour Grace with Dean Shaw and Mr. T. Allsop	4.65
December 8-9/54 St. John's to Clarenville with S. Grant re negotiations with Flinkote Co.	70.25
October 4-27/54 Visiting England, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Austria and Switzerland	1,745.01
January 1-10/55 Switzerland, Germany and England	739.75
February 13-19/55 Visiting Montreal, Ottawa and New York re Gypsum	479.12
May 13-14/54 Trip to Toronto re C.I.T. Fair	225.10
January 30—February 4/55 Trip to Toronto re C.I.T. Fair and visit enroute Montreal and Ottawa (defense production)	336.75
March 6-9/55 Visiting Montreal, Hamilton and Toronto re C.I.T. Fair and Knitting Mills	295.75
Total 1953/55	\$5,555.72

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I have been instructed to get the detailed answer to Question No. 3, of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Part of this question has already been answered by the Premier. I think I can give most of the remaining answers — Fire Insurance is placed to the extent of \$1,852,000. It is carried by Steers, and Steers have in turn passed it over to about fifty or sixty other agents, the names of which I do not know nor the amount of insurance carried by any firm. I do not know. The annual premium is about \$17,096. Of the \$1,852,000, \$1,300,000 is on the plant and machinery and the balance is on stock in trade, both in the yard and in the building. Some time ago it became apparent to the Government that Newfoundland Hardwoods were unable to carry on, and the Government consequently entered into negotiations with three Montreal gentlemen who operated a firm in Montreal called General Woods and Veneers Limited, and who also operated a plant in Paris. These gentlemen are veneer manufacturers. They undertook to take over the shares in Newfoundland Hardwoods, which shares had been hypothecated to the Government and to the bank in consideration of loans made by the Government for financing the business. The Government, as you know, Mr. Speaker, did not undertake to assume any responsibility for the liabilities of this company, but we felt that we should, since some people have given the firm credit, and since we had guaranteed the bank account. So the Government undertook to assume the liabilities of the firm and to take over the shares. The shares were passed over by the Government for one dollar to these three gentlemen who have now undertaken Newfoundland Hardwoods and they have undertaken to

operate the company under the agreement, the new agreement, which has not yet been signed but agreed to. All former agreements of the company are cancelled. Then the Government undertook to convey the birch plant to the company in consideration of the payment of all moneys advanced and paid by the Government with respect to Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited both on capital account and on operating expenses. Therefore the consideration for the purpose will be the amount named in part of the answer to Question 1, about \$3,600,000. That amount is to be secured by a mortgage on everything that is conveyed to the company, and they undertake to pay the Government that amount of earnings. The Government has undertaken to supply any additional machinery that may be necessary, the costs, however, are not to exceed sixty thousand dollars. The Government also undertook to execute a bank guarantee in the sum of three hundred thousand dollars to the new company, or to the company newly organized. So that the net position is that we will convey the property to the company. The company will give us mortgage in full of the entire amount of the Government expenditure to date in the birch factory, but the amount is to be paid out of profits. Normally the amount to be paid by the company will be two hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year, but that is a nominal amount only if the company makes more than half a million dollars a year. Any additional amounts, up to fifty per cent of the earnings, will be paid to the Government. If, on the other hand, they make less than two hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year, or if two hundred and fifty thousand dollars is less than half, they will pay the Government fifty per cent of all earnings. In other

words it is actually an operating agreement whereby the company will operate on behalf of the Government on a division of profits, fifty per cent to the company and fifty per cent to the Government. The fifty per cent to the Government will be on account of the purchase price.

A physical inventory has been made of all raw materials and stock in trade and the proceeds thereof, if and when liquidated, may be used as working capital. The proceeds from all these items will be repaid to the Government when the company is in a position to make payment.

The company undertakes to conduct operations with all reasonable skill and energy. No additional salary fees nor other remuneration will be paid in any year unless the company earns profits in that year. The company will keep the entire property insured against any risk or loss, to be payable to the Government. In the event of loss or damage the company is to restore the plant to its previous state. The Government undertakes not to charge any stumpage and also to give the company any reasonable assistance in producing timber from timber limits held privately, if the timber is necessary for the success of the company's operations. The Government also undertakes to consider any reasonable request for other assistance in furtherance of the company's operations but is not obliged to give any such assistance.

The annual balance sheets and profit and loss account will be available to the Auditor General for inspection and audit. The company shall not export any raw materials nor unmanufactured timber without the previous consent of the Government. A Government director will be appointed.

He will receive copies of all minutes of all meetings of both the shareholders and the directors. He will be in liaison to the Government and will have personal responsibility for any acts of the said director. The Government may terminate the agreement and the plant will revert to the Government and any amount paid to the company will be forfeited and any amount still unpaid will be payable to the Government. If any winding up proceedings take place, if the company ceases bonafidely to operate the plant, if the executive dies, if stress is levied on the assets of the company and remains unpaid for thirty days; if the company parts with any part of the plant without the written consent of the Director of Economic Development, if it has not paid any instalments, and if the company does not show a profit on such operations before December 31, 1957, if the company is not in the black — I may say, as far as I as director, the company is proceeding very satisfactorily. I think I can already say it is operating in the black, and I am hoping that the company will meet with great success.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, on that question may I ask, in view of the amount of money the Government has in this birch plant, would the Honourable Minister be prepared to table copies of that agreement which is to be signed?

MR. CURTIS: I don't think I should before it is signed, Mr. Speaker. It is still being negotiated. I am just referring to the draft.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? When is it expected to be signed?

MR. CURTIS: Any day now, Mr. Speaker. As honourable members

know, we have been busy lately and it may have to wait until the session is over.

MR. BROWNE: There is one thing I should like to ask in reference to what has been said. How are the profits to be arrived at? Is it to be on the same principle as the previous agreement by a deduction of twenty per cent for depreciation?

MR. CURTIS: No. That is not the basis, Mr. Speaker, that the Government contemplates. Actually the profits were to be determined, according to our draft, by deducting from any gross profit (1) ordinary operating expenses (2) insurance and (3) maintenance and reasonable travelling expenses approved by the Government director. These were to be deducted.

MR. BROWNE: No depreciation?

MR. CURTIS: No depreciation.

MR. BROWNE: Is the Attorney General the Government director?

MR. CURTIS: No — I am hoping to be eventually.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 37 on the Order Paper of April 12th.

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Public Works in reply to Question No. 37 (Mr. Browne) — Order Paper of Tuesday, April 12th., 1955.

Were tenders called for the work of repairing the House of Assembly? If so, give the names of the parties tendering, the amounts of each tender, and how much has been spent to date on the said repairs. Give details of expenditure. Who is the party performing the work?

Tenders were received on the supply of cut stone from the following firms:

Mississquoi Stone and Marble Co., Ltd.

Harold Quinlan Cut Stone Ltd.

Ritchie Cut Stone Ltd.

Two other firms invited to tender did not do so.

The tender from Mississquoi Stone and Marble Co., Ltd., was accepted.

Owing to the impossibility of foretelling by inspection of the exterior wall the amount of work which would be necessary to effect repairs it would not have been possible to prepare a specification on which a reasonable tender could be prepared. Mr. Ralph Butler, a competent local contractor, was engaged to undertake the repairs.

Expenditures to date are as follows:

Cut Stone (including delivery to site)	\$ 37,000
Equipment	10,000
Supervision	8,300
Masonry Work	2,300
Scaffolding and General Labour	10,700
Total	68,300

I am reminded that some honourable members might be interested in knowing some of the reasons for the delay of the work on this building. I can only point to the fact that very shortly after work began last year, a general strike took place in the city of the masons and some of the men engaged under Mr. Butler were in that category, and their services were withdrawn. Unfortunately that delayed the work very considerably.

About the time they were able to get back again bad weather set in and very little progress was made. Nevertheless sufficient progress was made to prove to us that repairs to the building are well worthwhile. The main walls of this building, although built, as the House is well aware, somewhat over a hundred years now, are still in very fair condition. It so happens that some of the plaster within the thirty foot space of the great walls of this building has deteriorated somewhat. That is not surprising when we realize that in the days when this building was erected the modern method of cement plaster were not so advanced as they are today, and as presumably only lime was used in making the mortar, unfortunately the period of life of that lime plaster seems to have outlived its usefulness and a very considerable amount of the mortar with which the stones are laid has deteriorated. Hence the work will be slow and possibly somewhat expensive. But it is felt that when completed, as honourable members will have observed insofar as what has been done already, it will present a very fine appearance. We have every reason to believe that when a new facing has been placed on the four walls of this building we will have reason to be proud of the fact that the building will be retained for posterity.

First Readings :

A Bill, "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and Mr. M. Boylen." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Public Works Act." On motion

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

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Establish the City of Corner Brook and for Other Purposes in Connection Therewith." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Confirm to Bowater's Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Mills, Limited, Certain rights and Powers." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Committee of the Whole :

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act."

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would refer honourable members to page 7 of the Bill, the District of St. Mary's.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister in charge of this Bill why the settlement of Point Lance has been put in with St. Mary's instead of with the District of Placentia East to which it naturally belongs? The road from Placentia goes out as far as Branch. As I pointed out, Point Lance and Branch are both in the Parish of St. Brides. There are about five hundred people living in these two settlements of Branch and Point Lance and it seems to me they should be put in with Placentia East. It would just revise the figures and make St. Mary's 5,412 and Placentia East 4,402. So I see no reason at all to put these two places in the District of St. Mary's. Now we have made a lot of suggestions here and none have been accepted. But I cannot see how anyone on the other side

could get up and say it is unreasonable that Point Lance and Branch should be put in the District of Placentia East where they always belong and where they are located.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we did draw attention to the discrepancies relative to the populations in this particular instance of St. Mary's 5,912 people who have a representation of one man in this House, whereas it is seventeen thousand here in the City of St. John's. Practically three times the number of people will have only the same representation in this House as the five thousand nine hundred people in St. Mary's. Now that is not the only place where the discrepancy occurs. It occurs all through the Act, and I cannot let this pass without drawing the attention of the Government to it. I think it is highly unfair and contrary to all distributions and Redistribution Bills ever contemplated by any government anywhere in the western world. There was no attempt made whatever in regard to ordinary, decent justice in the sub-division of the people of this country.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, is this in order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is voicing his opinion.

MR. HOLLETT: I still say this sub-division with St. Mary's District with 5,912 people with one man representing it in this House is absolutely ridiculous. Here we have actually three thousand souls in Grand Falls and Gander with two men and here we have 5,900 with one man. You may call it redistribution if you like, but I want it to sink home into the minds of the people of this country that no honest, at least no proper effort, has been made in this par-

ticular district, as in any of the others, to give fair representation here in this House which is supposed to make the laws and which does make the laws.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get some explanation from the Minister in charge of the Bill with regard to the point I made — Why is it that Branch and Point Lance are separated from the Cape Shore and Placentia East where they always belong and form a natural part. Under this now the Parish of St. Brides has to spilt up. That parish extends in to Placentia Parish. There does not seem to be any logical reason for taking Branch and Point Lance and putting them in St. Mary's. They are not with the other settlement on the west coast of St. Mary's Bay at all and in order to get there it is necessary to go by boat or drive around about eighty miles. Whereas the road from Placentia goes out to Branch as part of the Cape Shore Road. Now, Mr. Chairman, I feel the Minister of Provincial Affairs should be willing to remedy that and have Branch and Point Lance put back with Placentia East. Last year, of course, when the Bill was in here, the Premier had cut the whole parish out and the boundary line was drawn north to Point Verde. It has now been extended from Point Verde to St. Brides. It seems to me it should go one step further and take in these two settlements of Point Lance and Branch.

MR. HOLLETT: With regard to St. Mary's again, Mr. Chairman, I have been told the idea is to preserve the denominational balance. I point out, as I have already pointed out, in the industrial area in the centre of this country where there are approximately thirty thousand people there

are approximately seven thousand Roman Catholic people without any opportunity at all —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. Are we going to have all over again now the argument about Grand Falls. Are we going to debate every district? Is it proper to debate every district?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, surely I can refer to other districts for reference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes — refer, yes.

MR. HOLLETT: That is all. The reference I wish to make, Mr. Chairman is that there are in that industrial area seven thousand people who are Roman Catholics, and it was suggested that three members should be allocated there. That would give the people opportunity — Here we have 5,000 people with one man in this House. I want to draw that to the attention of this House.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister in charge able to answer my question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am the Minister in charge. You are looking in the wrong direction.

MR. BROWNE: Well, the Premier is always so willing and courteous. Would he be willing to answer why Brauch and Point Lance have been put into St. Mary's instead of Placentia East?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has already been answered, and I do not propose to repeat it. I am sorry if the honourable gentleman was not listening. I did give it, and I do not intend to give it again.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to say that the Honourable the Premier

has not given any answer, as far as I am aware, and if he has I do not know anything about it, and I do not know why. I thought he would give the answer. I made a mistake when I said he was courteous. I don't think he is very courteous when he won't answer that question. I asked the question — why take them out of their natural setting in Placentia East and put them in the District of St. Mary's. Of course we don't get any answers to questions here. We get what the Minister feels like giving us. This is a reasonable question but it is not answered.

Clause carried (Mr. Browne voted nay).

Clause 24 — Placentia East:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask why there have been so many changes since last year. At that time the boundary was placed at Point Verde, one miles outside Point Verde. Now the whole Cape Shore is taken in with the exception of two settlements to which I referred before. Why was that change made? Would the Minister in charge be good enough to explain that to us. I might say also, whilst on my feet this time, there seems to be a good deal of confusion about the boundary between Placentia East and Placentia West — Come-By-Chance is referred to there — I was down there about two years ago, and I found that three returning officers had accepted their ballot boxes there, and the lady who was to be the deputy returning officer advised me that she did not know what to do. All the returning officers of the three districts thought that Come-By-Chance was in their district. I remember going down and speaking to a gentleman who was just closing up his house, as he was going away, and told

him who I was. He was a supporter of the Liberal Party, but belonged to Placentia West, whereas he was obviously on the east side of Come-By-Chance River and belonged to the District of Placentia East. But he did not know the difference. A lot of people were under that impression. I would suggest that whoever has the administration of elections would take care around the locality. It is a very narrow strip of land between Trinity Bay and Placentia Bay, and the boundary around that area ought to be clarified. The people around there have been confused in each election since 1949.

Now to return to my question — I wonder is there any reason why the change was made since last year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I don't feel any obligation whatsoever to discuss a Bill introduced into the House last year and not proceeded with. I think we have enough to do to debate the Bill as it now appears before us. Now with regard to the point my honourable and learned friend made about confusion existing amongst some people as to the district in which the settlement ought to come or came; I will certainly draw it to the attention of the Chief Electoral Officer and he probably will take necessary steps to acquaint all the persons concerned as to the name of the district in which they happen to be.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on this particular district, Placentia West, which formerly was Placentia and St. Mary's and where there is a total of eleven thousand people, we are bound to ask, when we come to the next district, Placentia West, how did the Government arrive at the decision to split Placentia East and St.

Mary's into two making it five or six thousand apiece and do nothing whatsoever about Placentia West, which is the next one, and which has approximately the same population and I think generally has the same denominational balance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not so.

MR. HOLLETT: I am wondering if the Honourable the Premier would tell us why he chose Placentia and St. Mary's to divide rather than the other one?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We will deal with the other one when we come to it.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder then if the Honourable the Premier would tell us why he divided this one and gave a little over five thousand people to each district?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have already done it about twenty-eight times. I will now do it the twenty-ninth — to get twenty Roman Catholic seats out of thirty-six. That is why.

Clause carried.

Clause 25 — Placentia West read:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't mind saying we did give careful consideration to this district and to the district that lies immediately beside it, in the hope that we could find an additional Roman Catholic seat there. And our opinion is that we could not. Placentia West is about 45% Protestant and the remainder would be Roman Catholics but Burin District is very largely Protestant but with a very large minority of Roman Catholics. If you could shuffle them about as you would checkers on a checker board you could

create another Roman Catholic seat. But you do not shuffle people about. It is not done.

MR. HOLLETT: What about St. John's?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't shuffle anybody about. We have not shuffled a single soul. If anybody wants to move from north, south, east or west he is free to do so. We do not move them. We take them as we find them and draw the lines accordingly. That is what we did in Placentia West. It is an area in which undoubtedly a clear majority of the people are of the Roman Catholic faith. Therefore following the denominational principle, we draw a line around it to say that is a constituency in which the majority of the people are Roman Catholics and they can, if they wish elect a Roman Catholic candidate. It is a district to which undoubtedly every party sending a candidate will send a Roman Catholic candidate. But why go on with that — the honourable gentleman knows just as well as I do — we are just wasting the House's time, as he perhaps hopes I will do, but I won't do it.

MR. HOLLETT: I hope the Honourable the Premier won't have any thought in mind of wasting the time of the House. But he has now told us why Newfoundland has been divided up as it is. He said: we have taken them as we found them and drawn the line accordingly. Now that is the answer. There is no doubt about it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is the honourable gentleman trying to do? Is he trying to start trouble? If he starts it we will end it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: I think I have the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. There will be no trouble whilst I am in the Chair. Order. Placentia West is under discussion now.

MR. HOLLETT: Placentia West is under discussion, Sir, but when I get an expression coming at me to show I am doing something which is not in accordance with "Hoyle" so to speak, I think I should be entitled —

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair only hears those who rise in their seats and address the Chair. It does not hear anyone else. Now I would like the debate to continue.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, as far as Placentia West is concerned, I have only to point out we have nine thousand people to send in one representative. I am only asking this House to think of the other districts and the numbers in them and how much representation they will have here. I have nothing against Placentia West, whether there is one man or two men or what not. I am talking about the general plan by which these districts are divided, with one representative here for nine thousand and others don't get the same representation.

Clause 25 carried.

Clause 26 — Burin, read and carried:

Clause 27 — Fortune Bay and Hermitage:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on that one too, I cannot but draw attention to the number, 12,400, Fortune Bay and Hermitage — Hardworking people, good seamen, good fishermen, in hard times now and have been for some time in that area. I have only to remind the House of a certain district with 3,200 people. There are four times the number of people here

in Fortune and Hermitage. That I believe was a district which came into being away back in 1855.

MR. BROWNE: There is another point, Mr. Chairman, that is the extent of that district. I have not the measurements for it here. But I am sure it must be a pretty hard district to get around. It must be as hard to get around that district as it is to get around the new District of Labrador South. I imagine it is very much more extensive and more difficult from that point of view.

Clause 27 carried.

Clauses 28 through 32 read and carried.

Clause 33 read—Labrador North:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to register a protest against this division of Labrador. The population altogether is only between seven and eight thousand people. To make two districts seems to be absurd. I realize, of course, the area is very extensive. Nevertheless since the population is so small the principle of a great area hardly counts, because the population as to a great deal of it is concentrated in the southern end, if we include the settlement of Goose Bay and Knob Lake where the work is going on at the present time. But to have two districts made for a population of eight thousand seems to be an expense that is not deserved for the country to have to carry. It is rather peculiar that all the districts returning Liberals are divided into two, so that if the Government were to be returned in the same way they would have eight more members after the next general election and maybe the Premier would have an embarrassment of riches. Seriously speaking, Mr. Speaker, it does seem to be an un-

necessary expense to have two districts in Labrador.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I will not detain the Committee except to say that the population of Labrador both North and South, especially northerly, in my belief, in the fairly near future will greatly exceed what it is at this moment, several times what it is now, and I foresee having to divide or sub-divide Northern Labrador again yet in my time. I expect to pilot through this House a Bill that will make three or if not more constituencies for this House for Labrador.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Premier is very optimistic about his continuing to be Premier. However, I wonder if he is in a position at the present time actually to say what is the population of Labrador or the Knob Lake area as far as the Newfoundland section of Labrador is concerned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Knob Lake is not in Labrador, it is in Quebec, and Schefferville is in Quebec.

MR. BROWNE: Is there any work going on in the Newfoundland section?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but nobody lives in it. The work goes on but the people live in Quebec. The settlement is in Quebec. At that point the boundary lies between the two. The work is on one side and the settlement in which they live is on the other. Quebec deposits are not being worked yet, at least they were not certainly to the end of the working season last year. I dare say this year work will commence on the Quebec side.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of

Mines and Resources): Mr. Chairman, I think I should add to what has already been said about Labrador: The census returns of 1951 show that there were one hundred and eight settlements in what is now the District of Labrador. Some of these are quite small and some are fairly large. But they all have people and they all expect some attention from their member. They all expect a visit once in a while. The thought has occurred to me as I have heard the honourable member for St. John's West talk here about joining up St. Barbe and White Bay and not splitting Labrador and so on; there speaks the man (I don't say this in any derogatory sense) who knows not too much about the Province, apart from the rather heavily populated areas of St. John's and the Avalon Peninsula. I don't know if the honourable gentleman is aware of the difficulty of travelling in the Labrador to visit these settlements. I don't know if he understands the length of the season nor how far apart some of these settlements are in vast stretches. For instance the distance from Davis Inlet to Nain. That is one thought. Now the other is this: Northern Labrador for the most part has its people concentrated in about ten or a dozen places whereas Southern Labrador has its people concentrated, or spread, over an almost innumerable number of places from the Quebec border at L'Anse au Clair up to Cape Harrison, and in many parts there is a tendency for people to move from one place for the winter and to another in the summer. The actual fact of the matter is that whoever computed the population for Southern Labrador found there were a number of smaller places which the persons who did the work were not sure were in Labrador North or Labrador South. At the time of the actual census of population in

1951 the actual population in Labrador South was 3,600, that is excluding any persons who might have been at construction or attached to any of the bases or other activities that were going on there. For instance, I won't name the place, but in 1952 there were about a thousand people attached to one base there. Some of these inevitably will become domiciled there. In any case the population of Labrador South today is between 4,500 and 5,000. It is not great, but, as I said before, it is spread over seventeen hundred miles of coastline and spread over seventy-three settlements big and small. I have just one other piece of information: Along the railway route, (that railway is 360 miles long) the terminus of the railway is in Quebec territory in spite of the fact some of the iron ore operations are in Newfoundland territory and is recognized by all concerned as being in Newfoundland territory. But along that railway are already the beginning of two settlements, one at the power dam, and the other at the mid point between Seven Islands and Knob Lake itself.

Clause carried: Labrador South:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I have in mind the remarks made by the Honourable the Premier in reference to the district in the north. I think the Honourable the Premier stated that it was hoped that within a very short time the population of that area would increase three or four fold. I take it that was one of the reasons why the north was divided, or Labrador was divided up as it was, because the Premier hoped there would be an influx of people making four or five times the number there are there now. That may be a very valid reason, but I am bound to point out that even the Premier's hopes at

times are not realized fully, and I think it would be time enough to change the boundaries existing relative to population at that time when the population does increase. However, with regard to these remarks as they apply to Labrador North, I fail to see how these remarks would apply to Labrador South, where, according to figures given us there are 3,200 odd people, and that constituted one district. Mind you, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, we have no particular grudge against Labrador North getting a member here in the House, not at all — We only say representation here in this House should be of the people and of groups of people and these groups should be more or less of the same size relative to populations and not to territory. It is people we are dealing with. These districts which have huge populations compared with Labrador South, I don't think, are going to feel very happy over the fact that the Premier has hinted now that probably in four or five years time or two years we might have to divide Labrador up into four or five or six districts. That could happen, of course, anywhere along the coast. We have a Premier who gambles everything on Labrador. He gambles so far he is prepared now to give it two and probably in four or five years there will be four or five new districts, so we would continue ad infinitum to have Liberal representatives on the opposite side here and most of them could eventually come from the Labrador and one or two other areas. I hope that is not in the mind of the Honourable the Premier. But I do think the Government made a mess of it with this Redistribution Bill and it will redound to their shame in the very near future I am quite sure of that.

Carried.

Sub-section 2 read:

(2) "Each of the districts named and described in sub-section (1) shall return one member to the House of Assembly."

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to move to this sub-section: My motion is that this sub-section be amended by adding thereto the phrase: "Except the District of Harbour Main which shall return two members."

Clause as amended carried.

MR. MURRAY: I would ask the Committee, Mr. Chairman, to return to a section which stood over as I have an amendment to move, Sir; That sub-section 2 of Clause 3 as it stands be stricken out and have the Clerk read the section to be substituted therefor. The effect of the sub-section will be to set up two new districts, in the present area, White Bay North and White Bay South to be (3) and that the subsequent sections be renumbered accordingly.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister in charge of the amendment prepared any sketch to show?

MR. MURRAY: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: What are the respective populations?

MR. MURRAY: Each is close to 7,000. The total of the district is about 14,000. Each will have slightly over seven thousand, within two hundred of each other.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, there is not very much to be said on the division here any more than has

already been said. "Cats Arm" I don't know what population "Cats Arm" has. Are there any people living there at all? Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs would tell us how many persons live in "Cats Arm?"

MR. MURRAY: I don't believe there are any.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder why that particular point is taken?

MR. MURRAY: It is a natural geographic place for such a division. There is a river which goes along to the boundary, Cats Arm River.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I have to say finally on that Bill, as far as the Committee is concerned, it seems to me to be absurd to make this small district and at the same time to have this great District of St. John's represented out of all proportion to the number of people, and it is done with a particular purpose in mind.

Amended Clause—District of White Bay South read by Clerk:

WHITE BAY NORTH

2. The District of White Bay North shall consist of and include all that part of the Island bounded as follows: Beginning at the west point of Open Bay in the Strait of Belle Isle and running by the eastern boundary of the District of St. Barbe south twenty-four degrees west true to its intersection with the southern bank of the Main Branch of Cat Arm River; thence along the said southern bank of Cat Arm River in a general easterly direction to its mouth at Great Cat Arm; thence along the northern shore of Great Cat Arm in an easterly direction to the point at its northern entrance; thence in a general northeaster-

ly direction along the shores of White Bay, Canada Bay and Haré Bay to Cape Bauld; thence in a westerly direction along the shores of Sacred Bay, Pistolet Bay and the Strait of Belle Isle to the point of beginning, together with all the islands adjacent thereto.

WHITE BAY SOUTH

3. The District of White Bay South shall consist of and include all that part of the Island bounded as follows: Beginning at Cape St. John and running thence by the District of Green Bay, south sixty-four degrees west eighteen miles; thence south sixty degrees west twenty miles; thence south forty-nine degrees west thirteen and one-half miles; thence south twenty-five degrees west seventeen and one-half miles to the north-east angle of the District of St. Barbe; thence along the said eastern boundary of the District of St. Barbe north twenty-four degrees east fifty-five miles to its intersection with the southern bank of the Main Branch of Cat Arm River; thence following the southern bank of the Main Branch of Cat Arm River in a general easterly direction to its mouth at Great Cat Arm; thence following along the southern shore of Great Cat Arm in an easterly direction to the point at its southern entrance; thence following along the western shore of White Bay in a general southerly direction to Hampden; thence following the eastern shore of White Bay in a general northeasterly direction to Partridge Point; thence following along the shore line in a general southeasterly direction to the point of beginning, together with all the islands adjacent thereto.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, on that point — There is a lot of talk about Cats Arm. I see here Little Cats Arm and Great Cats Arm. I would

ask which arm is it? I would not like to see any confusion down there in that district. I think the reading of that clause says Cats Arm, now which Cats Arm is it, Tom Cats or Somebody's Cats? Let us have it clear and distinct so that people in one area will not be voting in the wrong area, the next thing we will have lost ballot boxes again. I think the Honourable Minister ought to be more careful over his boundaries. And, Mr. Chairman, I just have to repeat, it is unfortunate the Government has seen fit to divide up the country in the way it has. It has not worked along any known principle whatsoever. They talk about "urban," "rural" and all that sort of thing, I maintain it must be done with regard to the location of people and those who are to be represented in this House and not according to Cats Arm and this, that and the other thing. It is not a question of territory it is a question of people in the areas. The Government has done nothing whatsoever to make a fair redistribution and as I have said, it will rebound to their shame in the very near future. It is disgraceful. I maintain it is disgraceful, the way the country is divided up and sub-divided at the present time, and for what purpose? Only the Government knows. We have maintained that the increasing of the expenditure to the extent of a hundred or more thousand dollars in connection with new candidates and the travelling expenses and all that sort of thing —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order — The honourable member is straying a bit now.

MR. MURRAY: Straying from Cats Arm.

MR. HOLLETT: I say the Government will be spending too much

money by the division here of White Bay, and that applies to the other divisions as well. Unfortunately the Government has seen fit to do that. We cannot stop the Government from passing it, but I do hope, and I appeal to the Government, that in the present year they give this thing further study, and then I believe they will see fit within the next year or two to amend this Redistribution Bill in such a way that the industrial areas where there are huge populations, if I may use that word in connection with Newfoundland, not huge but very large populations, will be given a greater representation in this House than they are under this present Bill. I say this with all due respect to Labrador and St. Barbe and White Bay, Harbour Main and St. Mary's etc. Certainly they have to be represented but they have not to be over-represented here in this House, if we are going to have any approach whatsoever to democracy in this country.

Clause 25 amended carried.

Clause 4 carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendment. On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill was ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, might I suggest a recess for ten minutes.

Pursuant to recess, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting the Provision of Building Standards."

MR. SPEAKER: The second reading was moved by the Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs and Supply, and the debate was adjourned.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I regret I have not my own copy of the Bill here. I did have some notes made. I went through this the other day and I notice this Bill repeals the Local Area Planning Act in the Revised Statutes. There are certain things in it that I propose to take up in Committee because they seem to be novel ways of dealing with the subject matter. For example, if I may be allowed, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the Local Areas Act, under Section 4 of the Local Areas Planning Act is repealed — "... but the repeal shall not affect any regulation or order made or anything done under that Act." Similarly other regulations may still remain in effect although the Act itself is being repealed. Now, as I understand it, the Local Areas Planning Act had a board which is supposed to meet periodically to make plans for the development of certain areas. I seem to remember the Minister telling us that. Now this board shall be dropped. There won't be any board any longer. The Government will make regulations and at the same time give the Minister of Municipal Affairs power to deal with matters for the administration of this particular Act. I do not notice here any specific statement that the regulations had to be put in the Newfoundland Gazette, but perhaps that could be dealt with in Committee. I take it, Mr. Speaker, also that the Building Standard Act will be for the purpose of regulating buildings all over the country where there are no councils in existence. I am wondering if the Minister when replying will be good enough to tell us if the Local Areas Planning Act, which is similar in effect to this Bill, was used actually to prevent building in any places, or was this or the other Bill used solely to control the building of settlements where there was no

councils at the time; the haphazard building we find along the highways, etc., I wonder if he would tell us to what extent the powers given under the Local Planning Act were carried out and enforced, and whether he has anything particular in mind by introducing this particular Bill here. Because, Mr. Speaker, this Bill gives the Minister power to say every house shall have a bathroom, electric pump, hot and cold water etc. I don't imagine such a rigid interpretation would be made of the powers that are given here. At the same time I would like to get a general idea as to how far the powers given under the Local Planning Act were carried out and how far now it is proposed to enforce them under this.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this Bill, I informed the House that the Local Areas Planning Act is being repealed, but the provisions that were contained in this Act and all provision dealing with planning were put over under the Urban and Rural Planning Act to which they properly belong. All that is being put into this particular one is the building controls really which were a part of the Local Areas Planning Act. You know that now, under the Rural and Urban Planning Act, there is a board set up. I gave the names of the members only a short while ago in this House. The Minister, it is true, has the power of approving or possibly he can disapprove, if you like, the recommendations of the planning board. In effect, of course, if the planning board picks up something, unless it is very very serious, I think it is going to be approved. After all they are more efficient to deal with the matter before them than the Minister would be, no matter who he is.

Now the honourable and learned

member for St. John's West also asked; are the powers exercised under the old Act — Well I will give an incident. He will recall that for the past two years or more for the approaches to St. John's there are quite a number of regulations enacted and carried out to the best of our ability to control the building. For instance along Topsail Road. We have been asked in the last two years by various residents scattered here and there (I think of one particularly contiguous to Humbermouth) to proclaim regulations dealing with the prevention, if you like, of building in a certain area. Under the Local Areas Planning Act there has been a prohibition, more or less, put upon certain sections. That has not been too far carried out. But I do know of that one in particular, and of certain sections along the highway we have endeavoured to control as far as possible any attempt at shack building along various sections.

This Act, today, as I say, does not deal with that particular thing at all because it merely allows the Minister to adopt some particular building code, whether the national code or something else that would be acceptable.

I think that answers, Mr. Speaker, as far as I can at the moment, the question raised by the honourable member for St. John's West.

MR. BROWNE: If I may ask one question regarding this — It does not apply to municipalities, in this Act these are excepted.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Elections Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The second reading of this Bill was moved by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply and the debate was adjourned.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I don't think we have anything to say at the present time on this.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Boiler and Pressure Vessels Act."

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in moving this second reading I will say there is nothing very contentious about it. The first amendment tends to raise the size of the boilers exemptions under this Act. Previously the boiler exemptions were twenty horse-power and this raises it to thirty. The amendments to Section (2) are to conform with the definitions in Section (2). Section 4 of the new sub-section is to overcome conflict if it should arise between this Act and any other Act and regulations under Acts relating to Municipal Affairs. The amendment to Section 6 (2) (d) is to reduce the responsibility of boiler inspectors in respect to industrial safety measures. In the Act it is stated that inspectors were responsible for all safety in all plants. The inspectors are not qualified to make decisions on guarding machinery. That kind of accident prevention is done usually by safety committees in the plant. They are responsible for engine turbines, fly-wheels, pulleys, etc., or the operation at safety speed. Otherwise the rest of the plant is outside their orbit. The amendment to Section 20 has a new sub-section to allow uncertified persons to operate as shift engineers while

taking apprenticeship training courses in order to obtain knowledge and experience required to pass his examination for certification. There is a great shortage of qualified engineers and we have arrangements with certain firms to start apprenticeship training schemes in their plants. And in order to allow the uncertified persons to take this apprenticeship training we intend giving them a temporary permit to operate.

Section 26 is amended to protect owners covered by the Act against the possibility of purchasing unsafe boilers or pressure vessels in this Province from those outside the legislative authority of the Province; namely, American base contractors or any contractors who may come in here and when they are finished with their equipment sell it to anybody concerned, and it may be unsafe.

Section 32 is a new sub-section to establish officially the total plant horse-power as computed according to regulations — "provides for and requiring every owner of a plant to register the horse-power of the plant or combination thereof for the purpose of these regulations and prescribing the fees payable for registration."

The amendment to Section 25 confirms the definitions, sub-section (1) 9.

That is the whole thing, Mr. Speaker, and I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have the same thing to say as regard to this: I went through this Bill and compared it with the Act, but I have not my notes here either on this matter. But there is one thing strikes me as very peculiar, and I would like to draw it to the attention of the Attorney General or the Solicitor General —

Section 3 of the Bill reads: Section 4 of the said Act is amended by adding thereto as sub-section (3) the following:

"(3) Where there is a conflict between this Act and the regulations and any other Act or regulations passed or made before or after the passing of this Act, this Act and the regulations shall prevail."

Now I do not believe that would be recognized in the courts — i.e. if an Act is passed, that Act over this Act that deals with the same subject matter, that the latest Act be applicable — I would like to suggest to the Attorney General he might get one of the drafters to examine that and see if that would hold. It seems to me too, in connection with another section there was a provision for the protection of workmen by having guards over machinery. That has been removed now in this amendment. In the old sub-section 4 of the old section there was a requisite that there be guards put over machinery and that sort of thing — now it has been removed.

In regard to No. 7 the boilers and pressure vessels brought into Newfoundland. I don't understand why it should be necessary a person should have to get the permission of the chief inspector before he could bring a boiler or pressure vessel in. I could understand why it should be necessary to get permission before operating it, but before he can buy or sell it he has to get permission — That seems to me to be going very far, and there should be some special explanation given why he should prohibit the sale.

MR. BALLAM: I might say, Mr. Speaker, the reason for that is that even with a new boiler or pressure vessel these things come right from

the factory, are registered, and their specifications are sent to the Chief Boiler Inspector—with this here, we have certain contractors or so on coming into the country with boilers, usually second-hand, and when they are finished with them they sell them to whoever wants to buy a boiler. Oftentimes we have had the experience that they are just pieces of junk, and these persons are sort of let down, they pay for the boiler but when it comes to be installed they must have it inspected and it must be condemned. It is for the protection of these persons that this amendment is made.

MR. BROWNE: May I just ask one question, Mr. Speaker, has the Minister actually had the experience of someone purchasing a boiler like that which proved to be defective afterwards?

MR. BALLAM: The department has. Yes.

MR. BROWNE: I see.

MR. BALLAM: I might say, the honourable member mentioned the wording here in Section (3) 4.—The wording of these sections was done by the Attorney General's Department.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The second reading was moved by the Honourable Minister of Public Works, and the debate adjourned at the request of the honourable member for St. John's West.

MR. SPENCER: My understanding is, Mr. Speaker, I introduced the

second reading of the Bill, and it was adjourned at the request of the honourable member for St. John's. If he has any questions in respect to the Bill I shall be glad to endeavour to clarify it. In the meantime, I think I gave a very full explanation of the one or two amendments in second reading yesterday, and as far as I know it is pretty clear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—If no honourable member wishes to speak, questions may only be asked and answered in Committee.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and Frobisher Limited":

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, back in 1951 the Government made an agreement with the great mining group known as Frobisher Limited whereby Frobisher was given a concession area in Labrador and in a practically unknown part of Labrador. The company was obliged to spend a total of \$160,000 in exploration work during the three year period. They spent that amount and in fact almost doubled it. The actual expenditure as shown by the account submitted to our department was \$164,000. The company found, as of course we know perfectly well they did, it was one of the most difficult terrains in the whole world. It is very mountainous. I don't suppose it is generally known that it is the highest land this side of the Rockies. As a result they could not do a very satisfactory job during that three year period as the area was so vast and the difficulties of transportation were so great. But in spite of these facts they

spent two hundred odd thousand dollars. The agreement lapsed last year, and for a time, I might say, Mr. Speaker, the Government were afraid that Frobisher might relinquish all interest in Northern Labrador. However, during the latter part of their exploration there, they found some evidence of copper in particular, other things too, but copper in particular. So much so that they applied, after some discussion with the Government, for another exploration lease for a period of four years, on a much smaller area. The area that they now have under consideration is five hundred square miles. It is in three areas. The agreement itself follows the lines of many other agreements that have been submitted. For the most part, of course, it is more or less formal. I would just draw attention to two or three parts which are peculiar to this agreement:

Clause I designates the three areas which they have selected as part of the agreement.

MR. HIGGINS: It says a period of three years. The Honourable Minister said four?

DR. ROWE: I am sorry, I made a mistake. It is three years. Area "A" is about 94 square miles, area "B" 78 and "C" 24 square miles. I am afraid I was a little out there on 500 square miles.

Clause 3 on page 5 of the agreement shows that expenditure shall not be less than \$25,000 in any year with a total of not less than \$75,000.

Clause 7 gives the company the right at any time during the period of the lease or at the end of it to apply for a development licence and following that a mining licence, in accordance with the terms of the Crown Lands Mines and Quarries Act.

Clause 9 gives them the right to develop water powers subject always to the terms and conditions of the terms of agreement between the Government and British Newfoundland Corporation, Limited.

I believe all other parts of the agreement are formal, Mr. Speaker. I think I should say before sitting down that this Government are very happy that the great mining enterprise of Frobisher is still interested in Northern Labrador and is willing to spend money there, hard cash, on the chance they might be able to find something worth developing in the years to come.

I move second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if someone on the other side of the House could take advantage of this occasion to tell us something about the British Newfoundland Corporation's right in connection with agreements such as this. I notice here the condition to which the Minister has just referred — I understood that BRINCO had to make a selection before the end of 1954. I don't think we have been given any information as to whether they have. At any rate, as far as this company is concerned, are these areas adjoining or within the British Newfoundland Corporation limits so that it has been necessary to have these conditions placed in this agreement?

My honourable friend from St. John's East draws to my attention the clause which states the company shall not at any time pay any taxes other than taxes of general application.

DR. ROWE: That is in all agreements.

MR. BROWNE: I presume they are liable to taxation of general ap-

plication but the Government has no right to impose special taxes on them. If it is convenient for the Minister when replying, would he say something about that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should say that although the Frobisher Company is one of the many shareholder companies that constitute BRINCO they are also, of course, a separate company in their own right and existed long before BRINCO existed. Frobisher had gotten these concessions on the Peninsula of Labrador from the Newfoundland Government before BRINCO existed, and it is with regard to these concessions that the present Bill is brought in here.

Now with regard to BRINCO: — It is the intention of the Government in this present session to introduce an amendment to the BRINCO Act. And I think perhaps any discussion of BRINCO would best be left to that occasion:

MR. BROWNE: I take it they have not made their choice yet?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is with regard to that that the amendment to the BRINCO Act is to be brought in here.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it could be possible to have the debate on the second reading of this Bill adjourned until the other Bill has been brought in?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Notice of it has not yet been given.

MR. HOLLETT: Could we defer this second reading?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has nothing whatsoever to do with it.

MR. CURTIS: Actually, Mr.

Speaker, I think this is purely in regard to water powers, and water powers are not under dispute and never have been. BRINCO had, under its charter, the first right to develop water powers. If anybody else wants to develop water powers they first ask BRINCO if they will develop. If BRINCO does not do so, then this section will give the Frobisher people the right to develop. That is purely precautionary wording to protect this section.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honorable the Premier really covered the points raised by my honorable friend opposite. I might say the clause about water power is now standard in all agreements of any kind. If a logging company is planning to set up in Labrador or on the Island of Newfoundland they might very well need water powers. Nevertheless we put in their right subject only to the terms and conditions of the BRINCO agreement, which, as the Honorable the Attorney General said, gives BRINCO any unalienated water powers in the country to develop. If BRINCO does not elect so to do, then the company has the right to do so, subject always to the terms and conditions laid down by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I think that covers the points made. There may be one or two things in Committee that will crop up.

I move second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the District Courts Act":

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this

Bill. In considering the District Courts Act it is necessary to refer to the relevant provisions of the British North America Act, 1867: Section 91 of the British North America Act sets out the subject matter in respect of which the law-making authority of Canada, namely the Queen, acting by and with the consent of the Senate and the House of Commons has exclusive legislative authority: Head 27 of that section assigns to the law-making authority of Canada exclusive legislative authority over the Criminal Law, except the constitution of Courts of Criminal Jurisdiction, but including the procedure in criminal matters. The exceptions referred to in Head 27 of Section 91 are really, Mr. Speaker, a cross reference to Head 4 of Section 29. Section 29 is the section which assigns to the law making authority of the Province exclusive legislative authority over certain matters. By Head 14 of Section 92 exclusive legislative authority is assigned to the Province, over the administration of justice in the Province including the constitutional maintenance and organization of provincial courts both of civil and criminal jurisdiction and including procedure in civil matters in those courts. Section 96 of the British North America Act confers on the Governor General of Canada the power to appoint judges of the Superior, District and County Courts in each Province except those in courts of rebate in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Sections 3, 4 and 5 establish judicial district and set up courts for dealing with civil matters and matters arising under provincial statutes. The subsequent provisions of the Act up to and including Section 45 confer jurisdiction on the district judges in civil matters and matters arising under provincial statutes. Appeals from magistrates in

civil matters and in matters arising under provincial statutes are provided for by Section 60 to Section 70 and in Section 87 to Section 90 of the Summary Jurisdiction Act. Under those provisions there is the same right of appeal from magistrates to district court judges as formerly existed from magistrates to the Supreme Court.

Sections 46 and 47 of the principal Act establish a Criminal Court for the trial of matters arising under the Code. The principal Act does not set out any procedure for the trial of criminal offenses nor for appeals from magistrates in criminal offenses. The judges of the district courts must look to the provisions of the Code and of related Federal Acts for jurisdiction and procedure in criminal matters, since the making of laws relating to criminal procedure is a matter for the law-making authority of Canada. Under the Code as it is presently constituted the only criminal matter with which district court judges will deal will be the speedy trial, without a jury, of certain indictable offenses. There is at present no appeal from a decision of a magistrate under the Code, to district court judges. The appeal is to the Supreme Court.

A Rules Committee has been appointed under Section 2 of the Act consisting of Mr. Justice, Sir Brian Dunfield, the Attorney General, Judge Kent and Judge Whelan, R. S. Furlong, Esq., Q.C. and Mr. Gordon Stirling. Recently the Rules Committee met on several occasions in order to draft rules for the district courts, and the Act was also considered by the Committee. It was felt that some amendment should be made to the Act to provide for matters that were discussed at the meetings and these amendments, Mr. Speaker, are the re-

sults of these deliberations and are the recommendations of this Committee:

(1) The amendment to Section 7, which would be provided by the Bill, is necessary to make certain that a judge may be authorized to work in a judicial district where a judge has never been appointed. The right to ask a judge to work in a district other than his own is recognized in the Judges Act, Chapter 1959, Revised Statutes of Canada, in that it is provided that a judge of a county court may be paid travelling allowances for attending in court or chambers at a place not within his county only if the attendance at that court is approved by the Attorney General of the Province; and the Minister of Justice can be satisfied that the attendance was duly authorized and necessary.

(2) Clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill would require clerks and shorthand reporters in the district courts to take and subscribe oaths of office. These provisions are similar to the provisions of the Judicature Act. Clause 5 of the Bill would re-enact Section 16 of the Act to ensure that the Sheriff of Newfoundland and his deputies may serve and execute process of District Courts anywhere in the Province.

In Section 19 of the principal Act it is not stated beyond the Code that district court judges have jurisdiction to hear actions for recovery of land. However, Section 26 of the principal Act refers to that jurisdiction obliquely by providing that that action for the recovery of land shall be taken in the jurisdictional district where the man is situated.

Clause 6 of the present Bill would resolve any doubt as to judges jurisdiction in this matter.

The principal Act does not say

whether matters are to be tried by the judges without a jury. My own opinion, Mr. Speaker, is that, since the Act is silent on the matter judges may not try actions with a jury. Trial by jury in criminal cases is a right conferred by Common Law beginning with the Magna Carta. The right to have a jury in a civil case is not a Common Law right, wherever the rights exist they have been conferred by Statute. Therefore, the Statute being silent, the right cannot be said to have been conferred. However, since the Act was being amended, it was felt that it was just as well to put the matter beyond all doubt by stating that the judge shall try all civil actions without a jury.

The remaining provisions which would be added by Clause 6 of the Bill are modelled on provisions of the Nova Scotia County Court Act. The provisions which would be added to the Act by Clause 7 are similar to the Nova Scotia County Court Act, and the same applies to provisions added under Clause 8 and Clause 9.

It has been decided by the Rules Committee not to make a special set of rules for the District Court Act but to apply the rules of the Supreme Court, with the right to exclude any of these rules or provisions when it seems to them necessary or desirable so to do. These matters have been provided for by Clauses 10 and 11 of the Bill.

Clause 12 of the Bill would confer on the district courts the same right to issue warrants and writs of execution as is held by the Supreme Court. As mentioned above, Mr. Speaker, the Summary Jurisdiction Act confers on district court judges the same right to hear appeals from magistrates in civil cases and in matters arising un-

der the Provincial Statutes as was formerly held by the Supreme Court. The procedure on such appeals is set out in the Summary Jurisdiction Act and in the Justice Act. And the District Court judges will have the same powers under the Judges Act in this respect as was conferred on the Supreme Court. On the other hand, Section 37 and Section 38 provide for appeals from magistrates to District Court judges and provide that the procedure on appeal as set out in a special part of the Criminal Code shall be followed. The provisions relating to that matter appearing in the Summary Jurisdiction Act and the District Courts Acts are in conflict. And it is felt that Section 37 and 38 of the District Courts should be repealed. Under Section 39 of the District Court Act it provides that when a District Court judge has been appointed anywhere the Supreme Court may no longer deal with appeals from Magistrates Courts. It is felt that the section should be amended to provide that the powers of the Supreme Court to deal with appeals from districts other than those for which judges have been appointed should remain. Hence this amendment.

I would move, Mr. Speaker, the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, this District Courts Act is something comparatively new to us. We have been hearing of them it is true but have yet to see one in operation. That is something now we can look forward to with anticipation.

We have got our Rules Committee, and I take it that the two members of the Bar were probably nominated by debentures—they sound like it.

There is only one thing, which perhaps the Attorney General could deal

with when replying, that is, this proposed Section 6 of this Act will remain Section 19 of the principal Act by the addition of sub-section (1), and sub-section (5) of that provides for trial of every action, suit, cause or matter by a judge alone, without a jury. Now unfortunately I have not the original Act before me—but assuming that a man is being tried before a County Court for a matter for which if he elected trial before a Supreme Court he would have a jury.—He is now to be deprived of this right. I don't know of my own knowledge, but perhaps the Attorney General can advise me whether that is the practice in other Provinces for District Court judges or County Court judges, whichever you want to call it, to sit without juries? I seem to have a recollection of seeing in Canadian Criminal Court cases where judges sit without and with juries—If we are taking away from a citizen his right to be tried by jury, I submit there must be some real reason for it, because, whilst I have every respect for members of that particular Committee, I am quite frank in saying, with the exception of Mr. Justice Dunfield, I don't think any other one has any experience of criminal law. They are all very well in their own particular field, but in the past fifteen or sixteen years I have no recollection of seeing any of them appearing in criminal courts. The Attorney General also has been always very fortunate in having very able and willing people nominated to go for him. But it is a point, Mr. Speaker, I feel we should give some attention to, unless the practice is uniform and it is just a matter of our accepting what experience in other places has shown to be the best. I, for one, would not be too prompt to take the recommendations of this Committee without questioning that. That

seems to be the only point. The rest of it seems to be sensible. Most of it, as the Attorney General says, brings us in line with the practice in other parts of the Dominion.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, it has not been too easy to follow the statement given by the Attorney General. It is a pity we could not have that made available to us for a little examination—the notes he has made—Perhaps he would be willing to allow the debate to be deferred so we could study that and give the Bill a little more attention.

On motion second reading of Bill adjourned.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Local School Tax Act, 1954."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague, the Minister of Education, I might point out two amendments in this particular Act. Now it really deals with the enlargement of the interpretations clause dealing with the definition of councils. The other one, under the parent Act passed last year says the maximum number to comprise a school taxation authority is ten. But it also states, that ten can be called from one representative of every Municipal Council in the area and one member of each local school board in the area. We have applications on file, where the representatives from the local boards and from the municipal areas are more than ten, consequently we have to bring in an amendment so we can increase the number.

I move the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister might be able to tell us—

Is there any reason at the moment to anticipate the school boards in the City of St. John's or indeed the St. John's Municipal Council or any branch thereof is going into the school taxation field? Has there been any approach from the council itself or any of the school boards?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, I have heard of none. I have heard nothing whatever of any approach from St. John's.

MR. HIGGINS: The reason, Mr. Speaker, is this—if I may—As I recall the St. John's area was not included in the parent Act, was it?

MR. BROWNE: Yes.

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes.

MR. HIGGINS: There does not seem to be any reason for it, unless we are not as close to the people as we are supposed to be. We have not heard any rumours.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Registration of Deeds Act."

MR. CURTIS: I beg, Mr. Speaker to move the second reading of this Bill, which is designed for a very simple purpose and a purpose which I can explain very briefly. There is one Act before this House, "The Conditional Sales Act" and also a "Bulk Sales Act," and one of the objects of this Bill is to repeal the sections dealing with such registrations, and have it re-drafted, bearing in mind the enactment of these two Bills. So honourable members will see, if they refer to it, that Section 2 removes subsection 6 or rather provides (1) Sub-

ject to sub-section (2) there shall be registered in the Registry in suitable books which the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall provide for the purpose.

- (a) conveyances, mortgages, releases or transfers of mortgages, leases, assignments of leases, bonds and agreements for sale or purchase of land;
- (b) deeds and other assurances whereby lands or tenements in the province are hereafter granted, conveyed, mortgaged, charged or otherwise affected;
- (c) powers of attorney or substitutions thereof under which any documents referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) are executed;
- (d) judgments of foreclosure and other judgments affecting any interest in or title to land;
- (e) conveyances of personal chattels referred to in Section 31 and
- (f) deeds and other documents.

There is really no effect to that section but to make it uniform with the sections which will prevail when these other two Acts become law.

The next amendment which this Bill provides, Mr. Speaker, is a provision whereby instead of copying deeds as we do it at the present time, the Attorney General is given power to give instructions that deeds may be reproduced in books to be provided by any photographic, mechanical or chemical process. Actually, Mr. Speaker, the Registrar of Deeds has found it quite impossible to keep up to date with the deeds—they are three months behind. On a recent visit to Montreal, in company with the Minister of Supply, we visited several places where these reproductions are made, and we did bring back with us a piece of apparatus which will re-

produce deeds photographically. However, when we examined it a little more closely we found out the paper presently available was not sturdy enough to stand up. We have since been in communication with the manufacturers, and I understand that now rag paper and paper with a rag content is available. If we can get that paper then the apparatus which we brought back, which cost very little, less than a thousand dollars, will be workable. I hope that before long we will be able to have it in operation in the Registry of Deeds. But, before we do it this legislation is necessary, because the present legislation provides that it must be copied verbatim.

There is also a provision in this section, Mr. Speaker, whereby the Registrar copied documents, and in arranging to have them photographed can, if necessary, have them taken apart page by page, because sometimes, as you might well know, Mr. Speaker and some members present may know, sometimes the staples joining the deeds go into the top line and sometimes it is impossible to copy them accurately. So that the Registrar has permission now to disintegrate a deed and put it back, and the deed is not deemed to have been damaged in any way and its validity is not to be impeached because of the fact it had been separated.

The other sections are just formal amendments, designed always to bring into line the fact that we have a Conditional Sales Act, or expect to, and a Bill of Sales Act. Provision is also made, Mr. Speaker, that certain sections of the Act would come into effect on the date we fix for proclamation, so that they will not come into operation until we are sure that the relative legislation has been enacted,

I move second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the Attorney General is to be congratulated on the idea of getting this machine in. There is only one thing I would pass on to him, which has been already mentioned — Perhaps he does not go to the Registry of Deeds as much as he used to in the old days, but he will remember any time you do go and get out these volumes, they do get a big of rough usage. Unless that paper is fairly strong — the present paper is thin in structure — unless that is done the last state of these things will be much worse than having to wait three months to get a copy. Certain it is, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time anybody who has any occasion to deposit deeds in the Registry will agree that three months is the earliest you can hope to get them. This system should result in a better service to the public all around. I think certainly that the whole thing seems to be a forward step.

MR. CURTIS: In closing the debate, Mr. Speaker, I might say the matter to which my honourable friend referred has been under consideration. As a matter of fact I have been wondering whether in addition to taking photographic copies of the deeds we should not microfilm the entire records there and have them put in some other place for safe keeping. That is a matter on which I am not prepared to make any statement.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move all further Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and the House at its rising

do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 p.m. of the clock.

On motion the House then adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 14, at 3:00 of the clock.

THURSDAY, April 14, 1955

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

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I direct to the attention of Your Honour and that of the House that we have some very distinguished visitors in the Chamber with us today, in the person of a group of Brownies from Fort Pepperrell. I am sure that they are exceedingly welcome, and that we are all very happy to see them here. I hope if they learn something from us, we may learn something from them as well. I am sure we are all glad to express a word of welcome to them.

Presenting Petitions

MR. DROVER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of LaScie and Fleur-de-Lys in White Bay. These people are petitioning for cheaper hospital services and a hospital in that section of the District of White Bay. I must say that the people of LaScie have been given the opportunity to pay a hospital fee to the people of Springdale. But Springdale is quite a distance from LaScie and other settlements in that area, and they have not any roads. Quite often the coast is blocked with ice and in the early Spring or late Fall it is impossible for them to get to hospital. The people of Fleur-de-Lys are in a worse predicament. They have not been given the chance to join the hos-

pital scheme which most of the people of the country are subscribing to, and they have not any roads.

This petition is signed by 369 voters of the settlements. I have much pleasure in presenting their request to this House, and ask that the petition be laid on the table of the House and forwarded to the Department of Public Health for their consideration.

On motion petition tabled for reference to the department concerned.

HON. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition) : Mr. Speaker, I would like on behalf of the Opposition, to lend our support to the petition from these people of White Bay. These people have been pleading for hospital services and better medical services for the people since I came into this House. I do think that petition ought to receive attention from the department, in fact all the departments which know the situation. They are isolated many months during the year not only by reason of not having any roads there. But I think surely an attempt should be made by some Department of Government to make available to these people the services which have been given to other areas in Newfoundland, with cheap hospital rates and hospital fares. On behalf of the petitioners, I strongly support the petition so ably presented by our honourable friend from White Bay.

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education) : Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Bristol's Hope in the District of Harbour Grace. They are requesting that a patrolman be appointed to look after the roads in that area. They further state, Mr. Speaker, that Bristol's Hope is one of the most beautiful spots in all Conception Bay, and during the summer months many

people drive down to see this historic and beautiful place. And they think that they should have the privilege of a road there.

I request, Sir, that this petition be tabled and sent to the department concerned.

On motion petition tabled for reference to the department concerned.

MR. COURAGE : Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of presenting a petition from the residents of Little Bay East in the District of Fortune Bay and Hermitage. Like some other petitions that I have presented in the House, Sir, these people are asking for a road connection with the highroad which runs along from St. John's to Marystown. Little Bay East lies between Harbour Mille and Bay L'Argent. There is now a road connection between this highroad and Bay L'Argent and St. Bernards. These people ask, Sir, to be joined up with the St. John's - Marystown Highway. This might be part of a road which I hope might be built to connect Harbour Mille, which lies close to it, with the main road.

The petition, Sir, is signed by more than one hundred of the residents of Little Bay East, and it has my full support. A great number of roads of this kind are needed in the District of Fortune Bay and Hermitage, and I think this should be one of the first roads built now on the south coast.

I have much pleasure in supporting this petition and asking that it be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department concerned.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the annual report of the Department of Education up to and including March 31, 1954.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I ask permission of the House to table copies of the Report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture which was set up twenty-two months ago by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. This Report is probably the largest report ever presented to any government in any House in Newfoundland. Because of its size the printers and the other people responsible for the actual mechanics of getting the report together it was decided to divide it into two. It is called Part (I) and Part (II) for distinction, although it is actually just a continuous Report.

I am not going to make any comments on the contents of the Report, Mr. Speaker, but I should perhaps inform the House in a few sentences something of the background. The Royal Commission was set up twenty-two months ago. It consisted of Dean Shaw, Professor Drummond and Mr. P. J. Murray, Dean Shaw is perhaps one of the world's most distinguished Agriculturists. He is a graduate of the Ontario Agricultural College and the University of Ontario. He served as social field man with the Department of Agriculture in Ontario. He undertook what was the greatest experiment in livestock development ever engaged in in any period in the history of agriculture for the Great Northern Railway. He became Dean of the Faculty for Agriculture for the University of Saskatchewan. He has been the Commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board and Director of the Government Marketing Service and then Chairman

of the Agricultural Service set up by the Government of Canada in World War III, with the design of increasing manifold agricultural production in Canada and to assist the allied war effort. Dean Shaw was responsible for the tremendous expansion in agricultural production in Canada during World War II. Then he became Chairman of the Agricultural Prices Support Board. And for a number of years he has been the right-hand man of the Right Honourable James Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture in the Government of Canada.

Professor Drummond, the second member of the Royal Commission was Professor of Economics at the University of Alberta, and in 1939 became Professor of Agriculture and Economics in the University of Toronto, the most responsible position of its kind in all Canada. He has made economic studies in the United States and in a number of countries in Europe and Asia. He was appointed to head up the United Nations agricultural studies, for the relief of Korea. As a matter of fact our delay in getting the Commission going was due to the fact that Professor Drummond had commitments in Korea.

The third (and I am not listing them in any order of preference) is a Newfoundlander, Mr. P. J. Murray, present Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources. Mr. Murray is a graduate of Nova Scotia Agriculture College and of McDonald's Agricultural College at McGill University where he received his B.Sc. in Agriculture. He subsequently did agricultural studies at the University of Toronto. He served as an agricultural fieldman in 1930 for the Department of Natural Resources and later he became Director of Agriculture for the Government of Newfoundland. In that capacity he

travelled to practically every settlement, every community, every hamlet in the Island of Newfoundland and indeed in the territory of Labrador as well. He has travelled to and studied agricultural activities on the Mainland of Canada in a number of countries in Europe. Perhaps no other Newfoundlanders is so familiar with Newfoundland's agricultural background and with outside agricultural activities as he is. By that I mean that perhaps no Newfoundlanders has that dual knowledge of agriculture.

The Commission had attached to it other specialists of whom perhaps the one heard most frequently is Dr. Carr, an Economist. Dr. Carr's studies and analysis of certain aspects of our economic trends, for example, our population trend, is most penetrating, the most penetrating that ever came to the attention of this Government. Dr. Mallard, who is a soil specialist and numerous other specialists were brought here chiefly through the good office of Dean Shaw, who is perhaps the leading agriculturist in all Canada and the right-hand man of the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa and was in a position to avail of resources which otherwise would have been denied us.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House that in almost all cases these specialists were made available to us by the Government of Canada and in some cases by Provincial Governments as well at no cost whatsoever to the Province of Newfoundland not even travelling expenses in most cases. I would like to express the appreciation of the Government to the parties concerned for that very fine contribution to this survey. I would especially, Mr. Speaker, like to say a word of appreciation of the effort and interest of the Right Honourable

James Gardiner, Canada's great Minister of Agriculture. I believe he has held that position for twenty years or more. He is, I think, universally regarded as the greatest Minister of Agriculture that Canada has had in her long history of agricultural development. He has taken a special interest, and as perhaps the House will recall, visited here several years ago. Subsequently when we discussed the feasibility of setting up this Commission, the Honourable the Premier had discussions with Mr. Gardiner in Ottawa. It was through these discussions we were fortunate enough to obtain the services of Dean Shaw. It was one, I would say, of the most fortunate things that we have had come to us during the six years this Government has been in power.

Just a brief word about the activities of the Commission itself. I was interested in looking through — I need not say perhaps that this Report which was presented to the Government last week has not been read by anyone, apart I believe from the Honourable the Premier, I believe he has just about completed the reading of it. I have not done so myself, and I don't believe any member of the Government has. I was interested in seeing in the back of the volume that the Commissioners had visited something like two hundred settlements in all parts of Newfoundland. The work and the energy of that Commission is something, I think, which deserves great credit.

I have just one other word to say about it, Sir, before I sit down: I would be lacking in my duty to this House if I did not express, as the Minister concerned, my personal appreciation and I feel, the appreciation of my colleagues in the Government, for the role the Honourable the Pre-

mier played in the creation of this Commission and in the actual work of it. I must confess, when the Government decided to create two Royal Commissions almost simultaneously, I was just a little bit appalled by the responsibility that was laid upon the Department of Mines and Resources especially at a time when the department was engaged in a number of other experimental measures. I can say, without in any way exaggerating, if it had not been for the efforts of the Honourable the Premier, even after the Commission was actually appointed, this report would not have been available to us today. I understand from him that tomorrow he will be moving the House into a discussion of this Report, I suppose a formal debate, but he will move the House into a discussion of it so that he will be able to make a statement on the Report itself. I know of no person more competent or better fitted to discuss the sections of this Report, and I know that we will all look forward to that statement which he will make tomorrow.

I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in seeking permission to table this Report in the House of Assembly.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may be permitted to make a few remarks on our behalf on this side of the House in regard to this voluminous Report presently being tabled. I note the Premier is going to adjourn the House tomorrow for the purpose of discussing this Report. I wonder if he could defer that until Monday so that we may have an opportunity of studying it. We have had no opportunity to study it. It is so voluminous it is impossible to do anything other than just look through it. If it were deferred until Monday we would be in a position to appreciate some of the finer points and be able to discuss it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have every possible sympathy with the thoughts of the honourable and learned member for St. John's West. I would like to see the discussion of the Report held over until members have had the opportunity to look through it if not to study it thoroughly and carefully. But I remember that my honourable colleague, the Minister of Finance proposes to bring down his budget on Monday, which would make it a poor day for a discussion of this Report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture. Perhaps on tomorrow I could initiate the discussion, which would give me an opportunity to say something I have on my mind. Then we need have no further discussion on it tomorrow but defer the continuation of the discussion until some day, not necessarily Monday, of next week. That would give honourable members a chance to read and study the Report, and with perhaps a little guidance which I might be privileged to offer in my remarks tomorrow I think perhaps honourable members would read it a little more fluently, a little more easily, after hearing the explanation that I would give tomorrow.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, we are governed of course by the Government's wishes in this regard. I feel that it would be better if the discussion had been kept together instead of separated. I don't know how we will be able to bring it up after the Premier speaks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will bring it up.

MR. BROWNE: Thank you — I do want to say just two things about the matter. After listening to the announcement which the Minister of Mines and Resources made —

MR. SPEAKER: I don't under-

stand — The Honourable Minister merely mentioned the members of the Committee. As for the matter of discussion of the Report, that is a matter to be decided between the two Leaders privately, and the motion to adjourn moved by the Minister, in the House.

MR. BROWNE: But, Mr. Speaker, I understand you to say we cannot say anything now?

MR. SPEAKER: No. There is no discussion at the moment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There will be ample opportunity.

MR. BROWNE: I thought that perhaps when a statement of that kind was made by somebody on the other side of the House it was permissible for one person on this side to have something to say — Not an elaborate debate or anything like that, but to make some few remarks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think, Mr. Speaker, in the House of Commons, if one may have the temerity to use it as an example of anything, the practice is: if a ministerial statement is made, for the Leader of the Opposition to comment very briefly on what has been said. But certainly it is never a debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I am aware of that — But the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources asking leave to table a report gives a very lengthy sketch of each member of that Commission. If one honourable member wants to make a comment on it, what about every other honourable member? Then we are into a full-fledged debate thereon. I do not see any useful purpose being served by discussion of it now. However, if the Opposition wants to voice some expression of opinion, I do not see that I can prevent it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend, of course, to make extensive remarks, as I have not read it, but I have made one or two interesting observations in connection with this. We must remember it is 1955 and the present Government or its predecessors came into office in 1949. And yet this Commission was not appointed until two years ago. I remember very well the day Mr. Gardiner announced it in the House of Commons because I was always anxious we should have an agricultural investigation and he said he has just told Mr. Smallwood he was going to give him the best man he had to send down.

Giving Notice of Motion

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act;" and a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Construction of a Railway to Wabush Lake;" and a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to enter into an Agreement with the British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to an Agreement Dated the 21st day of May, 1953;" and finally a Bill, "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and the Union Electric Light and Power Company Limited Relating to a Franchise" — This latter one, Mr. Speaker, I believe has already been entered, so I withdraw that one.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friends opposite would be agreeable to having these Bills, of which I have given notice and those which will presently be given by my honourable colleague, given First Reading today so that on tomorrow,

Friday, the Minister will be able to give the necessary brief explanation of the Bills. For the most part these are mere amendments to existing Bills. If they could be given a brief explanation tomorrow, honourable members opposite would be enabled to take the Bills with them and over the weekend perhaps give them a little longer study than they could otherwise, and be better able to debate them sometime next week. If my honourable friends would be agreeable to that?

MR. HOLLETT: Are the Bills ready for distribution now, may I ask?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I believe all of them are not. Suppose we gave it with respect to those which are ready for distribution?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Bills, as my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition knows, are never distributed except at Second Reading. They may or may not be ready, but First Reading authorizes their printing. The Government usually assumes that First Reading will be given and authority to print them will therefore follow. Anticipating that, they get them printed. But sometimes they are still waiting on the printers.

MR. BROWNE: Does the Premier intend to sit tonight?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. I am not too sure — Ordinarily yes. But if we get through everything this afternoon and there is no need to meet tonight we won't meet, having in mind the great desirability of proroguing the House in time to enable some of the Minister to attend a most important Dominion-Provincial Conference, having that in mind, we will meet only as frequently as is necessary to complete

the business and duty of all members in this House.

HON. I. R. COURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow or later ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act to Amend the Stamp Act," also I give notice that I will ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Judicature Act," also a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Constabulary Act."

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that these are very minor amendments to existing Bills, and although they are not printed nor available, I think the House would be so much further ahead if they could be read a first time now.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Election Act, 1954."

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Processing of Pothead and Minke Whales."

HON. S. J. HIEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authorities Guarantee Act, 1952," also a Bill "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951." These are merely nominal amendments.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Bill of which the

Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources gave notice; could he give us the proper zoological name of pot-head whales? I wonder if he could give us the proper name of that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is printed in the Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: We have not got it.

Answers to Questions

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 10 submitted by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Friday, March 25th. This question was directed, I believe, to the Honourable Minister of Finance.

QUESTION No. 10 (Mr. Hollett).

GUARANTEED BANK LOANS AND CASH LOANS—APRIL, 1949 — 25 MARCH, 1955

A. GUARANTEED BANK LOANS	Date of Loan	Amount of Loan	TERMS	Interest Rate %
Alberto Fisheries Ltd.	24. 3.50	65,000	To be paid on or before 1.4.55	3½
Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.	13. 4.50	160,000	To be repaid in equal annual instalments of \$40,000 first instalment to be paid 15.4.51. \$120,000 repaid to Bank by Government and converted into cash loan	3¼
Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.	18.10.53	125,000	To be repaid 18.10.54	4½
Arctic Fisheries Products Ltd.	31.10.52	87,500	Originally a guaranteed loan of \$125,000, repayable by ten equal annual instalments, first payment to be made 24.7.52. Subsequently converted to a revolving credit	3½
Atlantic Films and Electronics Ltd.	29. 3.54	50,000	Repaid to Bank by Government and converted into cash loan	
Atlantic Hardboard Industries Ltd.	31. 3.54	278,000	Repaid to Bank by Government and converted into cash loan	
Atlantic Hardboard Industries Ltd.	24. 9.53	40,000	Repaid to Bank by Government and converted into cash loan	
Blackmore, Capt. J. H.	23.11.54	106,000	To be repaid in five instalments of \$21,200, the first instalment to be paid on 15.11.55	5
Bonavista Cold Storage Co. Ltd.	5. 5.51	600,000	To be repaid in fifteen annual instalments, first payment to be made 1.11.54	4½
Bonavista Cold Storage Co. Ltd.	29. 9.53	1,050,000	Repaid to Bank by Government and converted into cash loan	

Burgeo Fish Industries Ltd.	3. 11.54	650,000	To be repaid 3.11.55	5
Cape St. Francis Co-operative Society Ltd.	3. 1.55	10,450	Repayable at the rate of \$3,000 per annum, first instalment payable 1.4.55	5
Duphy's Limited	27. 3.51	45,000	To be repaid in five annual instalments of \$9,000, the first instalment payable on 31.3.52	3½
Eckhardt Mills Ltd,	30.12.54	160,000	Repayable on or before 31.5.55	5
Fishery Products Ltd.	11.10.50	110,000	Repayable in annual instalments of \$22,000, first instalment to be paid in November, 1951	3½
Fishery Products Ltd.	4. 7.50	350,000	To be repaid in annual instalments of \$23,500, first instalment due in October, 1951	3½
Fishery Products Ltd.	19. 2.54	350,000	Repaid to Bank by Government and converted into cash loan.	
Fortune Bay Products Ltd.	11. 9.54	200,000	To be repaid 11.9.55	5
Fortune Shipping Ltd.	11. 9.54	250,000	To be repaid 11.9.55	5
Gaultois Fisheries Ltd.	10. 9.51	425,000	Repaid to Bank by Government and converted into cash loan	1
Hollett Sons & Co. Ltd.	29. 3.51	125,000	Repayable in instalments of \$12,500, first instalment due 1.3.53. Instalments subsequently reduced to \$6,250	5½
Koch Shoes Ltd.	2. 2.55	120,000	To be repaid on or before 31.5.55	5
Loures Co-operative Society Ltd.	Aug. '49	40,000	Replaced by cash loan in 1952 of \$50,000.	
MacLellan, C. F.	30. 1.54	75,000	To be repaid on 29.12.55	5
Newfoundland Asbestos Ltd.	20.10.54	130,000	\$95,000 repaid to Bank by Government and converted into cash loan. Balance of \$35,000 repayable by Company on 1/4/55	4½

GUARANTEED BANK LOANS AND CASH LOANS—APRIL, 1949 — 25 MARCH, 1955

A. GUARANTEED BANK LOANS	Date of Loan	Amount of Loan	TERMS	Interest Rate %
Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd. #1 a/c	30. 4.52 to 7.10.54	225,000	To be repaid on 30.4.55	4½
Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd. #2 a/c	20.10.54	300,000	Revolving credit	4½
Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.	6. 7.54	500,000	Repaid to Bank by the Government in 1954	
Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd. #2 a/c	15. 2.55	185,000	To be repaid on or about 31.10.55	4½
Northeastern Co-operative Fisheries Society Ltd.	13. 7.5.	400,000	Repaid to Bank by the Government. Converted into cash loan.	
Northeastern Fish Industries Ltd.	11. 7.51	400,000	Repayable in annual instalments of \$25,839.39, first in- stalment to be paid on 23.7.54	4
Northlantic Fisheries Ltd.	28. 4.51	675,000	Taken over on 5.5.51 by Bonavista Cold Storage Co. Ltd. (See above).	
Olsen Whaling and Sealing Ltd.	15. 4.50	425,000	Repayable in annual instalments of \$37,500 commenc- ing 15.4.51; \$88,146 repaid to Bank by the Govern- ment and converted into cash loans	3½
Penny, John & Sons Ltd.	5.11.52	125,000	To be repaid in ten equal annual instalments, the first instalment to be paid 5.11.53	3½
Richard Ltd.	19. 5.50	250,000	Repaid to Bank by Company from proceeds of Govern- ment cash loan.	
Springdale Fur Farmers Co-operative Society Ltd.	25.11 50	7,000	Repaid to Bank by the Government. Government has taken possession of Society's assets.	

St. Lawrence Corporation of Nfld. Ltd.....	12. 9.50	250,000	To be repaid on 12.9.55. Converted to a revolving credit	3½
St. Lawrence Corporation of Nfld. Ltd.....	19. 3.58	230,000	To be repaid at the rate of \$25,000 per annum, the first instalment to be paid 13.2.55. Converted to revolving credit to be repaid on 14.2.56.....	3½
Superior Rubber Co. Ltd.	14. 6.54	150,000	Repaid by Company to Bank from Government cash loan of \$400,000.	
Terra Nova Textiles Ltd.	18.12.53 & 2. 6.54	185,000	Repaid to Bank by the Government in 1954 and converted into cash loan.	
U. G. Board of Education	29. 8.50	40,000	Repaid to Bank by Board in 1954.	
Union Electric Light & Power Co. Ltd.....	Sept. '54	500,000	Repaid by Company to Bank from proceeds of Government guaranteed bond issue.	
United Engineers & Contractors Ltd.	19. 9.51	75,000	\$35,000 only drawn and subsequently repaid to Bank by Company. Guarantee terminated.	
TOTAL		<u>\$10,158,950</u>		

B. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CASH LOANS	Date of Loan	Amount of Loan	TERMS	Interest Rate	Interest Payments Received	Interest Refunded
		\$		%	\$	\$
Atlantic Films & Electronics Ltd.	12.12.52	150,000	Repayable in instalments of \$50,000, first payment due 23.1.55. Interest due 23.1.54 and each 23 January following until loan repaid.	5	—	—
Atlantic Films & Electronics Ltd.	July, '54	50,000	This amount was formerly a guaranteed bank loan. Agreement in course of preparation and terms of repayment not yet available in Finance Department.	—	—	—
Atlantic Gloves Ltd.	10. 2.53	350,000	To be repaid on 1.3.53. Interest due 30 June and 31 December while loan is unpaid. First payment due 30.6.53.	5	172.60	172.60
Atlantic Gloves Ltd.	1.10.54	279,152	Agreement in course of preparation and terms of repayment not yet available in Finance Department.	—	—	—
Atlantic Hardboard Industries Ltd.	11. 3.52	575,000	To be repaid within eight years from 11.3.52. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December beginning 30.6.52.	4½	12,336.13	12,336.13
Atlantic Hardboard Industries Ltd.	17. 3.53	60,000	Repayable within fourteen years from 17.3.53. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December beginning on 30.6.55.	4½	214.52	214.52
Atlantic Hardboard Industries Ltd.	22. 9.53	285,000	Repayable within fourteen years from 22.9.53. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December beginning on 31.12.55.	4½	—	—

Atlantic Hardboard Industries Ltd.	31. 3.54	278,000	Repayable within fourteen years from 31.3.54. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December beginning on 30.6.56. This was previously a guaranteed bank loan.	4½	—	—
Atlantic Hardboard Industries Ltd.	1.12.53	40,000	Repayable within fourteen years from 1.12.54. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December beginning on 31.12.55. This was previously a guaranteed bank loan.	4½	—	—
Atlantic Hardboard Industries Ltd.	1.10.54	308,000	Agreement in course of preparation and terms of repayment not yet available in Finance Department.	—	—	—
Atlantic Optical Co. Ltd.	20. 5.52	150,000	\$110,290 only drawn and subsequently repaid by Company.	4	2,027.65	—
C.M.I.C. Ltd.	3.11.51	2,500,000	To be repaid within ten years from 3.11.51. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December beginning on 31.12.51.	4	68,951.67	68,951.67
Eckhardt Mills Ltd.	30. 9.53	387,400	To be repaid on 30.9.67. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December commencing 31.12.53.	4½	—	—
Gold Sail Leather Goods Ltd.	23.11.53	50,000	Repayable on or before 31.12.67. Interest payment 30 June and 31 December starting 31.12.53.	5	—	—
Gold Sail Leather Goods Ltd.	1.10.54	155,000	Agreement in course of preparation and terms of repayment not yet available in Finance Department.	—	—	—
Hanning Electric Co. Ltd.	2. 9.52	325,000	To be repaid within five years from 1.4.54. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December beginning 30.6.52.	5	3,231.20	3,231.20

B. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CASH LOANS	Date of Loan	Amount of Loan	TERMS	Interest Rate	Interest Payments Received	Interest Refunded
		\$		%	\$	\$
Hanning Electric Co. Ltd.	15. 4.54	120,000	Repayable within three years from 15.4.54. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December beginning 30.6.54.	5	—	—
Koch Shoes Ltd.	2. 5.53	750,000	Repayable within ten years from 30.6.56. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December beginning 31.12.53.	5	—	—
North Star Cement Co. Ltd.	16.10.52	4,740,000	Repayable in annual instalments during period from 5.7.53 to 15.7.64.	4½	225,150.00	225,150.00
Nfld. Tanneries (Wm. Dorn) Ltd.	13. 9.51	800,000	Repayable within ten years from 13.9.51. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December starting 31.12.51.	4	17,730.84	17,730.84
Nfld. Tanneries (Wm. Dorn) Ltd.	9.10.52	60,000	To be repaid on the 9th October 1957. Interest payable on 9th October, first payment to be made on 9.10.53. Interest unpaid two months from day due is capitalized.	6	—	—
Nfld. Tanneries (Wm. Dorn) Ltd.	30. 6.53	8,000	To be repaid on or before 26.5.55. Interest payable on 30 June and 31 December commencing 27.5.52.	5	—	—
Nfld. Tanneries (Wm. Dorn) Ltd.	5. 3.53	25,000	Repayable on 13.9.61. Interest payable on 30 June and 31 December beginning 30.6.53.	4½	342.12	342.12
Nfld. Tanneries (Wm. Dorn) Ltd.	1.10.54	76,208	Repayable on 13.9.61. Agreement now being finalized and copy not yet available in Finance Department.	4½	—	—

Newfoundland Asbestos Ltd.	Aug. '54	95,000	Interest payable quarterly from 9.9.52, first payment due 1.10.53.	—	—	—
Superior Rubber Co. Ltd.	2. 9.52	1,000,000	To be repaid within thirteen years from 23.10.52. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December starting 31.12.52.	5	10,810.70	10,810.70
Superior Rubber Co. Ltd.	1.10.54	400,000	Agreement in course of preparation and terms of repayment not yet available in Finance Department.	—	—	—
Terra Nova Textiles Ltd.	7. 7.54	298,000	To be repaid on or before 31.12.67. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December beginning 31.12.56.	5	—	—
Terra Nova Textiles Ltd.	1.10.54	235,840	Agreement in course of preparation and terms of repayment not yet available in Finance Department.	—	—	—
United Cotton Mills Ltd.	9. 8.51	2,000,000	Repayable within ten years from 9.8.51. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December starting 31.12.51.	4	16,798.35	9,418.79
United Cotton Mills Ltd.	10.10.53	83,500	Repayable within fourteen years from 16.10.53. Interest payable 30 June and 31 December starting 31.12.56.	4½	2,059.55	—
United Cotton Mills Ltd.	1.10.54	109,000	Repayable in annual instalments to be fixed by the Government. Agreement now being finalized and copy not yet available in Finance Department.	4½	—	—
TOTAL		<u>\$16,493,100</u>			<u>\$359,825.31</u>	<u>\$348,358.57</u>

(NOTE: During 1953, the Government granted all operators of industrial plants receiving Government loans a deferment of interest payments for a period of two years and of repayment of principal for a period of four years from the date of commencement of construction).

C. FISHERIES CASH LOANS	Date of Loan	Amount of Loan	TERMS	Interest Rate	Interest Payments Received	Interest Refunded
		\$		%	\$	\$
Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.	13. 8.53	120,000	This was previously part of \$160,000 guaranteed bank loan. \$8,000 on the 15th August, 1953; \$16,000 on 30th April in each succeeding year until retired. Subsequently deferred to 31.3.56.	5	—	—
Bonavista Cold Storage Co. Ltd ...	13. 8.53	1,050,000	To be repaid in full 1.10.73. Interest due 1 April and 1 October, commencing 1.4.55. This was previously a guaranteed bank loan.	3½	—	—
Bonavista Fish Meals & Oils	27. 5.52	40,500	To be repaid in ten equal annual instalments, commencing 27.9.55. Interest payable 27 September until repaid.	3½	2,335.00	—
Duffett, Alexander	4. 6.52	20,000	Repayable by instalments of \$5,000, beginning 4.6.53. Subsequently deferred to 4.6.55.	4½	—	—
Fishery Products Ltd.	16. 7.53	750,000	To be repaid in full 31.12.78. Interest due 31 December, commencing on 31.12.53. \$250,000 of this amount was previously a guaranteed bank loan.	3½	21,543.49	—
Fishery Products Ltd.	16. 7.53	937,000	To be repaid in full 31.12.73. Interest due 31 December, commencing on 31.12.53.	3½	49,903.77	—
Fishery Products Ltd.	4. 4.51	29,000	To be repaid in fifteen equal annual instalments beginning 31.3.53 and each 31 March following.	Free	—	—
Fishery Products Ltd.	1. 6.54	1,500,000	To be repaid in full 31.12.76. Interest due 31 December, commencing 31.12.54.	8	5,479.77	—

Gaulthois Fisheries Ltd.	26. 5.52	425,000	Repayable by instalments of \$28,333.34 beginning 28.2.54 and on each 28th February until repaid. Interest due 28 February, beginning 1953. This was previously a guaranteed bank loan.	5	—	—
Lourdes Co-operative Society Ltd.	16. 2.52	50,000	Reduced to \$10,000 in March, 1953 and repayable by instalments of \$1,428.57 commencing 16.2.55.	4½	—	—
Newfoundland Quick Freeze Ltd.	24. 2.55	40,000	Repayable at \$4,000 per annum. First payment due 1.3.57.	4	—	—
Northeastern Co-operative Fisheries Ltd.		57,734	\$35,000 of this amount was previously a guaranteed bank loan. Society is in voluntary liquidation and Government has taken possession of assets.		—	—
Olsen Whaling & Sealing Ltd.....	15. 5.54	88,146	This amount was previously part of \$425,000 guaranteed bank loan.	5	—	—
Petite, H. E. Ltd.	13.11.53	15,000	\$1,500 on 3.12.54, \$2,000 on same date for next four years and \$2,750 for next two years. Interest payable on 3 June and 3 December, starting 1953.	5	750.00	—
Thomsen & Nickels	21. 6.52	33,500	Repayable in three equal annual instalments of \$11,166.66 commencing 15.8.56.	3½	—	—
Trepassey Fisheries Ltd.	25. 9.52	316,000	\$287,000 repaid in 1953. Balance of \$29,000 taken over by Fishery Products Ltd. See above.	9½	5,143.34	—
TOTAL		\$5,471,880			\$84,687.37	

- (i) Question relative to Fisheries Development Board and Industrial Development Board loans referred to Provincial Government Loan Boards.
- (ii) Question relative to Tourist Development loans referred to the Hon. the Minister of Economic Development.
- (iii) For information relative to guaranteed bank loans to Town Councils, etc., the Hon. Member is referred to the Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply.

MR. BROWNE: Or to any other appropriate Minister.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the absence of my honourable colleague it has come to me to answer. The loan boards, one of them comes under me as Minister of Economic Development and two of them come under my honourable colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives. The answer to all three came to the Minister of Finance, and that is why I am tabling them. The loans made by the Industrial Loan Board are given here in the answer. They total \$100,000 in amount and twelve in number. There is a footnote to them which says, all loans are cash loans, and all loans have been paid to the borrowers listed or are in the process of being paid pending completion of certain documents. The rate of interest is 4½% and every loan is repayable with interest in equal annual instalments within very definite stipulated periods, the maximum being ten years and with interest fully paid in all cases.

Then secondly the Fisheries Loan Board showing amounts of nine loans totalling \$49,000 and eighteen loans more totalling \$91,000 and another eighteen loans at a total of \$118,000 and fifty-two loans more at a total of \$420,000 making an aggregate total by the Fisheries Loan Board of \$579,000 to date. With regard to these the footnote say that all of them are cash loans, all of them have been paid to the borrowers listed or are in process of being paid, and additional loans not listed relating to temporary advances against Federal subsidies available on completion of long liners and druggers have been paid and later recovered or are recoverable from the Department of the Federal Fisheries. The total fund in this respect to date amounting to \$104,000. The rate of

interest is 3½% to fishermen and 4½% to incorporated companies for plant construction. Every loan is repayable with interest in equal annual instalments, within various stipulated periods, the maximum being ten years. Interest has been fully paid in all cases with the exception of overdue interest charges relating to the past year only, as undermentioned—then follows four names with a total interest due of \$1,100.

Finally the Co-operative Development Loan Board, which has made three loans to Co-operative Societies totalling \$78,000. All of them are in cash, interest at 3½% for a period not exceeding ten years, and the interest is being fully paid in all cases. I regret that I have only the one copy, which I am sure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will receive.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask if that is just the answer to No. 10, subsection (1)? There are other subsections there. I notice the Honourable the Premier has not made reference to them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I frankly don't know at the moment. I merely gave them as received, but I will look. Yes that appears to deal only with section (1) of that question. I had better mark it off.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Attorney General, with regard to an answer he gave yesterday, whether it was supposed to cover a question I asked the previous day in regard to the birch plant? I asked when the management was transferred to the present operator, etc. I wonder if he intends to reply to that?

MR. CURTIS: I don't know, Mr. Speaker. I can, if it would be proper

to file a balance sheet. But I am prepared to give the House all information in connection with it. I might say an inventory of the entire plant and equipment has been taken by the Auditor General or at least one of his officials, and he has it, and at the time of transfer a complete inventory was taken of the entire stock that was there. No, that was not taken by Government officials, because we actually had no Government officials available or particularly able for that kind of work. But we did entrust the whole thing and it was done under the guidance of Mr. Eric Dawe, who is no relation of Mr. Chester Dawe, but who is a former bank manager, and is in there, and in whom we have every confidence. Actually, the inventories all were taken under his direction and certified by the manager. Now I do not know just how much of this information is available, because the transaction is not yet finalized. It is true that the company is in on an agreement, but transfer has not actually as yet taken place, because the conveyances have not been signed. These inventories will be attached to the conveyances.

MR. BROWNE: I understood no representative of the Government was present when Mr. Chester Dawe was making this inventory—you replied entirely—

MR. CURTIS: We have confidence in him, and unless it should be suggested otherwise we are prepared to accept his figures. We feel he is a responsible party. He not only was with the firm and knew all about the transactions but he is continuing with the firm. Although it has not been decided finally that we will accept his figures, we will, unless there is reason to question them, and unless we can

find someone who can properly analyze them and certify them.

MR. BROWNE: Could I ask one more question on that? Did the Auditor General at any time inspect the books or any of these officially?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, all the books of the company have been inspected by the Auditor General from time to time, during the past two years.

Orders of The Day

First Readings:

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Trustees Act"; On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it would be well to give now at this juncture, first readings of Bills presented today so that we could get on with the next step tomorrow?

MR. SPEAKER: At this juncture the House asks for leave to have certain Bills read a first time without notice.

On motion leave given to read sundry Bills a first time without notice.

Honorable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Stamp Act" — On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honorable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Judicature Act."

On motion read a first time— ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the Attorney General what that is?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, if I may? This is a Bill to enable us to appoint sub-sheriffs in Corner Brook and one in Grand Falls should we have a district court there — that is practically the whole thing.

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Constabulary Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Finance asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, could someone tell us what that is?

MR. CURTIS: I understand, Mr. Speaker, this deals with pensions in conflict with the Constabulary Act.

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

Honourable the Minister of Economic Development asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Construction of a Railway to Wabush Lake." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Economic Development asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to enter into an Agreement with the British Newfoundland Corporation, Limited, and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to an Agreement dated the 21st day of May 1953." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Election Act, 1954."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would give us the gist of what that is supposed to be?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing very formidable attached to it. Actually the Redistribution Bill because it became law necessitates some change in the Election Act in regard to taking lists of electors. That is the only subsequent provision in the Bill. The rest is just tied up with renumbering and that sort of thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course — so that an election can be held in the Spring.

MR. HOLLETT: Which Spring?

MR. HIGGINS: If the ice moves off.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister is misinformed. The Redistribution Bill is not law yet.

On motion this Bill read a first time, ordered referred for second reading on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authorities Guarantee Act, 1952." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Education asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Minister of Education could tell us the purpose of this Act?

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill, is being requested by the Church of England Authorities, to change their regulations presently in force which requires two school boards in the City of St. John's. They want one school board.

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

Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Processing of Pothead and Minke Whales." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Second Reading:

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Payment of Bounties on the Construction of Fishing Ships."

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of this Bill, "An Act Respecting the Payment of Bounties on the Construction of Fishing Ships." The Bill asks the House to approve that the Government of Newfoundland should continue to do something that the Government of Newfoundland has done for longer than all of us who are here can remember, only now to do a bit more of it. For close on three generations, governments in Newfoundland have assisted in the building of vessels for us in the fisheries and in the trade of Newfoundland. There was in 1880 an Act to provide

for the encouragement of shipbuilding and for other purposes. And there appears to have been some such legislation on our statute books ever since. And the measure of assistance that has been made available has grown more generous with the years. It is interesting to note that in that Act of 1880 a bounty of \$2.00 per ton was payable upon all vessels of not less than thirty tons, built from the keel up in this country. And the first bounty of \$2.00 per ton was payable on any such vessels that were within two years after registration bonafidely employed for one season of three months' duration in the prosecution of the deep sea, bank fishery.

The payments that are in effect today are, of course, decidedly more generous. The Act in force at the moment, Chapter 221 of the Revised Statutes of 1952 was passed in 1938, and has been amended from time to time. These are provided for under this existing legislation bounties on fishing ships of from twenty to one hundred and fifty tons built according to a certain schedule; a bounty of \$90 a ton in the hull; on fishing ships of from twelve to thirty tons built according to another schedule a bounty of \$70 per ton on the hull. And if the owner of a fishing ship undertakes to put in his vessel and does put in an adequate engine, then he is eligible for additional bounties of \$100 per nominal horsepower in respect of the engine. Existing legislation makes this provision for bounties upon trading vessels. On trading vessels of from twelve tons to thirty tons, built according to a certain schedule, a bounty of \$20 per ton on the hull, and on trading vessels of from twenty tons to one hundred and fifty tons, built according to another schedule, a bounty of \$30 per ton on the hull.

If the owner of a trading vessel undertakes to put in an adequate engine and does put it in, then he becomes eligible for an additional bounty of ten dollars per ton on the hull and also a bounty in respect of the engine of \$75 per nominal horsepower.

The Bill for which I now seek the approval of the Legislature reflects and stems from these three things (1) the experiences of the years in administering ship building bounties, particularly under the Act of 1938, (2) the changes in methods and emphasis on the fisheries of Newfoundland and (3) the development of the Government's policy in fisheries, especially where the construction of fishing ships is concerned. The Bill now before the House proposes a goodly number of changes in the Ship Building Bounties legislation as it presently stands. Of these changes the one that likely will be found most interesting is the proposal to increase the bounties to be paid upon the hull of a fishing vessel of new construction to one hundred and sixty dollars per ton. Now, having said that, I should go on in the same breath to point out that while at the present moment the highest possible bounty being paid in respect of hull construction of a fishing ship is \$90 per ton, this proposal is to increase the bounty to \$160 per ton does not reflect a proportionate increase of \$70 per ton. If I appear to be contradicting myself in saying that, I only appear to be. In determining the new rate, subject to the Legislature, the Government took two bites. The first bite had to do with whether and by how much they should be increased, this present bounty payment of \$90 per ton on the hull. It was recognized that in order to increase appreciably the productivity of our inshore fishery they have to be given greater

mobility, and larger and more efficient crafts. Now the beginning has already been made in this direction with the introduction of the long liner and Danish seiners and inshore draggers. It follows, of course, that this type of mechanized fishing brings with it considerable increase in capital costs because of the need for diesel and for special mechanized equipment such as radio-telephones, depth recorders, mechanical winches, etc. We are also confronted today with a considerable increased construction cost due to the higher cost of labour and materials and to higher standards of construction.

Now, of course, the fishermen who built these newer type boats hope to come by a proportionate higher return from their investment. Unfortunately many of them are not in a position, without Government assistance, to make the original capital outlay required. It is true that a fisherman when he gives an undertaking and plans to build, up to ten per cent of the estimated cost of his boat, he can get long-term financing from the Fisheries Loan Board and on completion of his boat, if he has built a long liner or a dragger he can get a Federal subsidy of \$165 per ton after the issue of a certificate of inspection. But, without the Provincial bounty, many fishermen would likely find that they would have to borrow from the Fisheries Loan Board to such a dimension as would make the venture of building and operating a boat uneconomical. Therefore, I think it is safe to say that without the Provincial bounty a great many of the new type boats that are now in operation would never have been built. So, because of the considerably increased construction costs that are involved in such a fully equipped modern fishing boat,

the Government decided to recommend to the Legislature that the bounty on the hull should be increased from \$90 to \$110 per ton in order that the cost may in some measure be offset. Now, at first sight, it may appear that \$20 is a meagre enough increase in view of the increased costs of construction involved in ship building today. But when it is remembered that considerable financial assistance can be had from the Fisheries Loan Board and that, where a fisherman is building a long liner or a dragger a sizable Federal subsidy is involved, then, I think, the House will agree a considerable measure of encouragement is available in the construction of fishing ships.

The second bite the Government took at the cherry had to do with the decision to recommend that for the future the bounty upon engines should be eliminated. In the first place, payments of bounties on engines were put into effect in order to encourage the building of boats with motive power so that we would not build up a fleet that would be dependent upon sail power alone. The Bill before us proposes that for the future bounties shall be paid only upon power vessels. But with the prime reason of paying the bounties on engines eliminated the bounties themselves might well be eliminated. The second consideration is this: It is felt desirable for the future that the department administering bounty payments should be in a position to indicate what type of engine should go into a specific boat. Now I do not mean by that the department should become involved in recommending brand names — Quite a hornet's nest that would stir up — But I do suggest that the technical personnel of the department are in a much better posi-

tion to indicate the performance that should be required of the machinery that is going to power a specific boat, rather than, say, a fisherman building a boat, a long liner or a dragger, for the first time. It has been a cause of some friction now and then that the department has known and has desired and has indicated that an engine of a particular type should go in a specific boat, but the fishermen have held out for a different type of engine, mostly for reasons of a higher bounty being involved. So, for the future, the boat builder is more likely to take the guidance of the department in this matter if engine bounties were not to be a consideration.

It is therefore proposed that the engine bounty should be eliminated. Now the suggestion is not that all persons who build fishing ships should for the future have to forego the monetary advantages involved in getting the engine bounties. The suggestion is that the bounty on the hull and the bounty on the engine be compounded, that is that the whole be paid upon the hull itself. It has been calculated that fifty dollars per ton is a fair average on a per ton basis, half the bounty that is being paid on engines on a number of typical vessels — So in the Bill before the House it is proposed that the bounty on the hull of fishing ships should be increased to \$160 a ton, which is a compounding of the newly recommended bounty of \$110 on the hull and the old fifty dollars per ton equivalent on the engine.

I think it would be worthwhile at this juncture to digress for a moment to have a look at the financing of say a typical long liner of under fifty feet to be built under the proposed bounty with the Federal subsidy and with assistance from the Loan Board. Let us suppose the gross ton average of a

typical long liner would be thirty tons, in round figures, which is a good average running figure for boats of that class. The Provincial bounty on such a boat would be thirty times \$160 or \$4,800; the Federal subsidy would be thirty times \$160 or \$4,800. So that the person building would get unrepayable assistance in the amount of \$9,650. His boat would cost him at the present rate of prices, say, \$700 per ton to build a long liner, \$21,000. The fisherman who is building would have to make an investment of ten per cent of that estimated cost. That investment in cash or kind could be labour or material or both. He can get assistance from the Fisheries Loan Board as needed to complete his boat. When the boat is completed, after assignment of any balance of Provincial bounty or Federal subsidy to the Loan Board, he would have a balance to pay the Loan Board of \$9,150. He would have ten years, if necessary, in which to repay that amount and interest would be at the rate of $3\frac{1}{2}\%$. I think, as I have said, the House will agree, having these facts in mind, that a considerable measure of encouragement is made available in respect of the construction of fishing ships.

Before I proceed further, I feel that I should draw the attention of the House to the fact that whereas the existing ship building bounty legislation is concerned with the paying of a bounty on the construction of both fishing and trading vessels, the Bill presently before the House is concerned only with paying a bounty in respect of the construction of fishing ships. The whole problem of our trading vessels is one that requires further study and investigation and very likely consultations with the Government of Canada? Honourable members will be aware of the recent es-

tablishment of a Royal Commission on the Coastal Shipping of Canada. Steps are being taken by the Government of Newfoundland to ensure the careful preparation and the adequate presentation of Newfoundland's case to that Commission. In addition to the whole broad picture of our around the Island coastal trade and of our trading vessels will be looked at to determine what action may be necessary on the part of the Newfoundland Government to assist. To that end the Government has asked certain gentlemen to constitute a Committee to inquire into these matters. I am in a position to give four of the names of the gentlemen concerned. Mr. Grieve, President of the Newfoundland Fish Trades Association; Captain Arch Hayes, President of the Coastal Shipping Association; R. A. Harvey, Lloyd's Surveyor and Director of Vessel Construction in the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives; Mr. Ross Young, a member of the Fisheries Development Authority. A fifth gentleman from out of town, who is involved in the coastal trade of Newfoundland, has been asked to act on this Committee. We are presently waiting to hear from him. There has not been enough time as yet to hear from him. But when he replies, and I hope accepts, I will be in a position to give his name. But until such time as that Committee may report it is thought wiser that the Government of Newfoundland should not make any decision in regard to the bounty upon trading vessels nor make any other decisions about trading vessels until they have the full facts before them. Consequently, it is proposed that instead of including trading vessels in the present Act that bounties on trading vessels should continue to be paid under the existing legislation, which

will be repealed only insofar as it pertains to fishing ships. Now the development of Government's assistance where fishing vessels are concerned is further reflected in the proposal, for the future bounties should not be paid upon sailing vessels. Power is a most important requisite of the modern fishing vessel. Therefore, unless a ship is adequately powered it will not be eligible for bounty, under the Bill now before the House. It would be unnecessary to dwell on that aspect of fishing ships. It would be inconceivable that any serious minded fishermen in this day and age would build a boat not adequately powered. I need only mention the need for power to take his boat rapidly to and from the fishing grounds or to and from establishments, in which any loss of time consistent with the distance and time involved, or the need for staying out overnight, going further from shore than the traditional pattern in search for new fishing grounds. All this is apart and separate from the need for power for the operation of mechanical equipment.

With the principle of this Bill I doubt any member of the House will be in disagreement. The principle may be said to be that bounties shall continue to be paid to assist in the construction of vessels for use in the fisheries of Newfoundland. That is a practice sanctioned by history and has been proven to be wise by the experiences of the years.

There are other changes that this Bill proposes, Mr. Speaker, but as they are a matter of detail, any specific thing can be considered in Committee of the Whole. And I move the second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take up the time

of the House on second reading of this Bill because I have only had it passed to me this afternoon since the Honourable Minister got to his feet to introduce it. Therefore I am not competent to speak on the Bill to any great extent, except I say that I feel quite sure that we on this side of the House, and I know we are definitely in accord with the general principle of the Bill that is, to increase the bounties for the building of properly equipped fishing ships.

As the Honourable Minister had pointed out, there is no member in this House who could be in discord with the general principle. There may be certain things in connection with certain sections of the Bill which we might want to discuss at length, but as for the general principle of the Bill, I feel that we can offer the Government every support. We on this side, and I am quite sure the Government, realize that unless something of the nature of this Bill is introduced, very shortly we won't have any fishermen. We won't have any fishermen, Mr. Speaker, because under the present setup it is not possible, only in a few instances, for a fisherman to make sufficient money to give himself and his family a living anywhere in keeping with that which, I should say, the miner who goes into the mines or the logger who goes into the woods or into any other occupation in this country. The fisherman has no chance whatsoever to survive as a fisherman under the present setup. I am deeply cognizant of the effort which the Government has been making with regard to the Royal Commission in connection with the fishery and fish prices and all that sort of thing. Only today before I came down here I was reading the report of the Fisheries Authority. That was in March 1954. Ap-

parently they have not told us anything they did during the last twelve months. But we do realize the magnitude of the problem. Here you have an industry, ancient as is Newfoundland, in competition with the other countries of the world. As a matter of fact these countries were for a time our chief markets. They are now generally our very close competitors in producing fish for their own people. We are up against that problem. We realize, of course, that as soon as possible, we ought to change our fishing from the salt fish business as much as possible in all parts of the coast where it is possible to do that, and only, I believe, devote our efforts to the salt fishery in those areas in Newfoundland where a fresh fish industry is not feasible.

I am wholly in accord with the Minister when he says it is absolutely essential that our fishing vessels be modernized, that the fishermen should be able to move quickly from one place to another, from one scene of the battle of life to another one, from one bank to another. To do that he has to have adequate power. I am also aware of the fact that \$160 per ton today does not compare too largely in excess of the bounty of \$90 which had been paid heretofore, when we realize that the costs of construction and material for the construction and equipment for a ship today are practically three times as much as they were, say, twenty years ago. I am quite sure that the Government in granting \$160 per ton bounty are not being as generous as they themselves even would like to be. But we do all realize, of course, the Treasury has certain commitments and certain capacities only, and how that \$160 per ton is going to be worked out I personally at the moment cannot say unless I had an opportunity to dis-

cuss it with people in the fish business who have keener knowledge of it than I have. Again, I say, Sir, we are in accord with any piece of legislation brought in here in order to enhance the living conditions of our fishermen in the many, many places around the coast. Today many of these places are beginning to be abandoned by forthright fishermen, fishermen who are most anxious to earn a livelihood at fishing and to remain at it, and unless they are subsidized — say what you like — the farmers of Western Canada are subsidized — only it should be more so now because our fishermen have to build something upon which to build something, so to speak, because their fishing gear is outmoded, the fishing boats are outmoded. And unless they can get help from the Government or some other financial body then they will have to leave the fishing business. Yes, we are in wholehearted accordance with the principle of the Bill. And I would like to congratulate the Minister on having the honour of bringing in such a Bill as this.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to that of the Leader of the Opposition to this Bill. As he says, \$160, while it may appear large in comparison with \$90 given in 1938, is not so great after all, especially when taking out the \$50 which has been given for the installation of engines.

There is one feature about this I would like to make reference to, that is, in regard to the type of vessels being constructed in the future, I remember about three years ago meeting a ship builder in the north shore of New Brunswick. As you know, the north shore of New Brunswick is a fishing coast. And the fishermen from that coast fish out in the Straits, in the Gulf

of St. Lawrence and along the coast of Newfoundland. Some of them are being blamed for taking our salmon. This shipbuilder told me that the day of the old-fashioned boat is gone and that even the long liner was out-of-date, and the thing to go in for was the dragger. I hope that the Minister will see that his officials give advice to the people who come looking for long liners. From what I have found from people I have met in Placentia Bay and even in my honourable friend's district now, in Ferryland, the long liner has not been too happy a success in that area.

MR. MURRAY: There has not been any there.

MR. BROWNE: One in Portugal Cove. But the dragger seems to be a very modern fishing craft. No doubt the officials in the department are aware of that. Now I was astonished when I heard about it because at that time everybody down here was talking long liner, and I did not think they would go out of favour so quickly. But it is a good thing to see the intention to modernize our vessels and it is good to see there is no longer any bounty being paid on sailing vessels. I don't suppose there are so many being built anyway. Everybody who builds intends to put an engine in. But I do feel the position about the dragger ought to be kept in mind.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, as one who comes from a fishing district, one time one of the greatest fishing districts in Newfoundland, I rise to support this Bill, with the hope that it may in some measure help to bring back the interest in the fisheries which has certainly declined to some extent on the south coast, because the bank fishery has gone out and there has been nothing else to take its place.

Now it is very difficult and very expensive for anybody to build a banker today, but these fishing boats, I note that the minimum is 12 tons and the maximum 159 tons to qualify for this bounty of \$160 per ton, and the building of vessels of this type would be paid for in part by the Government. I do hope, Sir, that the regulations for the payment of these bounties will be given the fullest publicity so that our fishermen can understand and will know what these regulations are. I have come across instances where people have built small ships intending to use them at the fishery and then found they were not able to qualify for any bounty at all.

I won't get a chance to say anything about this Bill in Committee so —

MR. BROWNE: Pass the information on to us and we will take it up for you.

MR. COURAGE: I certainly approve of this Bill, and the \$160 per ton is a fairly large amount although it certainly is not too large to pay in order to help subsidize the construction of vessels. I congratulate the Minister on having brought in this Bill, and I do hope that his hopes for the fulfilment of its purpose will be realized.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, there is just one final word I want to say. I want to thank the honourable member for the courteous remarks made about this Bill and about myself in producing it. I just want to say in reply, by way of information to the honourable member for St. John's West that the department, in the building of new crafts, does keep a very close eye on the actual construction of the hull and here latterly upon the superstructure of these boats and

how they are outfitted. Actually in this new Bill we are looking for authority that would put us in a position to be able to require the acceptance of what we know from experience is the better procedure to be followed. We are also gradually building up a staff particularly qualified in that regard. I may say that within the last year the Fisheries Development Authority acquired the services of a naval architect who is concentrating particularly upon the designing of crafts particularly adaptable for locations in Newfoundland, not just Newfoundland but particular locations in Newfoundland. One of the jobs he has turned out and has completed his drawings for recently and blue prints are now available for fishermen. Most of the long liners built so far have been around 56 feet and 59 feet the top of that scale for Federal bounties—Fishermen have come into the department from time to time and have given us the idea they want smaller types of boats. At the other end of the scale 46 and 47 feet, this naval architect has produced plans. And plans of that type are now available for fishermen who want to build the smaller type boat. But the situation is watched closely, and we are building up crafts to deal with the situation.

MR. HOLLETT: What is his name?

MR. KEOUGH: His name is Harrison—He comes from Lloyd's of London.

On motion Bill read a second time and ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion the House then recessed for ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to

Amend the Life and Accident Insurance Agents (Licensing) Act."

MR. SPEAKER: Let me first remind honourable members that the motion was made on the 6th, I think, by the Honourable Minister of Finance, and the debate was adjourned at the request of the Opposition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I had forgotten the fact that the moving of that motion had already been made by my honourable colleague, and thinking that the duty fell to me to do so, I equipped myself duly with all necessary facts, with which I am now prepared to regale the House at any length desired.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Does the Premier intend to close the debate?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, Mr. Speaker, just in case the House has forgotten the facts given by the Honourable Minister of Finance. There are two sections. The meaning of the two sections is extremely simple. In one it is to strike out the words "Any payment by him of a fee of five dollars" and substituting therefor the words "and payment by him of such fee as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council prescribes by regulations." That is perfectly plain as to its meaning.

Then the same thing almost exactly in the next section of the Bill:

Now I may say, Mr. Speaker, in the past three or four years the Government, in the Department of Finance, have been making a strong effort to prepare legislation for the House here to clean up the insurance situation generally and to bring controlling regulations and some discipline into the whole field of insurance, life,

fire, accident, marine, etc., insofar as it is proper by legislation to do so and insofar as it effects the legislative jurisdiction of the Government over insurance. This is the latest in the series of such Bills or amendments to Bills to come before us. The feeling in the Treasury, so they tell me, is that they ought not, the Government ought not to be limited to fixed fees stated by Statute. It should have much more flexibility. Now I asked if in fact, since this same type of amendment was made in other parts of other Bills—the present Bill you see has to do with life and accident insurance agents, whereas there are other Bills affecting other types of insurance amended in other sessions of this House. I asked as with this other amendment, whether in fact they want the amendment made to strike out a fixed fee and substitute a flexible formula under which the Governor in Council could fix a fee. I was informed that in fact only one change has as yet been made, namely in the case of insurance companies as distinct from insurance agents. I asked then if it was likely if the Treasury would recommend any changes with regard to that amendment, should this amendment become law, and they told me, only with regard to the distinction to be drawn between resident and non-resident agents. It is the intention of the Treasury to recommend to the Government, should that amendment pass and become law, that a higher fee be charged for non-resident than for resident agents. So, according to the intention of the Treasury Department, and it is they who administer all insurance legislation, they only intend that that sole distinction be made. But even that they could do only if that Act is amended either in the form suggested here or in citing stated

fees and having the definite fees named in the Statutes, which we consider to be an undesirable thing to do.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I looked through this Bill the other day, and I notice the section having to do with the licensing of sub-agents:

4.—(1) The Minister may issue to any person who has complied with the requirements of this Act a licence authorizing such person to carry on business as an agent subject to the provisions of this Act and to the terms of the licence.

(2) Upon written notice to the Minister that an insurer has appointed a person to act as its agent in Newfoundland or that the agent of an insurer licensed to transact the business of insurance in Newfoundland under The Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act has appointed a person to act as his sub-agent in Newfoundland and upon due application of such person upon a form prescribed by the Minister and payment by him of a fee of five dollars, the Minister shall, if he is satisfied that the applicant is a suitable person to receive a licence and intends to hold himself out publicly and carry on business in good faith as an agent, issue to the applicant a licence which shall state in substance that the holder is, during the term of the licence, authorized to carry on within Newfoundland the business of an agent: Provided that if for any reason the Minister is of the opinion that an applicant is not a suitable person to receive a licence, he may at his discretion refuse him a licence.

(3) Such notice of appointment by an insurer or agent as aforesaid shall be upon a form prescribed by the Minister and shall state that the applicant has been authorized in writing by the

insurer or agent to act as agent or sub-agent respectively as aforesaid in the soliciting of and negotiating for insurance and shall be accompanied by a sworn statement of the applicant on a form prescribed by the Minister which shall give the name, age, residence and present occupation of the applicant and his occupation for the five years next preceding the date of the notice and particulars of any other employment in which he may be engaged and such other information as the Minister may require.

(4) Licences so issued shall be of two classes:

- (a) Licences covering insurance transacted by insurers licenced under The Life Insurance Companies Act; and
- (b) licences covering insurance transacted by insurers licenced under The Accident Insurance Companies (Licencing) Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Actually anyone who is not the manager of a company. In Newfoundland they are all so-called and are in fact sub-agents according to that.

MR. BROWNE: I know that. The Premier has now stated that the department says there should be a flexible formula, but in the case he referred to as an illustration only one change has been made — I don't know if it would be very great in the case of a corporation, probably fifty, a hundred or two hundred dollars. No doubt that is what they have in mind here — the amending section says it shall be done by regulations.

There is no provision here for the publishing of the regulations, so another section will have to be put in to deal with the publishing or regulations.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is not that in the Act as it stands?

MR. BROWNE: No I could not find any reference in the Act. It seems to be a very small point upon which to make regulations — if the officers in the Department of Finance think it is necessary — but I cannot follow the Premier — If he is going to reply; perhaps he can tell us what is the reason. I cannot see the reason for not being able to specify in the Bill the amount that is going to be charged, if it is so unlikely that it is going to be used very much.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That point seems to me to be very sensible. Frankly I am fed up with these deputy ministerial Bills, Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputies get their heads together every year and flood us with Bills. We could do nothing else here for months but pass all kinds of departmental Bills. I usually don't take the slightest interest in them. I am forced to this because my colleague is absent. I frankly don't care if it passes or not. But that is what the Department of Finance wanted. And they are responsible for carrying out the departmental supervision. They are, I believe, doing a good job. We appointed Mr. Walter Marshall, Deputy Minister of Finance to be our Newfoundland Insurance Commissioner or Superintendent.

MR. BROWNE: He is under the Superintendent who is at Ottawa.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is the Newfoundland Commissioner or Superintendent or top-dog. He is the man who is in charge of all governmental supervision or regulations on insurance. He is the man. And he keeps sending us these amending Bills. And I suppose it is all right. We pass them here very dutifully every year. For

the last five years we have been passing these Bills. We have not heard any had effects nor have we seen any had effects, so we just pass them.

MR. BROWNE: I notice, on Monday or Tuesday, if I think, of this week — I just want to ask a question on this, if I may, with the consent of the House — that rules or regulations came from the Department of Finance to my office. I don't know if any other members received them. They were in a little green book, I passed over to an insurance agent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are circulated in thousands, these booklets.

On motion Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the District Courts Act."

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading was moved by the Honourable the Attorney General. It was spoken to by the honourable member for St. John's East and by the honourable member for St. John's West who asked that it be adjourned.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday when that matter was adjourned I asked to be permitted to look over the very lengthy memorandum supplied by one of the officials of the Department of the Attorney General, and which really does not have very much to do with the Bill itself.

I would like to say a few things about the Bill. This Bill amends the Central District Court Act which is Chapter 116.

MR. CURTIS: The District Courts Act.

MR. BROWNE: I am so used to

that title. That Act is in respect of the District Courts, and if I remember rightly, yesterday the Attorney General in introducing this Bill gave me to understand that there only will be two of three district courts, although under the Act which was passed some years ago, there is room for seven, and under the Government legislation introduced at Ottawa provision had been made for the payment of the salaries of five. Now these two judges of these two courts, the St. John's District North, and Centre or South. I don't know which it is; the District Court has a judge and Corner Brook has a judge. I don't know what that is called, Humber District I suppose. So that there are only two judges appointed about three years and have been drawing their salaries. What we are interested in, and what the public should be interested in, is when they are going to function?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have been wondering that ourselves.

MR. BROWNE: When are they going to start? They are drawing their salaries and doing nothing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The best jobs in Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: Their services to the Liberal Party must have been tremendous.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are Liberals.

MR. BROWNE: For such a reward!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nothing is too good for a good Liberal.

MR. BROWNE: It looks like that anyhow. I don't know how good they were, but ten thousand dollars a year is certainly a rich reward, and with nothing to do only to walk around.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is more than the Premier gets.

MR. BROWNE: No. He has an abundance of offices.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No—Not on the hierarchy.

MR. BROWNE: He is other things. The public is interested. When are the courts going to function? We have heard nothing about that. Yesterday we were told about what they were supposed to do. I don't think there should be so very much difficulty about what they should do. In fact they should have been functioning years ago. I don't know why they were not appointed at the beginning of Confederation, when they came into effect, when the Government went to such trouble to penalize the incumbent of the office, and prevent the functioning of the office at that time. I don't wish to elaborate on that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Come on — elaborate.

MR. BROWNE: No thanks! I am quite satisfied.

There are in the Magistrates Court here in St. John's today two men who have been so very well trained, and who have been accustomed there to hearing the time of cases which are going to be heard by these district courts. They are perfectly well qualified to take over these courts and operate them nicely at any time. The Magistrates Court itself could have been transformed just by regulations almost into a District Court, because it has functioned for about ninety years as a District Court, and there should not have been any difficulty at all about setting up the District Court in St. John's. I must say, although the Government seems to be amused — at least the Premier seems to be amused at the

fact that the judges are walking around doing nothing, nevertheless the Government, it seems to me, are the ones who are responsible because these courts are not functioning. I hope now that they are going to get this amendment through that we will certainly see them functioning before this year is over, or before many years pass.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being told by the Honourable the Premier that I am incompetent to speak to this Bill, I want to say a word. I was a bit worried about that particular part where it says a person may be tried without a jury. But I have been informed by my learned friend on my left that the matter is perfectly straightforward and deals particularly with the laws of the Province and the Criminal Code. But I was reminded how necessary and essential it is that people should be allowed to have a jury, because I recall one time when sitting on a bench a man came before me for vagrancy, I think. It was late in the Fall. It was his habit to come before the magistrate for vagrancy, and he had been before me once or twice before this particular Fall. It was getting cold you see. Instead of sending him to prison I dismissed the charge against him for vagrancy. He was quite indignant, and said he wanted to go to gaol. He said: "If you don't send me there I want a jury." So I think we should be allowed to have a jury. But these matters are fixed up, I think.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak I would like to say, I think my honourable friend from St. John's West got off on a familiar topic when he got on the topic of "trial by jury," and misread the section of the Act or the explanation I tried to make in dealing with

it. Actually this amendment to the Bill does not affect in any way "trial by jury." The District Courts are not criminal courts in the first instance. The only cases under the Criminal Code that come before District Courts are cases where on his own election an accused asks for speedy trial. And when an accused asks for a speedy trial, the trial is before a judge of the District Court. And speedy trials are not trials by jury. Consequently, the only criminal cases under the Code that will come before these judges are cases where the accused himself has asked for a speedy trial.

MR. BROWNE: Whom does he ask?

MR. CURTIS: He asks the committing magistrate. So that "trial by jury" is not affected by the amendment. The act does provide there shall be no trial by jury for civil cases within the District Courts. If any plaintiff or any defendant wants "trial by jury" his right is to take his action, if the plaintiff, into the Supreme Court, or if a defendant wants trial by jury he can ask at the Central District Court to have his case transferred to the Supreme Court where it would get trial by jury. But certainly it is not our thought that we should have trial by jury in the Central District Court. The Court's function, as I have said, is only in the case of speedy trial on parts of Section 16 of the Criminal Code, and in the case of provincial offences, such as a breach of the Highway Traffic Act or some other Act, or in civil cases where the amount involved is inconsiderable. In these cases, we feel the County Court has full power, the judges are competent to deal with such cases.

I would move the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting the Mortier Bay Development Company Limited."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at any great length in moving the second reading of this Bill, nor do I propose to ask the House to enter upon this debate this afternoon. For this reason, I have asked my colleague the honourable the member for Placentia West to give the House the benefit of the careful study that he has made of this whole matter, the better to enable the House to understand, debate and decide on this particular Bill. Unfortunately the honourable member is home sick today and yesterday and may possibly be home sick tomorrow. At all events, when he does return to the House he will participate in the debate.

Now the House may feel that it wishes to go ahead and debate the Bill. But I would not wish, personally, to see the second reading given until that honourable gentleman has had an opportunity to give the House the benefit of his studies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the establishment of a free port in this Island is not a new idea. Indeed it is quite an old one. It was introduced into Newfoundland by the late Mr. H. C. Thompson, very widely known in Newfoundland as "Fog-free Thompson." Mr. Thompson came out to Newfoundland — Oh it must have been half a century ago — from England, with a rather striking idea. The idea was to establish in Green Bay a large Trans-Atlantic seaport. To that seaport in Green Bay would come Trans-Atlantic passenger liners as well as freight ships. The port was to be in

Green Bay because Green Bay, he found, was free of fog, and he put that name on it, "fog-free." He thereby gave himself a nickname that stuck to him to the day of his death and even to this day. Now from that seaport in Green Bay a short railway would run across the neck of the Northern Peninsula, somewhere across say —

MR. MURRAY: From Great Cats Arm.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I don't think so. It was to run across the land from Green Bay near the head of White Bay. That is, say, somewhere south of Hampden and then across to Bonne Bay. It was to run, in short, from Green Bay to Bonne Bay. From Klug's Point in Bonne Bay, perhaps, to some point in Bonne Bay. Then in Bonne Bay another boat would complete the trip in sheltered waters or the relatively sheltered water of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and on to Montreal. In that way the trip across the Atlantic, if you could regard the trip from Montreal to Bonne Bay as not being across the Atlantic but as being just a pleasant excursion on an inland lake, then a rail trip to Green Bay; then the trip across the Atlantic was to be several days more quickly made in each direction than by following the normal course. Well, that idea vanished. That idea was thrown overboard down through the years. And finally Mr. Thompson came around to an entirely different idea, which was to establish a free port in Newfoundland, specifically in Mortier Bay on the west side of Placentia Bay. Certainly he did select one magnificent harbour because, as you travel around that harbour by boat or on foot or fly over it, as I have done a number of times in an aircraft, you see that it is truly a magnificent harbour.

So he got this idea. Well he was able to get to the various governments, beginning with Sir Robert Bond and continuing with Sir Edward Morris and Sir Richard Squires and later Mr. Monroe. And he was able to get the necessary legislative report for his idea, because the Statute Books bear eloquent evidence of the influence of Mr. Thompson upon the various Governments of Newfoundland, for almost half a century. The Commission of Government in turn also enacted legislation. Mr. Thompson made a great effort to interest great and important people — I remember discussing the matter with him on one occasion for about two days off and on, all day. I wrote a lot about the matter myself. I wrote one article in particular for the Sunday edition of the New York Times with maps and illustrations. It was a very striking idea — Well from the standpoint of a newspaper it was a striking idea. Mr. Thompson went to Detroit. He went to Cleveland. He went to other American cities on the Great Lakes. And he got from the Board of Trade and the Chamber of Commerce in each of them, very strong and very enthusiastic support for his idea of a free port in Mortier Bay, to be reached from these Great Lake cities by boat, with low draft that would navigate even in salt water as far as Mortier Bay, even if they could not attempt the Trans-Atlantic and the South Atlantic crossings, thus piling up motor cars and beef and livestock and grains and cereals in great mountains in Mortier Bay during the shipping season. They could put so much there that ocean-going ships would have enough freight to haul away from Mortier Bay to the Continent of Europe and to the Continent of South America to last them all through the winter, after the St. Lawrence had frozen over and closed and

until it reopened in the following year. And so it went.

Well, Mr. Thompson met a very tragic end. I believe he had just left Newfoundland by means of a boat out of Botwood, one of the AND Company boats, at the very outset of the war. And that boat was torpedoed by a German submarine somewhere in the North Irish Sea. And he lost his life, with several other passengers.

MR. HOLLETT: One other.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, along with that of one other passenger out of eight or a dozen on the boat at that time. That was the end of Mr. Thompson who had reached a ripe age. He must have been close up to eighty years of age at the time of his death. But his idea has not died. It has lodged, for instance, in my mind and doubtless in the minds of others, because it is so spectacular, it is so striking — Consequently when Mr. McLellan, who established the Capital Coach Lines in St. John's, and who in many conversations with me struck me as being a man of very progressive outlook, a man who has really a tenacious faith in the economic possibilities of Newfoundland, so much so that I broached the matter to him and said: "You know there is an idea that some one man, if he had the strength and energy and time, time especially, and enthusiasm, would tackle it it might turn out to be one of the really great ideas of this century on this continent." He wanted to know what it was, so, of course, I told him the story, as far as I could recall it and in such detail as I could marshal from my memory. And he became enormously interested. Well, the House is doubtless aware of the fact that he has been working on it energetically, in Toronto and in Ottawa and in Montreal, and I believe

he has gone across the border into the United States, although I expressed to him the strong hope that it would be made a Canadian project, as much as possible a Newfoundland project, but certainly very much a Canadian project, although I foresaw the inevitability of it being at least in part a United States project as well.

He has enlisted the support of some very important people in Toronto. And I was interested to see that John Fisher, who admittedly is not an industrialist nor a financier nor a banker, but is an exceedingly brilliant and able radio commentator, and who in the course of a year meets up with a great many extremely powerful and influential men in the United States as well as in Canada, has become greatly interested and has devoted an entire radio broadcast to it on the National network of the C.B.C., and since then has referred to it very frequently at the many dinners and banquets and conventions he is invited to address. John Fisher has constituted himself a sort of one-man crusader for Newfoundland on the Mainland, to boost Newfoundland to sell to his fellow Newfoundlanders the idea that Newfoundland is a great Province and Newfoundlanders are great people of whom Canada should be extremely proud that we have become Canadians.

Now, Sir, to be quite frank — I don't know if this thing will ever come to anything. I frankly don't know. How can I know? How can anyone know? It is one of those things — It is not like a mine. It is not like forests. It is not like water power. It is a great idea. Now it may be unsound or it may be sound. But it is great. It is big. It is dramatic. What effect the deepening of the waterways will have is a matter that requires far more, certainly far more serious grasp of world

economics that I possess. Where on the surface you would say the deepening of waterways just kills the idea completely — But I have heard it argued very powerfully that the deepening of the waterways is the one thing that makes it inevitable.

Now, Sir, any member who would take the trouble to examine the globe — Unlike the map of the world, a globe of the world — and there identify Mortier Bay on that globe and then from Mortier Bay measure the distances to Europe, to Liverpool, Southampton, to France, to the Mediterranean ports, and from Mortier Bay to South American ports and to the ports of Africa and from Mortier Bay to the Atlantic seaports of the United States and to the Caribbean, he will see, I am sure, that Mortier Bay is by far and much more in the centre of the North Atlantic, of the Western Atlantic, of the Atlantic Basin, shall we call it — That is to say it is more nearly than any other place, in the centre of the great Atlantic Basin, in the centre of the area whose shores are shaped by the Atlantic Ocean. Now that takes in a pretty big territory. It takes in three continents at least if not four. The same might be said, of course, of St. John's or Placentia or Ferryland or Trepassy. But around here in this southern portion of Newfoundland we are more nearly in the centre of the great Atlantic Basin than in any other part of that basin. But as I have said, and as I must repeat, I don't know whether the Mortier Bay project has been rendered obsolete and the idea rendered obsolete by late developments. I don't know. I frankly don't know. I do know that for Newfoundland it is good to have a man like Mr. McLellan pursuing the matter. It is costing Newfoundland precisely nothing. We don't pay one cent

for it. It has cost us the price of the paper to print this Bill and the portion of the time the House that is occupied in debating it and perhaps eventually passing it. That is all it is costing Newfoundland. That and an occasional letter I have written for Mr. McLellan to show that he has some standing, that the Government of Newfoundland are at least interested in it. Now that is all it has cost us. And it is to the good to have a man who is young and energetic and personable and well-spoken and who is able to mix with people to start the ball rolling. It might in the end require much more powerful interests to put the thing over. But in the initial stages, to have a man like McLellan is a distinct advantage to Newfoundland. All we are asking is to pass this Bill. I don't think there is anything in it that is original. I raised the point — I have a very strong ambition to see a very modern fishing industry established in Mortier Bay, in the neighbourhood of Marystown or in Creston or somewhere around there, within Mortier Bay. And I said that I would never accept a proposal on his part which would render physically difficult the starting of a fish industry, a modern fish plant in Mortier Bay. He said: you can put in anything you like in the legislature to protect your idea. And that is, I think, protected here in this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I have anything more to say about it. The thing is pretty clear in its meaning. The details of it, of course, can be thrashed out in Committee of the Whole. The idea is that we give this company the concessions they request to enable them to start an international free port in and around the area of Mortier Bay.

Now, as I have said already, I hope

that my colleague from Placentia West will be here in a day or so., and before this debate is concluded, so as to give the House the benefit of his information. But, in the meanwhile if any other member wishes to speak, of course that is his privilege. If the Opposition wishes to speak we could adjourn after that. If nobody wishes to speak we could adjourn the debate now.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member for Placentia West has something in addition to what the Premier has already said, we would like to hear that. I dare not speak at all now on this Bill as I might be disqualified from speaking again, but meantime I would like an adjournment of the debate.

On motion debate adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: That does not mean the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has to speak as soon as the debate is announced — He may if he wishes.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and Union Electric Light and Power Company Limited Relating to Franchise."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, this Bill proposes the ratification in the House of an agreement made last October between the Government and the Union Electric Light and Power Company of Port Union. It is probably known to the House that the company in question has had a franchise and has been operating as a light and power company since 1916. And from their plant at Port Union they have been able to give light and power to some extent to the neighbourhood of Catalina and Bonavista. It is a mat-

ter of record, Sir, that in 1944 the Clarendville Light and Power Company was given a franchise whereby they were enabled to put in a plant and give light and power to an area around Clarendville. At the time of the original franchise in 1916 it was foreseen that the waterpower available was not sufficient to supply the needs of the Bonavista end of the peninsula, and the option was taken at that time on the water contiguous to Trinity. That option lapsed, as a matter of fact, in 1917, I believe. In the intervening period from then until now there has been talk at different times of trying to extend the Port Union system, because as was foreseen in 1916, time has proven that with the increasing population on the peninsula, particularly with the coming of fish plants to Bonavista, there was not sufficient power for domestic and industrial consumption. As a matter of fact, time and time again, particularly in dry seasons, Sir, curtailment was very great indeed during the summer months.

Three or four years ago the management of the Port Union Company began to explore very seriously the possibility of putting in electrification right up and down the Bonavista Peninsula. They engaged Commander Desbaretts, an engineer, who made a survey of the potentiality of the peninsula not only of the water available but also of the economic aspect. They then came to the Government with a proposition. However, the Government was not quite satisfied to take the figure as submitted. And at a request from the Government, the Power Corporation of Canada was asked to make a corroborative survey, if you like, of what had been done by Commander Desbaretts. His figures were in the main confirmed. So the company approached the Government for a

guarantee of a bond issue of 1.1 million dollars in order that they might carry out electrification of the entire peninsula.

That agreement was signed in October of 1954. Immediately the company began to work. It might be interesting to the House to know that only last week I received information that the dam had been installed near Trinity Pond, which was the main source of the water supply reservoir. The plant is in course of construction, and it is hoped that power will be available by the first of July of this year. The company asked for a fifty year franchise for that area, and they were given a certain period of years, five years, as a matter of fact, to carry out certain installations. But a franchise gives rights to waters which are to be found in the drainage area of Trinity Pond just inside of Trinity, the drainage area of George's Brook, the drainage area of South West Brook, which flows into Clode Sound at Port Blandford, the drainage area of Black Brook which flows into the head of the South West Arm of Random Sound, the drainage area of Lady Pond and the drainage area of its outlet stream which flows into South Sound at Hickman's Harbour, and the drainage area of Trouty Brook which flows into Trinity Bay at Trouty. The area of the franchise begins at Deep Bight in the bottom of Trinity Bay and some five or six miles west to Clarenville to the tip of the Bonavista Peninsula. It will run down the north side of Trinity Bay to join this brook and then across to Lethbridge in Bonavista South. Then after running down the south side of Bonavista Bay, across to Lockston which is three miles inside of Trinity. That is where the power plant is being constructed at the present time. So that, when the whole in-

stallation is completed there will be really electrification of the entire peninsula on both sides, because the existing system now takes care of the area from Port Union to Bonavista, and up to Newman's Cove.

That agreement naturally carries with it certain provisions safeguarding, as far as possible, the position of the Government. It has provisions that the rates set shall be in accordance with those laid down by the Board of Public Utilities. It makes provision for the extension of the system. It makes provisions for failure to carry out the agreement, and the normal things, of course which are found in such agreements. One particular provision in the agreement makes it subject to all rights granted to the British Newfoundland Corporation Limited by the Act No. 63 of 1953, or the BRINCO Agreement.

There has been some talk, particularly during the tenure of office of this particular Government of the boundless potentialities and of the effects of rural electrification upon our people and upon our entire economy. Now this may not be part and parcel of this plan if this plan is ever put into effect, but there is a provision in this agreement whereby at the expiration of twenty years the Government may have the option of purchasing the entire plant.

Of the effect on our economy we have direct evidence already in the rapidly nearing construction of a large fish plant by Fishery Products at Catalina, which, for its success, depends upon the supply of additional power in that particular vicinity. Again, only a few miles up, we have one of the most commodious and naturally safe harbours in all Newfoundland, the harbour of Trinity. On two or

three occasions during the last twenty years it has been considered for certain purposes. One of the drawbacks that has deflected its utilization has been the lack of waterpower. It seems to me, Sir (that by the consummation of this agreement, and by giving the right of electrification of the whole peninsula, the possibility of industrial development of that entire area will be realized. Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I believe that last year we gave the loan of one million dollars to this company, or 1.1 million dollars.

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: At that time I think I drew attention to the fact that the amount of capital already invested in that company is very slight in comparison with the amount of the loan. The loan must have been ten to one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The invested capital, not their worth.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to be able to take up a Bill like this and listen to the explanation, the lucid explanation of the Minister, and be in a position to examine it fairly. I don't know what we can say about it at the present time. I think we ought to have a little time to consider this, if the Minister is agreeable. I would ask him for an adjournment.

On motion debate on second reading adjourned.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Confirm to Bowater's Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Mills Limited Certain Rights and Powers:"

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 42 is a Bill, "An Act to Confirm to Bowater's Newfoundland Pulp and

Paper Mills Limited Certain Rights and Powers." Honourable members of the House will realize that under its various agreements with the Government and under various Acts which have been passed since 1923, this company is vested with certain assets. The company now asks the Government if it will allow it to divide up these assets between itself and its subsidiary. The actual share position of the Bowater's is that the shares are controlled by a company known as the Bowater Company of North America, and all Bowater's assets are now on this side of the water, and are, I understand, now vested in that company.

MR. BROWNE: A Newfoundland company?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, a Mainland company, incorporated, I think, in Montreal.

MR. CURTIS: This company in Montreal controls the Bowater Power and Paper Company of Corner Crook. Now it is proposed to divide up the Corner Brook Company into two companies, one to generate power and the other to continue to manufacture paper. The object is to enable the company to further develop its power resources in the Humber area. They have, as the House may well be aware, much undeveloped water power there. The feeling is that that additional water power can be developed better by a power company than by a paper company. Consequently this Bill is being introduced, in order that the company may be able to divide itself into two parts, and convert its power assets to a new company, which has been incorporated under the name of Bowater's Power Company, Limited.

This Bill does not give the Bowater's Pulp and Power Company power to assign its rights and privileges to any

outside company. The assignment is to be limited to the company which forms a relationship to the parent company.

So that the first clause in the Bill defines a parent company. I don't know really how you would define these new companies except as "cousins" because they would both be owned by the same parent, but they will have no relationship as between one and the other. In other words, the North American company will own the power company and the North American company will also own the paper company.

MR. BROWNE: They will then be brothers, not cousins.

MR. CURTIS: That is right, brothers. The second brother is very young, Mr. Speaker. So that the effect of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is to enable what has been owned and enjoyed by Bowater's Pulp and Paper Company to be now owned and enjoyed by two companies, the Bowaters Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Company and the power end of it, the Bowater's Power Company. The effect of this legislation is simply to provide that the paper company may assign its brother, the power company, certain of its assets, rights and privileges.

Now the Government has agreed to do this, and we are introducing this measure, Mr. Speaker, as we see the advantages to the west coast. The policy of this Government is that, insofar as possible, to develop water powers; and there are water powers not being developed, on the west coast owned by these people, and we think this Act will secure their development. Actually the west coast is hungry for water power. In the second place, it might be pointed out that under the Tax Rental Agreement the Provincial

Government gets from Federal Government fifty per cent of all taxes in the case of power companies. Now this power company will be a peculiar one, because it is tied up with the paper company. For that reason it is not likely that the Minister of Finance, who has certain discretions under the tax agreement, will see his way clear to give us the entire fifty per cent. But we are entitled to and can demand fifty per cent of the other income. The other income in the case of Bowater's Company will, of course, be the money received annually by them from Buchans to whom they supply electricity, Newfoundland Light and Power to whom they supply electricity and to the two new industries on the west coast to which they supply power. So that it is not unlikely that it will be to the peculiar advantage of the Government to have this change made. Lastly, Mr. Speaker, as I intimated when giving notice of this Bill, it is very likely, if the company carries out its proposed transfer, it will have to pay off the "B" debentures which are guaranteed by the Government of Newfoundland. As is known, the Province holds the first or second mortgage on all these assets. And obviously if the company is to transfer them to the power company these mortgages will have to be released. Consequently, it is not unreasonable for us to anticipate that one of the results of this division of ownership liability on the part of these companies will result in Newfoundland being released from its guarantee.

MR. BROWNE: That is not so very much now.

MR. CURTIS: No, but it is still a liability. It is always listed as one of our liabilities.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, we

would like to have tonight at any rate to think over this measure. It is an Act which looks very appropriate. I am wondering if the Minister would agree to postponing the debate until tomorrow? And it is nearly six o'clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are going to sit tonight.

MR. BROWNE: When can we examine this Bill?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the mornings.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether the Government will agree to postponement or not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

On motion debate adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now six o'clock I do leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock tonight.

THURSDAY, April 14th, 1955

NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Slum Clearance Act:"

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, Section 3, sub-section 2 of the Slum Clearance Act, as amended in 1954, provided that, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council the Government may make an agreement with the co-operative society for the purpose of the construction of houses to be conveyed, upon completion of the project, to members of the society together with such land as may be granted by the conveyance. The clause was predicated upon the assumption that a parcel of land would be given to the co-operative society and

then would be sub-divided upon completion of housing projects. That is not the case, however. The land today must be sub-divided and blocks marked out by the individual builders before any permission is given. That is laid down, of course, according to the policy of Municipal Regulations and the C.M. & H. regulations. Consequently that first amendment. The amendment is not only necessary, it is also a nuisance as sometimes solicitors allege it is necessary to secure a minute of council and to register that minute together with the conveyance, in order to give members clear title.

MR. BROWNE: You do not mean that — You said the amendment was not only unnecessary but was also a nuisance?

MR. HEFFERTON: I did not say the amendment was a nuisance, but rather the clause as it stands is a nuisance.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in the amendment of February 1951 between the Federal Government and C.M. & H. certain assessments were carried out along properties in the Housing area, Elizabeth Avenue and neighbouring areas. And these assessments were based upon the total expenditure in proportion to the value of the area served. During the past year we have found several instances where we find that assessment not at all realistic. Consequently we propose an amendment which will endeavour to wipe out some of these apparent anomalies. There are only two major amendments, Sir, in this particular measure, and I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite clear on the meaning of the second amendment proposed, because, as it reads, it says — "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act the

Lieutenant-Governor in Council may revise any assessment imposed under Section 20, whether the assessment was imposed before or after the enactment of this section, (a) by reducing the amount of the assessment, where in his opinion the assessment is too high." It seems to me that is a very vital principle involved in this thing. The Minister, the Government may in any particular case alter the assessment on the property. I cannot see how they can do that without having some system of regulations so we can see the law is being carried out and it is not entirely left to the arbitrary discretion of the Government to sign each individual case. That would result in an individual saying his assessment is too high, and being a good Liberal he could get his assessment reduced. Whereas Mr. Brown or Mr. Jones goes along, and there is no hope for him at all. That does not seem to me to be a reasonable way to leave the law. Looking at it for the first time, it seems to me to be an incorrect piece of legislation. However, perhaps the Minister may have some explanation to give. If not he will be asked to give it when we get into Committee.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might make it a little bit clearer: When this Bill was first introduced it empowered the Province to make a levy against privately owned property within the project area. To some extent the properties benefited from the services to be installed, that the Act put there — But there was an amendment to our original Act which was put into effect. That changed the whole basis of what was actually intended.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The amendment originated on the other side. Mr. Higgins, with the best of intentions, Mr. John Higgins.

MR. HEFFERTON: So, as I have said, in the light of the thing as it now is, no attention is paid to the fact that where the land is shallow or whether it is possible to have a sub-division there or not, it is put down as a firm figure. And we have had to try to bring about changes and work out our basis of assessment far more realistically than they are actually put down there. We had a case in Portugal Cove a few months ago, on which we took some action, in agreement with C.M.&I.L., but it required amending legislation in order that we might be able to carry the thing a little further.

On motion Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Third reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act."

MR. SPEAKER: Motion is that this Bill be now read a third time.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before this Bill is read a third time I would like to make a few remarks, and I also wish to move an amendment. This is the last stage in the passing of this Bill which we consider to be so undesirable, and this is the last opportunity we have of appealing to the Government to desist from the purpose which they have in mind.

We feel that this Bill was not properly prepared; that information which should have been available to them was not used, and that information of the most important nature is available at the present time — I am referring to the voters' lists which have been taken during the past few months. In St. John's, for instance, where it is of chief importance, things have been revised; and so it was possible for the Government to have before them figures giving precisely the

number of voters in each of the proposed constituencies. Instead of that we were given rough estimates of the people who reside in those districts. Then again we have had no denominational figures as regard city areas at all. But the Minister informed us that he used parish registers. Well, it seems to me that any material which was available to the Minister should have been rendered available to the members of the Opposition. How could we form a true picture unless the information was available to us. Instead we are told they depended on the Canadian Census.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, to move an amendment. I move that all the words after "that" be stricken out and the following substituted: "this Bill be not read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months."

I would like to make a few remarks, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, as far as I am concerned of my observations on this piece of legislation. I regret that it has not been possible for a committee to have been able to get together.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order — I don't want to interfere too much at all in this matter with the honourable gentleman. But on third reading only verbal amendments are permitted, I understand; or that it be not now read a third time but read six months hence; and that the very minimum of remarks are permissible. Certainly not at all any debate — I just listened carefully to the honourable gentleman, and it does appear he is about to enter into a debate on the matter, which I think is unconstitutional.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, it is a quarter past — We have passed several Bills in second reading. I have

spoken for about three and a half or three minutes; and the Premier objects to a lengthy debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I must deal with the point of order. I would have to uphold the point of order. I listened carefully to the honourable member's remarks.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have not been allowed to reply to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I assumed the honourable member already had replied to it when he rose to his feet.

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not think you were going to uphold the point of order raised by my honourable friend; that I could not speak and make some remarks upon third reading. I moved an amendment. I must make some remarks to make my amendment clear, and explain what I mean.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order was that the honourable member was about to go into a debate on third reading. That is the point I was upholding. Naturally the honourable member will be permitted to make some remarks to explain his reason for making his amendment. I was not too happy about the nature of the remarks the honourable member made, for this reason; amendments which may be moved on second reading may be moved on third reading with the restriction that they cannot deal with any matter not contained in the Bill. The honourable gentleman's remarks were not confined to the contents of the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: I beg your pardon — May not refer to anything not contained in the Bill?

MR. SPEAKER: Exactly — I could

quote a little longer — On second reading of a Bill amendment may be moved, expressing opinions as to the circumstances connected with the introduction. But this cannot be done on their reading. What the honourable member said borders very closely on expressing an opinion concerning its introduction. Therefore, I feel I have to uphold the point of order. However, on the other hand, I must permit the honourable member to make some remarks, because he has to give some reason for his amendment.

MR. BROWNE: I was going on to say, and had said, I had intended to make a few remarks — Surely when one considers the importance of this piece of legislation, and this is the final stage — The Premier is given great forbearance always in this House when he wishes to make a statement, and surely some similar allowance should be made to us in matters like this.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member said the Premier is allowed more latitude, he certainly is not correct.

MR. BROWNE: The point is we very seldom call him to order as he calls other members to order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is because I very seldom need to be called. I know the rules pretty well.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid I could not give a decision on what might have been done or was not done.

MR. BROWNE: Surely, Mr. Speaker, in moving third reading — I have heard third reading amendments made in the House of Commons, and I have seen people speaking there and give their reasons why they would like to see third reading not going ahead. I have seen it done and have some idea

as to what should be mentioned. I am not going into elaborate details or debate. I am not prepared for that. I was only prepared to speak for two or three minutes; and it seems like the Premier objects to hearing that. What I wished to say was this: If this third reading were deferred for six months it would give the Government an opportunity of availing themselves of the information that has been provided in the voters' lists, to check up on the rough figures which they have; and then they might come to a better solution than they have found. I regret that this Bill has been forced through like this. I consider that it violates the traditional divisions of St. John's for the first time since Representative Government; and I don't believe it is in the interest of anyone. I am not naive enough to think that the Government will be defeated merely because this measure goes through. The Government defeat will depend upon more serious causes than this. I move the amendment.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I second the amendment for the same reason as given by my honourable and learned colleague from St. John's West. If I may be permitted, Sir, I would say the adjournment of the passing of this legislation for six months has already been justified by the changes made since its introduction into the House. I don't propose to delay the House, but do say there is ample justification. Our past experience has shown there was a necessity during the very short time it was before the House for changes. More considered study, I think, would reveal other changes that might be desirable.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment too, Sir. And without going over all the ground covered from this side of the

House before, I must say that I am surprised that the Government could bring in a Redistribution Bill of this nature. There was absolutely no need of it, in my opinion. There was no need of it politically, as far as the Government was concerned, that I could see — There was no need of it. Certainly it was contrary to the necessity — the very afternoon, Sir, we talked about the fisheries and bounties on fishing ships — I submit that the amounts which it will cost to put eight more men in this House is sufficient to buy a couple of long liners — I am not going to argue about that — But I submit this, Sir, in support of this amendment — There are thirteen districts in this island of ours with a population of 80,879 people — I have added them up carefully — who will have thirteen men in this House, or will have under this Act. St. John's with eighty thousand people will have five men. I have argued all along, Sir, that representation here in this House should be of the people. And if that appears to the members on the opposite side of this House as a fair representation then there must be something wrong with my judgment. St. John's, with eighty thousand people will return five members. Now if that is fair, if that is just, if that is honest—

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is repeating a previous speech. I cannot allow him to proceed any further with that argument — The whole debate on second reading will be up again.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order — Third reading is debatable under Section 38.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member refers to Standing Order 38 of the House of Commons of Canada — in Beauschene it states: "all amend-

ments which may be made on second reading may be made on third reading, with the restriction that they cannot deal with any matter not contained in the Bill." The honourable member is talking about things not contained in the Bill. On second reading of a Bill amendments may be made expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction or prosecution or seeking further information. That cannot be done on third reading — That is what the honourable member spoke of when making his amendment. When a Bill comes up for third reading a member may move that it be not now read a third time, or that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending. In future, honourable members must not interrupt the Chair.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I must respectfully point out to Your Honour that in reading the section you misinterpreted the section.

MR. SPEAKER: The way to point out that is to make an appeal to the House.

MR. BROWNE: But, Mr. Speaker, it is just as plain as it possibly could be; on second reading of a Bill an amendment may be moved expressing opinions as to the circumstances. That is not the amendment here. The amendment here is to have the reading in six months hence. That is not the sort of amendment considered here. You have interpreted that, Sir, to mean that any explanations we make are out of order. It is the amendment that is being considered — If the amendment is in order — If the amendment said we rejected the introduction or the manner in which information has been produced we would have been out of order. The amendment itself is in order, and is debatable under Standing Order 38.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if I may, on this point of order, make just one remark, that is, in Committee of the Whole remarks must be strictly relevant to the clause under consideration. How much more therefore, on third reading, must remarks be strictly relevant to an amendment being moved. In the same House of Commons it is common-place to give third reading immediately after a Bill has gone through Committee of the Whole. Third reading is a very routine thing.

MR. BROWNE: By leave.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Third reading is invariably given immediately after it has passed the Committee stage. Then at third reading an amendment may be moved of a verbal character, or a six months hoist, commonly so called. The remarks to that amendment must be rigidly relevant and cannot, surely, consist of the type of speech one would make at second reading. What the honourable gentleman said is strictly relevant to second reading, and in the opinion of His Honour, and it seems to me, so obviously was improper.

MR. SPEAKER: I am quite at a loss to know how the House decided that I forbade any debate. I think I allowed wide latitude. I pointed out to the member speaking that speeches made on second reading being repeated, and that alone would have been out of order. I did not say that the honourable member must discontinue his speech, I merely brought him to order on a point. The honourable member was repeating a speech made on second reading.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if I repeated the speech I made on second reading I did not know I was doing it.

MR. SPEAKER: That is precisely

why I called the honourable member to order.

MR. HOLLETT: I was referring to thirteen districts and to eighty thousand people, which I did not say anything about in second reading; thirteen districts with eighty thousand people have thirteen members to represent them here in this House whereas here in the city of St. John's five men only represent eighty thousand people. That is the reason, Sir, I support that amendment. I feel that the Government should take more time to consider the proper division of the citizens of this Province. I feel that they have not done that. They have not given it sufficient study. For that reason I support the amendment. I think in six months time, naturally, they will have the benefit of anything worthwhile which may have been said in this debate on either side, and also have more time to consider. It is our duty, Mr. Speaker, to endeavour to point out any inadequacies that we see in any particular Bill, and we have only been debating this thing with that in view. We know we cannot stop the Government, Sir, because they have the majority. But we think it is our duty — we feel it is our duty — and we believe the people of the country will consider it our duty that we point out the various discrepancies which are in this Bill. There is another reason which I won't take time to voice now, and which I have already stressed. I support the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question. The motion is that this Bill be now read a third time, to which an amendment is offered, to delete the words after the word "that" and insert other words — "that this Bill be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months." The amendment is put

in the form that the word "now" do stand part of the question.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, should not the amendment be put first.

MR. SPEAKER: I am so weary of these continued objections and questions of rulings of the Chair.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, you have not given any ruling on it, Sir. You just said you were going to put it. I intended to ask on a previous occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot get a chance to complete a speech without an interruption. I grow more weary — The procedure I did not institute. I merely follow.

Motion put and carried.

MR. BROWNE: Divide.

MR. HOLLETT: Divide.

On division the amendment was lost sixteen to three.

(Hon. the Premier, Hon. the Attorney General, Hon. Minister of Public Welfare, Hon. Minister of Education, Hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs, Hon. Minister of Fisheries and Cooperatives, Hon. Minister of Labour, Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, Hon. Minister of Public Works, Hon. Minister of Mines and Resources, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Button, Mr. Janes, Mr. Norman, Mr. Brown and Mr. Courage.)

(Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Browne, Mr. Higgins.)

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the House now go into

Committee of the Whole on Orders 2 through 10. I do not suggest we are going to get through all of these, but in case we do we have enough work out out for us.

Committee of the Whole on Bills, Nos. 2 through 10 inclusive:

Mr. Courage, Chairman of Committees, in the Chair.

"An Act Respecting the Conditional Sale of Goods:"

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, this is a long Bill. It was one of those referred to a Select Committee. There are a couple of amendments we would like to make as we go through. Perhaps we might call the Bill by numbers, if the Committee is agreeable.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not agreed to on this side, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not customary to read the clauses in most Houses of Parliament.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let us read them. Then we will be more familiar with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might point out to the Committee that there is no rule on it. But they will be read.

Clauses 1 through 3 read and carried.

Clause 4 read:

4. — (1) A conditional sale of goods shall be evidenced by a writing, executed prior to or at the time of or within ten days after delivery of the goods by the buyer or his agent, giving a description of the goods by which they may be readily and easily known and distinguished, and stating the amount of the purchase price remaining unpaid or the terms and conditions of the hiring.

(2) Subject to Section 23, the writing or a copy thereof shall be filed in the registry within thirty days from the date of its execution.

(3) The registrar shall cause every conditional sale or copy thereof filed in the registry to be numbered, endorsed with a memorandum of the date, hour and minute of its filing, and indexed by entering in alphabetical order in a register kept by him the names of the parties to the conditional sale, its number and the date of its filing.

MR. CURTIS: We could let that sub-section stand, Mr. Chairman.

On motion Clause 4 sub-section 2 stand.

Clauses 5 through 8 read and carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, will the district courts be functioning in time to operate?

MR. CURTIS: They will be functioning just as soon as we get this new Bill through.

Clauses 9 through 12 read and carried.

MR. HIGGINS: Only one thought occurs to me — Where is the registrar going to find room for all these?

MR. CURTIS: I am afraid — Well, I am hoping to take in the gallery of the Supreme Court.

MR. HIGGINS: Well, you will need it.

MR. BROWNE: Was there not a point mentioned here on the question of selling — If there was any money left over after he had paid the balance due, sub-paragraph B there — If the seller owes money to the buyer after it has been sold by public auction and there was more money received than was owed, what happens then?

MR. CURTIS: I remember we discussed that. It seems to me there would be certain expenses and expenditures on the sale.

MR. BROWNE: And suppose there is still a surplus?

MR. CURTIS: However, that is the way they draft it for all Canada — We could probably just see how it works out — You can hardly — I suppose it would be an inducement to fraud really if the vendor on re-selling it had to account for any profit to the original buyer. He might put through some oversale to some friend of his so nothing is left.

MR. BROWNE: It is sold by public auction.

MR. CURTIS: Public auctions are not the most desirable thing — don't often result in the best price — I guess perhaps we might better let it stand and think about it.

MR. MURRAY: Is it not a fact the proprietor of the goods still gets it — the seller therefore only gets his own portion.

MR. BROWNE: Does that apply on motor cars?

MR. MURRAY: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: As often happens, a man buys a car, pays \$500 and has a balance of \$1,500 and pays another thousand, so that he has it three quarters paid for, when he suddenly gets out of work and can't meet his payments. The person who sold him the car is very strict, and probably won't wait but comes and take possession and then sells it. Suppose they get a thousand dollars for the car — What is to happen then? It seems to me to be an injustice. I am sure everybody agrees with that. The man who bought the

car should get that money back. Surely there must be some precedent. It might even be a \$7,000 Cadillac.

MR. CURTIS: Would not that be a matter for the contents of the agreement? Should not the agreement cover that?

MR. MURRAY: Should it not be read in connection with the preceding section?

MR. HIGGINS: I think, Mr. Chairman, the experience of anyone who has had much to do with these conditional sales usually finds the poor fellow who puts in his money loses, and they come after his hide. It is a funny sort of thing. Clause 2 gives —

MR. BROWNE: For instance.

MR. HIGGINS: I cannot understand it, Mr. Chairman — I had the floor and was interrupted — Clause 2 pre-supposes that a good intent in practice does not work out — I think it is sub-clause 3 we should give more attention — I think it usually works out that these agreements, at least the few that I have seen, are nearly always so worded the unfortunate buyer, call him what you will, usually ends up behind the eight ball — Usually the buyer loses. The seller takes the car back, takes what money has been paid, sells the car and usually doesn't make enough to make it good, and goes back to him again.

MR. HOLLETT: Let it stand.

MR. CURTIS: I suggest we see how it works out. I have had clients being gypped on these things, a fellow paid \$1,000 for a car, started to pay it off, and loses the car after paying off \$400.

MR. MURRAY: This has passed the Financial Section of the Canadian Bar Association.

MR. BROWNE: They are not concerned with justice — They are concerned with getting money. I thought some of the officials of the Attorney General's Department were going to look into that.

MR. CURTIS: That is right — We have been looking into it. The only recommendation that came across I am not prepared to accept — In fact one of the companies had the gall to suggest we put in under Section 12 (3) — the vendor may sell the goods by private sale or public auction — in other words there would be a perfect racket. So I refused that — They will be sold at public auction so that there is no hole in the corner. That, I think, will have to be controlled by the wording of the contract.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I think this is actually a good provision if it is going to mean the situations as it obtains now, whereby the company repossesses and sells by private sale, is going to be discontinued. Is that the effect now, they cannot sell privately but have to sell by public auction?

MR. CURTIS: Under sub-section 2 it may be sold either by private sale or at public auction, but where there is any deficiency on a resale, the seller may sell the goods by public auction, so that there will be no underground. There is nothing here as to what happens afterwards — In the last section (7) says — This section applies notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary. This does not say that the money shall not be paid to the buyer if he has any rights — I think we can leave it to the agreement.

MR. HOLLETT: If there is a condition in the agreement — it is up to the buyer.

MR. CURTIS: That is the way the

Act is expressed. But this Act does not say there shall be no refund.

MR. MURRAY: I think that is the decision we came to in the Committee — If any right does exist in the buyer, the Act does not interfere with it.

Clauses 12 and 13 carried.

Clause 14:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, does that mean that the seller can come into your home and take out your bathtub and fixtures in your house and that sort of thing? If it does it means we are doing something the people in this country are not used to — I wonder if the Minister could tell us —

MR. MURRAY: Yes, that is what it means. It does not alter the law.

MR. HOLLETT: Has that been possible under the law here before?

MR. BROWNE: He could not take out a fixture.

MR. MURRAY: Cannot take out a fixture now.

MR. HOLLETT: I say, if that gives the power to the vendor to enter into a person's home in this Province and take out goods which were sold to him such as furniture and fixtures like a stove and what not — Is that customary under our present law?

MR. CURTIS: Did I understand the honourable member for St. John's West to say they cannot take out a fixture?

MR. BROWNE: They cannot now, no.

MR. CURTIS: The honourable member does not call a bathtub a fixture?

MR. BROWNE: In some places a bathtub is cemented in.

MR. CURTIS: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, if a man gets a bathtub he should not be able to escape having it taken away by just having it nailed to the floor. I don't think a bathtub is other than screwed down — Is it a fixture?

MR. BROWNE: I would think so. Well, take a furnace, cemented down in a cement bed.

MR. CURTIS: A radiator is only screwed, is that a fixture? A furnace is only laid on the floor.

MR. BROWNE: It is sometimes cemented down.

MR. CURTIS: I have never seen one. I have one in my house which I know is only laid on the floor. I do not know about the honourable member, perhaps he took no chances.

MR. BROWNE: I think it is quite common to have them cemented.

Is the Government satisfied with that sort of legislation? You know the policy is entirely contrary to common law; permitting the vendor to come in and take possession of fixtures like that.

MR. HOLLETT: It seems, Mr. Chairman, under the present setup in this country, there are an awful lot of people acquiring household fixtures and furnishings on terms and payments over a period of months and years etc. And, if by reason of the fact that they happen to miss a payment or two the vendor is entitled to come in to the home and do that sort of thing, I think it is something our people are not going to be very agreeable to, and are not going to give anybody credit for allowing it to go unchallenged. I think we ought to be sure on that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HIGGINS: Of course, Mr. Chairman, they do take themselves out of the protection the common law gives them if they agree to it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The two professional members on that side and two or three on this side agreed on it.

MR. HOLLETT: Are they agreed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the Leader of the Opposition said they were, I will agree with him and filibuster the clause.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, if I sign a contract and then I can't pay in the certain time I agreed to pay — But in this, the House of Assembly makes a law giving the seller the right to come into my home, I don't think we have the right to do that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have the right, but —

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know that we have that right. There are certain rights that are God given, and I don't think even the House of Assembly would upset them. But, if I sign an agreement and do not pay at a certain date and give the owner the right to come in and take the article at a certain date, or take it into court and produce the agreement — But I don't think it is right here for the Government to legalize it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It must be the House— The Government can't.

MR. HOLLETT: All right; I object to it at any rate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In that case I do.

MR. MURRAY: What the clause means is this — If say building material is incorporated in a house, obviously a vendor cannot take these, but if

it is a fixture and can be removed — If we turn back to the definitive section — If it can be removed by unbolting, unscrewing, unclamping or uncoupling or by some other method of disconnection — Say a bathtub set in concrete — if the only damage done is to the actual setting in which the thing was — In order to do that the payment must be in arrears and twenty days notice must be given to the buyer to pay up. I don't know that it makes for hardship.

MR. HOLLETT: Both the Honourable the Premier and myself agree on that. I don't see how it can pass.

MR. HIGGINS: Does that mean personal notice —

MR. BROWNE: Supposing that when building a house a man puts a furnace in when he got the foundation down and builds the house around it — they could come then and open up the walls of that building and take the furnace out.

MR. CURTIS: No, it can only be done without damage.

MR. MURRAY: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: According to the definition they could open up all the walls of the building and take the furnace out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, this is the Bill which went before the Select Committee consisting of the lawyers of the House — Even lawyers — this is something they did not notice.

MR. BROWNE: We discussed it before.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is there a recommendation to the House from the Committee? If not, what is the purpose of the Committee? Can the laymen in

this House, men who have not had the great privilege of becoming lawyers, now that we have a committee of lawyers, leave matters like that to them and accept the Bill when they report it back to the House?

MR. HOLLETT: That would be passing the buck.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Apparently we can't. Apparently they noticed this when they met and did not report it to the House as a Committee. It leaves us all in the embarrassing position of having them debate it here in the House. So perhaps these sections could stand and give us all a chance to look at it and see what it really means. Then when in a more serious mood, perhaps we can take it up again.

On motion Clause 14 stand.

Clauses 15 through 20 read:

15. When under this Act the time for the filing of a document expires on a day on which the registry is closed, the filing, so far as regards the time of filing, is valid, if made on the next following day on which the registry is open.

16. — (1) Where the attesting witness to a document to which this Act applies dies or leaves the Province before making the affidavit of execution required by this Act or becomes incapable of making or refuses to make the affidavit, a judge of the Supreme Court or a judge of a District Court upon being satisfied as to the execution and attestation of the document may make an order permitting the filing of the document.

(2) The order or a copy thereof shall be filed with the document.

(3) Filing of the document under the order has the like effect as the

filing thereof with the affidavit of execution otherwise required by this Act.

17. — (1) In addition to any person authorized by law to take affidavits the registrar may take the affidavit of any person under this Act.

(2) No conditional sale or other document to which this Act applies shall be held to be defective or void on the ground that an affidavit required by this Act was taken and made before a solicitor for any of the parties to the conditional sale or other document or before a partner of the solicitor or before a clerk in the office of the solicitor.

(3) An affidavit required by this Act to be made by a seller may in the event of his death be made by his executor or administrator or by any of his next of kin or by an authorized agent of the executor or administrator.

(4) Where the seller or his agent is a corporation, any officer, employee or agent of the corporation may make any affidavit or statement under this Act on behalf of the corporation.

(5) Every affidavit made under this Act by an agent of a seller or by an executor or administrator or a next of kin or an authorized agent of an executor or administrator or by an officer, employee or agent of a corporation shall state that the deponent is aware of all the circumstances connected with the conditional sale and that he has a personal knowledge of the facts deposed to.

(6) Where a document to which this Act applies is executed by a corporation, no affidavit of an attesting witness is required.

18. — (1) A judge of the Supreme Court or a judge of a District Court, upon being satisfied that an omission

to file a conditional sale or renewal statement or amended statement within the time prescribed by this Act, or that an omission or misstatement in a document filed under this Act was accidental or due to inadvertence or impossibility or other sufficient cause may, subject to the rights of other persons accrued by reason thereof, extend the time for filing or order the omission or misstatement to be rectified on any terms and conditions he directs.

(2) An order under this section or a copy thereof shall be filed with the registrar who shall attach it to the document on file or tendered for filing and shall make the appropriate entries in the register.

19. A document to which this Act applies shall not be invalidated or its effect destroyed by reason only of a defect, irregularity, omission or error therein or in the execution or attestation thereof unless, in the opinion of the court or judge before whom a question relating thereto is tried, the defect, irregularity, omission or error has actually misled some person whose interests are affected by the document.

20. — (1) A copy of a document filed under this Act, certified as such by the proper officer, is receivable in evidence as prima facie proof for all purposes as if the original document were produced and also prima facie proof of the execution of the original document, according to the purport of the copy.

(2) The registrar's certificate is receivable in evidence as prima facie proof of the date, hour and minute of the filing of the document.

(3) No proof is required of the signature or official position of the registrar in respect of any certificate produced as evidence under this section.

MR. CURTIS: In Clause 20 (1) in the second line the word should be "registrar" instead of "proper official."

Clause 20 as amended carried.

Clause 21 carried.

Clause 22:

MR. CURTIS: This is to cover a case where a document is already registered in the Registry of Deeds and where conditional sale, referred to in sub-section (1) was filed under another Act and the fee paid for filing, the document shall be filed under this Act without the payment of a fee.

New sub-clause 22 (2) inserted.
Clause as amended carried.

Sub-section (2) is deleted in Clause 23.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we may take the forms as read:

Form 1, 2, 3 carried.

Schedule:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I move the following amendments. When talking to my honourable friends yesterday we discussed 50c. I think 50c. is too small. Let \$1.00 stand. \$2.00 let that stand, but stop there. In other words have two fees.

On motion Schedule as amended carried.

MR. CURTIS: Referring back, Mr. Chairman, to No. 4 which I asked to stand. The reason I held up sub-section (2) it is subject now to Section 22 instead of section 23.

Perhaps the Committee could rise now and let some of us read section 14 and see if it really does offend our sense of property rights.

On motion, the Committee reported progress.

Committee of the Whole on Bill,
"An Act Respecting Bulk Sales."

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Chair-
man, we read this Bill by numbers.

Motion carried.

Clauses 1 through 3 carried.

Clause 4:

MR. BROWNE: On sub-paragraph
2 there, the Select Committee dealing
with that had a point to make about
the judges of the District Court — It
should be judges of the Supreme
Court. Under the Act we are now
passing the District Court can be as-
signed for judgeship. For instance, the
judge for St. John's may be assigned
to Grand Falls; there will be one as-
signed for all the districts. We might
even let it stay for the moment and
come back to it.

On motion Clause 4 stand.

Clause 5 carried.

Clause 6:

MR. CURTIS: There is an amend-
ment to the first line, sub-clause (a)
following the word "by" and before
the word "mail" insert the word "reg-
istered."

Clause 6 as amended carried.

Clauses 7 through 12 carried.

Clause 13:

MR. BROWNE: There is some-
thing on that.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I
move that Clause 13 stand.

Clause 4 carried. Forms and Sche-
dule carried.

Motion, that the Committee report
progress and ask leave to sit again,
carried.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Pro-
vision of Building Standards."

Clause 1 and 2 carried.

Clause 3:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in
Clause 3 (1) (c).

"(c) to require the owner of any
land to remove from the land or de-
stroy any building, structure, object or
material situated or being on the land
or to do any act or thing deemed
necessary in the interests of health or
safety or for the protection of rivers,
brooks, streams, lakes or ponds, and to
provide for such removal or destruc-
tion or the doing of any such Act or
thing upon the failure of the owner to
do so."

It has occurred to me, perhaps there
might be a claim here for compensa-
tion on the part of the owner.

MR. CURTIS: Not if it is a nuis-
ance.

MR. BROWNE: If a person owns
land it is not easy to decide whether
it is a nuisance or not. "The Lieuten-
ant-Governor in Council may make
such regulations as is deemed desirable
to regulate and control the physical
development and improvement in a
systematic and orderly manner and to
prevent deterioration of the area or
areas to which the regulations apply
and without prejudice to the generality
of the foregoing may make regula-
tions."

Suppose a man gets a dwelling and
lives there before, we will say, the
lake adjoining the land on which the
building has been standing has been
taken as a water supply area for a
community. He has five or ten thou-
sand dollars invested in the House,
has a big family. What is done with

him? You cannot order him to take it away.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course you can, but you do not do it. You must have the power to do it, but don't necessarily do it. We have a case right now, if the honourable gentleman will allow me, which must be the very case he has in mind, because it is the same as the illustration he gave. A man with a house near a lake which is then taken afterwards for a water supply. We have a case like that in point right now, where it is absolutely imperative that that house be removed. It is imperative, yet it is occupied by a man and his wife and ten children. What are you going to do there? The Government has the right to remove the building, and the public health absolutely demands it. The situation is indescribably bad. It is extremely bad. What are we to do? Damage a man and his wife and ten children? Now what we are doing is buying it. In Cabinet the other day we agreed to compensate the family. But we must have the right to order that man off the property where the health of maybe ten thousand people is affected. We must have that right. That is all this Bill does, gives us the right. As long as we are in power, of course, we know that the Government that comes after us can be as human as we are, but we will be here a long time; and we might amend that before we go out, to take care of a less humane government, ten or twenty years from now.

MR. CURTIS: I see what my honourable friend means here. He would like to have written the question of compensation. I was just wondering whether it is possible — Perhaps we might leave the section and give it some thought.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. You do it, but cannot be bound to it.

MR. CURTIS: Suppose it was an outhouse.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Suppose it was anything — a disorderly house, then you got to compensate them.

MR. BROWNE: Then it would be a nuisance under the law.

MR. CURTIS: This is in the interest of health and safety.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We cannot bind the Crown to compensate in every instance.

MR. BROWNE: In my opinion, as the Premier expressed it a few minutes ago, where a man has vested interest and was certainly there before the lake was taken as a reservoir for other people miles away, and he is there with a fine new building and all the rest, they can't come along and order him out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can but don't.

MR. BROWNE: You are taking the power to do it without requiring that he get compensation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The compensation in fact is given in proper cases, but we must have the power to do it without compensation.

MR. BROWNE: I cannot agree with the Premier. I feel on mature consideration it would be found it would be advisable, in the same manner as those provisions in the Public Works Act, giving compensation where it interferes with the vested interests like that and for the benefit of those people elsewhere. There is only one family holding the works up. It is not unreasonable that a thousand people

should contribute a dollar or fifty cents each in order to get benefits for all time from this man. It is the practice everywhere to do it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is done. But I don't think the Crown can be bound to it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Crown has the right to go in on land, but must compensate the owner for the damage they have done. That is under the Public Works Act. It seems to me this is similar.

MR. HEFFERTON: This does not apply to that particular instance discussed a moment ago. This does not invalidate the argument advanced. It does not apply to town councils.

MR. BROWNE: As the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply knows, this man is several miles away, three miles away, I think it is, from the town we are thinking of. But the watershed has been put in the Act as part of the limits of the town, although it is three miles away. Suppose there was no community at all, and yet many people were drawing their water supply from the lake, and some man had his house beside and a septic tank draining into the water. Undoubtedly it is a thing which should not be permitted. But what should be done? Should he be told to get out at his own expense?

MR. CURTIS: Would you not be giving a man rights which at law he does not possess. Suppose a man owns a mine and the water runs over that mine and does damage to adjoining property. He is supposed to use his property so as not to do damage to another. That is the common law. If you give the right of compensation, you give right not possessed under common law.

MR. BROWNE: He was there before the other party came.

MR. CURTIS: On the other hand we don't want to create a claim. For instance, you and I live on adjoining land, and you or I put an outhouse right on the boundary and make the adjoining land unfit to occupy. Surely Heavens, you have not to be paid for being ordered to move it! The question is where to draw the line.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think inevitably it has to be left to the sense of justice and fair play of any government in office. I don't think you can bind the Crown in every instance without exception to make compensation. I don't think for one moment that that is practical. It must depend upon the Government's sense of fair play. Any government, I don't care who they are, are going to be ordinarily decent people and do the ordinary decent thing. But they must not be bound in every instance to compensate.

MR. CURTIS: There may be merits.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And where there are merits — after all a government is made up of politicians — Certainly they are ordinary decent people and want to do the ordinary decent thing. This very instance proves the case in point. It is, I believe, a client of my honourable and learned friend opposite, and I think not at all noted for being a supporter of this Government, and I doubt ever will be. But decent people confronted with this problem do the decent thing. We did not have to do it, but we have found the money out of the Public Treasury to compensate in this instance. Any government can be counted on to do that kind of thing.

MR. BROWNE: I don't say any

government would do it. It is very nice to know it has been done in this case. I appreciate what the Government has done. It was a very difficult question, I agree, and I appreciate the interest the Minister has taken. But I think if the rights of the individual have been raised—Has he rights or has he not? If he has a home and residence and a place which happens to be on the watershed towards which other people moved later on, after he has been established, and they use that watershed as a reservoir from which to draw water supplies, should he be eligible to be moved or could the Government come in any way, you got to get out? Here under this he has no right at all, and I know how slowly the Government moves. I know those things well. It is nice to know that in this particular case that finally a decision has been arrived at. I know the anxiety that goes on for years under no compensation after the person has been removed — and it has happened — Yet he might not have the patience and perseverance to keep on trying to get his rights recognized. Is there a resemblance between this and the Public Works Act, where the Public Works appropriate land? For instance the Federal Government the other day took Mr. Larry Cashin's building next to the Post Office. After the fire there they went in and took it.

MR. CURTIS: There is a similar matter up on Topsail Road, an empty house, empty now for about three or four years and is boarded up. It is unsightly. It is probably full of rats. The people who once owned that house are jolly well aware and can jolly well afford to fix it up. They won't let it go. It stays there and is probably a menace to the neighbourhood from the point of view of fire and every other point of view. Now if the council tomorrow orders that

house down, why should they compensate the owners? I don't know they should.

MR. BROWNE: No. It would be up to the owners to show there was not any damage due to it. There might not be any damage in a case like that.

MR. CURTIS: In the case of no damage we don't want the rights, as we are obliged to pay.

MR. BROWNE: Would not the Attorney General give consideration to, and get one of his staff to compare it to the Department of Public Works Act and see if there is not a resemblance?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There may be a resemblance, Mr. Chairman, but it seems to me there is nothing in this sub-clause (c) of Section 3 to prevent the Government from compensating if, as and when they care to do it. That is all right. That is as it should be. But there is a difference between putting in something to forbid compensation and putting in something to compel it. I don't think we ought to compel it. There is nothing now to forbid it. And it ordinarily will be paid in any case where it is just to do it.

MR. HIGGINS: I may say, whilst it is not strictly a point, the St. John's Municipal Council has got the right, if the city medical officers and community inspector reports a building as being dilapidated to the extent of more than fifty per cent repair needed, they can condemn it. And it is condemned and there is no compensation. Indeed there is a section, the Attorney General is doubtlessly familiar with, where they can even charge the owner for the cost of demolition. But they have, I would say, not got any obligations,

They have adopted the procedure in one or two cases not too long ago when houses were found to be definite traffic hazards, where they ordered them down. That is a different matter, but as I say, the principle, you can demolish without compensation, is established in the municipality.

MR. BROWNE: Does my honourable friend in the Municipal Council remember another instance on Twenty Mile Pond where one of his constituents had a barn? My Honourable friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, is very familiar with the location — where he had a barn there for many years and cultivated land and collected the hay — One of the farmers complained about it being a reservoir. The City Council went and took it and recompensed the owner.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is what a government would do in all ordinary circumstances. That is the fair and decent thing to do. But I don't think we could compel the Crown to compensate.

MR. BROWNE: In cases like that — you see it happened that particular case was within the jurisdiction of the Municipal Council, because it was on the watershed of the Twenty Mile Pond. But suppose the Minister wishes to deal with some other place; Big Pond, Round Island Pond or Topsail Pond or one of these places, and he wishes to order the removal of a building, there is nothing in this section which compels anyone to get compensation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But would it not be expected that in the ordinary course of events that would be precisely what a government would do, give compensation? Is not that what the Government does, in fact, in every case where it is the just and right thing to do?

MR. CURTIS: Take that part of Topsail Pond where the Honourable Minister of Welfare has his property, I understand there are houses that have sewers running straight into the pond. Well, of course, we are not going to have the pond infected. On the other hand are you going to pay them to take away toilets they have no right to have there. That is a nuisance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And they are endangering the health of everyone in that pond, people who swim in it, men, women and children. Is the Crown to be compelled to compensate them for removing a thing like that? We can't do it.

MR. MURRAY: I was just going to say, I would be opposed to putting in a clause for compensation, as it would be very difficult to cover all circumstances. It could well be in most cases it would give rights to persons they have not got already. Everyone is supposed to use his land so as not to hurt others. Take this case of my honourable friend over opposite, of a man being there from time immemorial. He might have certain vested rights, and it might be right to compensate him. But on the other hand, it might be dangerous in the case of a man who comes in, without any rights, and creates a nuisance.

MR. HOLLET: Mr. Chairman, the man did not create the nuisance in this particular case. It was the council who created the nuisance by coming in and wanting that pond. The man was there in an orderly fashion, and perhaps had a barn there near the pond. He had a perfect right there. Perhaps he had a lease or grant to the land. Then because the council wants that particular pond for a water supply, they say, you got to move all. You have to move your house off. I

think in that case, I agree with the Honourable the Premier, he would be compensated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the objection to saying it here?

MR. CURTIS: Because a man not entitled to it may then claim it. If it is established as a right it is there for everybody.

MR. HOLLETT: The right is there for everybody in certain circumstances.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And how do we describe the circumstances in a Bill? All we can do is leave it at the discretion of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

MR. HOLLETT: And make regulations for that as well as for something else.

Clause carried.

Section 4:

MR. BROWNE: When you were all talking about that particular clause, I noticed the next paragraph to it. That is a new thing too. The Minister now has power to prescribe building lines, fence lines and the area of yards, courts and other open spaces to be maintained and the maximum density of population permissible within any district.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is excellent.

MR. BROWNE: Yes it is excellent, but it does not seem to be practical.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But it will be done only insofar as it is practical.

MR. BROWNE: It should be done in a special way, and not be applied

to each individual house as you go along the road. I also want to refer to (c). This is something new. It empowers the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply to prohibit or refuse to permit the use of land for any purpose or the erection or repair of any building structure or thing on, in, over or under land or water, in any locality, even though such use, erection or repair would in all other respects be in accordance with regulations made under this section, when in the opinion of the Minister (1) the establishment, maintenance, or use of the land, building, structure or thing would be dangerous to the health or safety of persons living in the locality. I am getting to the matter of compensation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For instance if a man sets up something noxious and poisonous to health, and the Minister says he must remove it in the interest of health. The individual answers: "Yes, if you pay me." Do you think we are going to bind the Crown to that? That is what it says.

MR. BROWNE: Or, it says, "would be undesirable regard to existing buildings or buildings that will probably be erected or the probable or present use of land, in the locality. (iii) The height, ground area, bulk, or type of the building, structure or thing that it is proposed to erect or repair is or would be undesirable having regard to existing buildings that will be probably be erected, or the present or probable use of lands, in the locality.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. Shacks being built amongst nice houses. If, for instance, the honourable gentleman should go in and build a lot of nice houses and then along comes someone and insists on, and builds a shack in their midst. Should he be permitted?

MR. BROWNE: Or when the Lieutenant-Governor in Council directs that for any reason it is in his opinion undesirable to permit the intended use, erection or repair of the land, building, structure or thing.

What I am trying to get at is that there must be some regulations or clause covering it, and not in any particular case. Here it is, when in the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Now that seems to me to give powers to deal with any individual case. But it should not be that way. It should be by general regulations, so that a man would know where he stood.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He comes along to the department and says he proposed to build a house. He is told: "Fine, now what kind of a house do you intend to build, what plans?" When he explains the type he is told: "Well, look, old man, you don't really think you will be allowed to build a house of that kind amongst houses like that. We are sorry but we can't give you permission for that kind of an erection." The Minister is frankly refusing permission to build undesirable types of houses, under another Act — In another area, in along Topsail Road for instance, just in time, we prevented the building of shacks and slums right through the most popular drive in Newfoundland.

MR. HEFFERTON: The most concrete example we have of this sort of thing is the amount of regulated building along the Topsail Road, during the past few months comparable to all St. John's. We have refused permission, in fact I recall one case in particular from memory where a man who put up a barn two or three years ago, a few months ago applied to the department for permission to turn it

into apartments. We refused point blank. He was not allowed to turn it into apartments, since it was inaccessible to the road, and there were other unfavourable conditions around it. And that sort of thing is going on all the time. This allows us to take any area under our particular notice and apply there the same regulations as are of general application, and as are to be found covering the particular area of which I spoke, that is, the approaches to St. John's.

MR. BROWNE: You are dealing there with individuals. The regulations should cover all cases.

MR. MURRAY: That is what it says. "The Lieutenant-Governor may make regulations empowering the Minister to do so and so."

MR. BROWNE: That goes back to (1) does it not?

MR. CURTIS: To the beginning of (3).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I don't know how the stenotypist can take this down, two members partaking in the debate at one time.

MR. BROWNE: You see that part at the end of (c) (iii) — "Or when the Lieutenant-Governor in Council directs that for any reason it is in his opinion undesirable to permit the intended use, erection or repair of the land, building, structure or thing" — and (1) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make such regulations as he deems desirable under (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e).

MR. MURRAY: It just follows on sub-section (2) "In addition to or in lieu of the exercise of the power to make regulations under sub-section (1) the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may order, adopt and constitute as reg-

ulations by reference thereto. Sub-section (1) only confers the power to make regulations.

MR. CURTIS: Is not the real interpretation that the Governor in Council makes regulations and as a last resort reserves to himself the right to decide any disputed case?

MR. HEFFERTON: This Act when passed will apply generally throughout the Province. The regulations which have been made and incorporated under the Act will also be of general application. And if we get a request tomorrow from an area out near the Humber District where they want to put on a prohibition for a time of probably all building in the area, or the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may decide it is well to put on a prohibition for a time until a survey is made of the area, or even decide to take some area and regulate the building around that particular section, then it is empowered by this Act to do that very thing. I don't see anything wrong with that.

MR. BROWNE: I am not saying there is anything wrong about that. But suppose someone wanted to put a shack in Trepassey, on the North West River, tomorrow, within fifty feet of the river, does he have to get permission from the Minister to do that?

MR. MURRAY: He won't get permission at all — When he is within fifty feet of the river he is doing an illegal thing anyway.

MR. DROWNE: Well, suppose it is a hundred and fifty feet?

MR. HEFFERTON: No, because it is not designated as an area.

MR. BROWNE: It has to be designated first.

Clauses 3 and 4 carried.

Clause 5:

MR. BROWNE: Clause 5 seems to be quite a complicated one — "... any regulations or orders made under the "Local Areas Planning Act." (a) may be revoked in whole or in part etc. Why make any regulations under this Act, the Local Areas Planning Act, it is being repealed? It does not seem to me to be a sound procedure to amend regulations that have been made under an Act that has been repealed. I can understand the regulations you have there for the time being, but the new ones, I should think, would be under the new Act.

"(a) may be revoking in whole or in part; or (b) amending within the limits of the power given by Section 3 of this Act." It seems to be very complicated.

MR. CURTIS: I think you will find it all right though.

Clause 5 carried.

Clause 6:

MR. BROWNE: There is one provision, I think, should be made in every one of these Acts, and that is as to the publications of the regulations. It is not in this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I agree a hundred per cent.

MR. BROWNE: I have spent so much time looking for regulations. I think it is a bad idea when they are not published.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I agree with that entirely. And I think, notwithstanding what my honourable and learned friend has said, he will find that in the vast majority of cases our legislation does provide that regulations made under any particular Act shall be laid before the House and

published in the Gazette. I think that ought to be added.

MR. CURTIS: We will add that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the general policy to do it, but at times it is forgotten.

MR. HEFFERTON: There is a definite undertaking here in this Act about the publication of regulations, because there is a penalty provided.

MR. CURTIS: Actually I have on my desk a Regulations Act which would gather together all regulations issued under all departments, so that you would have one volume with them all in it, but it is too bulky to try to get through.

MR. BROWNE: If I may respectfully suggest to the Attorney General it seems hardly necessary to do that, if the printer could be given instructions every time he printed regulations to set them up for the purpose of compiling a volume of regulations.

MR. CURTIS: I was thinking more of regulations made thirty, forty and fifty years ago and are still in force. It is a case of getting them all collected.

MR. BROWNE: I believe the Federal Government has a section in their Gazette dealing with regulations only, and another dealing with statutes.

Motion, that the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again, carried.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Elections Act:"

Clauses 1 and 2 carried.

Clause 3:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, "Any person is qualified to vote in an

election of councillors who (a) is a British subject resident in Canada or twenty-one years; and is a Canadian citizen."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Every Canadian citizen is a British subject.

MR. BROWNE: Is he?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is why it says here — it was most interested in that myself when I first read it.

MR. CURTIS: We are all British subjects.

MR. BROWNE: I was going to say, in the definition of citizenship under the Canadian Citizenship Act, I believe that citizenship is extended to British subjects resident in Canada or a person born in the Irish Free State.

MR. MURRAY: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: We don't seem to recognize that principle here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, I don't know what Act it is, but we give the vote to them. It must be in the new amendment coming in in the new Election Act. In the New Election Act coming in there is a provision which shows who can vote; and that is a Canadian citizen or other British subject, in other words, Australians, New Zealanders, anywhere within Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: Why not go a step further, as the Canadian Citizenship Act goes, and extend it to persons resident here, born in Fire. We have a great number of Irish doctors and nurses.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are Canadian citizens but not British subjects. If they are Canadian citizens then they have the right to vote as such.

MR. BROWNE: Not under this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, but in the Election Act.

MR. BROWNE: Well, what does the Minister think?

MR. SMALLWOOD: A Canadian citizen, a British subject or a citizen of Eire, I think we ought to recognize for the purpose of voting — Citizens of Eire, as has been pointed out, are here as medical doctors and nurses, and like any private citizen, no doubt, they ought to have the right to vote when they have been here, say a year.

MR. HIGGINS: It is the Commonwealth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right, as Eire is within the Commonwealth. They are foreigners, in other words Irishmen are foreigners in Newfoundland. That really is something. In other words, one-third of the population of Newfoundland are British subjects, but descendants from foreigners.

MR. HIGGINS: We were not foreigners then.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well descended from people now foreigners — That is rich.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, the objection is valid. We have American citizens here that do not vote in our election, don't serve on our juries, and lose their citizenship if they do, that is my understanding, and I don't see why we should make fish of the Americans and flesh of the Irish.

MR. BROWNE: The point is that under the Canadian Citizenship Act, citizens are defined as persons born or naturalized in Canada or persons who are British subjects and have lived a certain length of time in Canada, and

person who are citizens of Eire and have lived a certain length of time in Canada, qualify as Canadian citizens. Therefore, why keep strictly to British subjects in this particular Bill?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the Election Act, in the amendment coming in, they will have a vote because they qualify as Canadian citizens.

MR. BROWNE: I brought that up last year when we had the Election Act before us. I think it ought to be considered here now also. Definitions are very important, as elections often turn on one vote.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not in Liberal districts.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, with respect to sub-clause (d) why is it that not only the taxpayer gets a vote but also his wife?

MR. CURTIS: We have an amendment for that, if we are up to that clause.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to (c) before we get down to (d). "Subject to Section 27, any person is qualified to vote in an election of councillors who (c) is liable to taxation under the Act governing the municipality, whether or not he is resident in the municipality, or — Is that to be a councillor?"

MR. CURTIS: No, only to vote.

MR. HOLLETT: He is not qualified to be a councillor?

MR. HEFFERTON: He is not allowed to vote if living two or three miles out, but if he is working within the municipality and is liable for taxation then he is entitled to vote.

MR. HOLLETT: What are the qualifications of a councillor?

MR. HEFFERTON: That is contained in the Local Government Act, the Revised Statutes.

MR. CURTIS: In sub-section (d), Mr. Chairman, should read, the wife or husband of a taxpayer resident in the municipality etc.

MR. HIGGINS: I still wonder why in these areas other than the city of St. John's. In St. John's only the taxpayers vote. It seems sensible. Why should a person who is not a taxpayer get the benefit of the franchise?

MR. BROWNE: Because when a man marries it is a partnership.

MR. HIGGINS: Yes, but why should they have two votes?

MR. BROWNE: In some municipalities they recognize that. Suppose the woman owns the house and the man earns and keeps the house going and maintained.

MR. HOLLETT: Does that section mean that a man who is not resident in a municipality but is paying taxes has the right to vote but his wife has not?

MR. CURTIS: Under the amendment.

MR. HOLLETT: That is ridiculous. The husband and the wife are one, and are both paying the taxes. When you tax the man both have to suffer. Making a lot of people suffer today.

MR. HIGGINS: I would like the Minister to explain, why is it the wife or the husband of the taxpayer? Why not the taxpayer alone?

MR. CURTIS: That is why the amendment was moved, to give the taxpayer a vote.

MR. HIGGINS: If they are not both

taxpayers — Suppose a man and his wife are living in an area, and only the husband is the taxpayer, why should his wife have the vote?

MR. CURTIS: If they live in the area they vote.

MR. HIGGINS: Why? In the city of St. John's you pay taxes and your wife does not, then she does not vote.

MR. CURTIS: We are not as small as that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why does not the honourable gentleman go out into real Newfoundland and see how it is done.

MR. HEFFERTON: I do know, when the Local Government Act was drafted some few years ago, it was modeled more or less upon practices throughout the Dominion of Canada, and apparently there in quite a number of municipalities the wife of a taxpayer living in a municipal area is entitled to vote. I think when it was decided to give the vote to people living outside a municipal area yet paying taxes, it did not carry with it a condition that the wife should have the same privilege, nor do I think she should. But if living in a municipal area then I see no reason why the wife should not be entitled to the same as the man. The property owners in very, very many instances are wives.

MR. CURTIS: Actually, if I might interrupt, we are reading the section wrong. It says (1) He must be a British subject. In addition to that he must not be disqualified by mental incapacity. (Some of us would not get a vote). Then, you notice, it is a man — So everybody does not get the vote. The situation is as my honourable friend thought it should be.

MR. HIGGINS: Otherwise it would be a ridiculous situation, a combination of a wife, not paying taxes, could elect a councillor against the inclination of a taxpayer.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if that should not stand for a moment. I have the Canadian Citizenship Act here.

MR. HEFFERTON: It is in the parent Act.

Clauses 4 and 5 carried.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I am still convinced that on that clause (d) Section 3, (c) and (d) — I wonder if the Committee could revert to that now — for my own satisfaction. A person qualifies under (a) and (b) — all right. Condition (c) does not apply, and we still have that position to which I objected. It still does not make too much sense.

MR. CURTIS: He has to be a British subject first, not to be disqualified, and then there are the alternatives. Under (c) he is liable to taxes under the Act governing the municipality, whether or not he is resident in the municipality, or is the wife or husband of a taxpayer resident in the municipality, and has resided for at least one year preceding the date set for the election in the municipality.

MR. HIGGINS: In other words section (d) wipes out all the virtues of section (c)?

MR. SMALLWOOD: As the wife or husband of a person in section (c) and in addition the wife or husband of a person mentioned in (c) has resided for at least a year in the municipality.

MR. HIGGINS: But is still not required to pay taxes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But is the wife or husband of one who is required.

MR. HIGGINS: And I still say, that, to me, would give rise to situations where a combination of non-taxpayers could all vote for Bill Jones and Sam Crow and elect these two men, against the vote of the tax paying people — Seems to me to be an anomaly.

MR. HEFFERTON: I am inclined to agree with my honourable friend when I look at the parent Act. I am only expressing an opinion. We have had no kick from the municipalities and that means we allow them to go on.

MR. HIGGINS: They are the people that really are concerned.

MR. BROWNE: What is wrong with the husband or wife of the taxpayer voting?

MR. HIGGINS: Why should they?

MR. BROWNE: They are contributing. I don't agree with that because they have not got it in St. John's. That is no reason why.

MR. CURTIS: It is a good reason.

MR. HIGGINS: If the husband controls the wife, but, I say, in this day and age they have no control over them.

MR. BROWNE: It says there, subject to section 27 — What is that?

MR. HEFFERTON: It deals with the list of electors for a municipality.

MR. BROWNE: Now I brought up the question about a British subject. I think it is a very important point. I am not sure that the Canadian Government recognizes as a Canadian citizen a British subject unless he has

been a resident for a certain amount of time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course. One province does not recognize a Canadian native born citizen from another province, unless that citizen has been in that second province for a certain length of time. It is not because one is born in Ontario that he can move into Quebec the day before an election and have a vote in Quebec, or the other way about. Not because a man is a Canadian citizen he can automatically vote in any province of Canada. He must qualify. If I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, to draw the attention of the Minister to this definition in the Canadian Citizenship Act: Canadian citizen means a person who is a Canadian citizen under this Act. An alien means a person who is not a Canadian citizen, Commonwealth citizen, British subject or citizen of the Republic of Ireland. In other words, a Canadian citizen is described later on, but an alien is a person other than a Canadian citizen, a Commonwealth citizen, British subject or citizen of the Republic of Ireland. These are not aliens. These are not — all others are aliens but these.

MR. CURTIS: Was not that done to protect people who might have come over from Ireland while Ireland was not Commonwealth?

MR. BROWNE: No, this Act was passed during the past couple of years.

MR. HIGGINS: The Irish vote must have been a prime factor somewhere.

MR. BROWNE: The definition of a Canadian citizen is very complicated because it does not distinguish between a native born Canadian and a Canadian citizen other than native born.

MR. HOLLETT: What are we here?

MR. BROWNE: On this side of the House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are the only Canadian in the world who became Canadians by voting to become Canadian.

MR. BROWNE: All of us — The honourable gentleman — don't start that now. Mr. Chairman, there is one point; you see there is a distinction made here between a Canadian citizen and a British subject, and I think that requires a little study. I suggest that the Committee let that stand over until it is clarified.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The qualifications, from the standpoint of my honourable friend's argument, are far more important from the standpoint of Provincial Elections than from that of a purely local standpoint. It would be much more appropriately raised, I think, when the amendment to the Election Act comes down.

MR. BROWNE: Well it is a peculiar thing that the Premier, the advocate of Confederation, does not now wish to see in municipal elections, qualifications of election of Canadian citizens.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I see more clearly it is five minutes to eleven, and I see an opportunity in another Bill to deal with this; another Bill has to come in in a day or two.

MR. CURTIS: I know of one instance of an American here fifteen years, and yet an Irishman who has just arrived a couple of weeks can vote.

MR. BROWNE: The question is, can a Canadian citizen vote under this Bill, or only British subjects.

MR. CURTIS: Every Canadian citizen is a British subject, but every British subject is not a Canadian.

MR. BROWNE: I am quite sure the majority in the Province of Quebec do not agree they are British subjects.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They may not agree, but they are. Everyone in the British Commonwealth is a subject of the Queen, whether they like it or not, admit it or not — Everyone in the British Commonwealth is a subject of the Queen. In Quebec they don't like it, but it is so.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Duplessis?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Duplessis is a subject of the Crown.

MR. HOLLETT: Does he say it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not matter what he says. He says lots of things. Does that really matter?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Clause carried.

On motion the Committee rose to report progress and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred, and on the Bill, "An Act Respecting the Conditional Sale of Goods," the Committee reports progress and asks leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion report received, and Committee ordered to sit again tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: The Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred, and on Bill, "An Act Respecting the Provision of Building Standards," made some progress and asks leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion report received, and Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred, and on Bill, "An Act Respecting Bulk Sales" made some progress and asks leave to sit again tomorrow.

On motion report received, and Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred, and on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Election Act" passed this Bill with some amendments.

Report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 11:00 of the clock, the House is adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 15, 1955

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

Presenting Petitions

None.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table of the House details of an agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada respecting the rehabilitation of disabled persons.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave

to table the first annual report of the Superintendent of Insurance.

HON S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply) : Mr. Speaker, we compiled for our own convenience, building regulations, and though not asked to do so, beg leave to table a copy for the information of honourable members.

Giving Notice of Motion

MR. SMALLWOOD : Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow move the House into Committee of the Whole on Supply. That is with the intention of bringing down the budget speech. I do so on behalf of my honourable colleague, the Minister of

Finance — And also to move the House into a Committee on Ways and Means.

Giving Notice of Questions

None.

Answers to Questions

MR. SMALLWOOD : Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 10, on the Order Paper of March 25th, directed to me by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I may say that the answer to this question covers the answer to Question No. 33 asked by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West. So that I do not propose to answer his question, as the answers are contained in the question as asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

QUESTION NO. 10 (Mr. Rollett).

(2) This Question should be referred to the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development.

(3)		1 April, 1954	28 Feb. 1955
(a)	Bank of Montreal (overdraft)	3,772,212.55	\$ (135,127.17)
(b)	Crown Agents for the Colonies	433,636.52	486,131.00
(c)	Government of Canada	10,850,000.00	10,890,135.64

(4)		Revenue	Expenditure	
			Payments	Commitments
(a)	Current Account	\$31,529,954.82	\$32,750,588.83	\$ 955,067.53
(b)	Capital Account	2,107,351.81	17,368,964.95	694,122.95
(c)	Financial Surplus	417,667.73	829.89	18,081.81
		\$34,054,974.36	\$50,119,883.67	\$ 1,667,272.29

NOTES

Revenue does not include the \$12,000,000 proceeds of 1954 bond issue.

Payments include the redemption of \$300,000 temporary borrowings outstanding at 31 March, 1954.

(5) The first overdraft at the Bank of Montreal had origin on 17/6/54 and reached the figure of \$799,578 on 30/6/54, the date of liquidation.

The second overdraft arose on 10/8/54, reached a figure of \$3,899,967 on 13/9/54 and was paid off on 14/9/54.

The third overdraft had origin of 13/12/54, reached a figure of \$819,819 on 21/12/54, was reduced to \$561,084 on 27/12/54 and was liquidated on 28/12/54.

The fourth overdraft arose on 24/2/55 and amounted to \$1,953,161.89 on 25/3/55.

MR. SPEAKER: That is Question No. 10, Order Paper of March 25th.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day, I should like to move the adjournment of the House.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order — Can we not ask a question on the Orders of the Day before the Honourable the Premier moves the adjournment of the House? I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Public Works — If he is yet in a position to tell us when the ferry services will be in operation between Portugal Cove and Bell Island? I don't know anybody more familiar with the difficulties of travelling between these two places than he is. He should be in a position to give us an idea.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the honourable and learned member for St. John's West and the House in general, I regret to say that I am unable to give specific dates as to when this ferry will actually be in operation. I have kept in very close touch with this operation, in fact there is scarcely a Sunday or a holiday that I do not take advantage of the opportunity to drive down to Portugal Cove and observe at first hand for my own information the actual project. The difficulty now — what little difficulty there is — appears to be a little delay in connection with electrical equipment required to operate the lift of the suspended bridge from the end of the dock, which is to rest on the bow of the boat. The ferry dock at Portugal Cove has been completed, with that exception. The bridge is in place, and we are merely waiting for the power, which means the installation of a transformer there to bring the power

to the site. And just at noon today I made contact, or tried to make contact with the architect who designed the work for us. Unfortunately he was already in Portugal Cove, so I was unable to ask him that very question. When that can be connected up I am unable to say. I did not get the answer, and unable to say just when. But I can say this, the dock is ready in Portugal Cove, and it is the intention, as far as I can understand with the contractor, to operate the ferry just as soon as he can arrange some temporary holding facilities on Bell Island side of the tickle, for the use of the new boat that is here for the purpose.

If I were to pull a date out of the air, my guess would be, we should have that bridge in Portugal Cove within a week from now. That is merely a guess. I cannot say specifically, but I shall endeavour to find out and have the information for the honourable gentleman as soon as I can get the answer with regard to the electrical power.

MR. BROWNE: I did intend to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour, but in his absence I wonder could I address it to the Premier? It has been reported over the air that a boiler has burst at Superior Rubber Company. I was wondering if that had been inspected by officials of the Department of Labour, and certified before going into operation, and if there is to be any investigation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think the honourable gentleman is correctly informed — There was no explosion.

MR. BROWNE: Well, a collapse of the boiler.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think there was any explosion. It was not functioning properly and the inspector

very properly closed or ordered it closed down for a new section to be put in to replace one section of the boiler that is defective. It is not at all serious.

MR. BROWNE: I heard it broadcast over the air.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No — that was inaccurate.

MR. BROWNE: I have one more question I intend to ask, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives — Perhaps once again the Premier may be able to tell me. Where the fishery programme promises a fishermen's wharf or market in St. John's — Is there any progress in that matter?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am afraid not — The difficulty so far is to get a site. The Government of Canada have agreed to build the necessary wharf, and the Government of Newfoundland have agreed on or beside that wharf to build the necessary market place or facilities. But all of that depends upon the site. And no site can be found up to this moment.

MR. HIGGINS: Has Steers Cove as a site been ruled out?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think it has been ruled out, but the Fisheries Development Authority have scoured the waterfront, and have been in touch, and indeed in working negotiations, with a number of property owners and they have not as yet been able to get a site. Now if the honourable gentleman wants more details on that, I can get them, but that much I do know.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House, and I do so for a purpose. The purpose is to have some discussion on the Report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture, tabled, I believe, in the House yesterday.

If this were a sermon I intended preaching, I would refer the House to Chapter 5 of Part 2 of the Report on Page 617, for my text; and I will quote it to the House. It is a chapter on human resources, and it says this: In 1901 Newfoundland's population was 220,984 (we might for convenience call it 221,000) increasing by about two thousand persons per year, it rose gradually to 289,588 in 1935. But since 1935 growth has increased rapidly until by 1945 the average annual increase per thousand population has risen from 7.21 to 11.18 and by 1951 it had climbed to 20.51. In June 1954 the population was estimated at 398,000 an increase of over 36,000 from 1951, and an average annual increase of 33.7 per thousand. That is to say, Mr. Speaker, it rose from 7.21 in 1933 per thousand of population and has grown until in 1954 it was 33.7 per thousand. That is the rate of increase of our population. By 1951 Newfoundland had the highest birth rate and the third lowest death rate in Canada, of any province of Canada — in 1951, the highest birth rate and the third lowest death rate of any province in Canada. In 1952 Newfoundland's death rate became the lowest in Canada, so that by that year, 1952, Newfoundland's birth rate was the highest in Canada and her death rate was the lowest — an astonishing fact — a glorious fact — and an appalling fact — depending on how you look at it.

Now at page 622 the Report still deals with population and says: For convenience all persons between the ages of fifteen and sixty-four may be classed as productive, and all those above or below these ages as non-productive. On this basis, Newfoundland had in 1951, 84 non-productive workers for every hundred productive workers. In 1951, taking the ages fifteen to

sixty-four inclusive as the productive age, in 1951 for every one hundred productive workers Newfoundland had 84 non-productive compared with 61 for the rest of Canada. The rest of Canada had 61 non-productive workers for every hundred producers.

MR. HOLLETT: In the same age group?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The same age group. Only 29½% of the Newfoundland population is occupied in the labour force compared with 38% for the rest of Canada. And the Commissioners add this observation: This situation is (1) because of the low per capita income in Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Speaker, I draw the House's attention to this next paragraph: Number of people coming of working age each year: The number of people coming of working age, that is to say, coming to be fifteen years of age each year from 1955 to 1956 will be in that period nearly 75% greater than the number found in 1951 census in each of the age groups fifteen to twenty-nine. That is to say, Mr. Speaker, the number coming of age in our population each year in the period of 1951 to 1956 is not doubling, but it is almost as frightening, it is increasing 75%. They then add the sentence: "In other words an increasing number of jobs will be needed each year for at least the next decade."

Now, Sir, these words, these facts, should haunt every member of this House should haunt, should disturb the slumbers of every Newfoundlander—the fact that our birth rate is the highest in Canada, our death rate is the lowest in Canada and our population has begun literally to shoot ahead, and in the next decade we will need not double the number of new jobs, but 75% more than we have. Now that clearly

means this: We as a province are going to lose our population to the other parts of Canada and to the United States as we did for a century. As a result of the past century there are more Newfoundlanders and descendants of Newfoundlanders, putting them together, living in the United States now than there are in Newfoundland; and there are tens of thousands of Newfoundland people and their descendants living on the Mainland of Canada. With this tremendous new pressure of population, either we are going to lose a very great number of our people to the Mainland of Canada and to the United States or else our standard of living is going to drop catastrophically, or we are going to find jobs for our people, and give them a chance to earn their living. Now, if this is not an authority I don't know what it is. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture gives part of the answer, just as the Royal Commission on Forestry's Report gave part of the answer. Clearly a marked development in forestry, including the building of a third paper mill of four hundred and fifty or five hundred tons of newsprint, and other developments accompanying it, an increase in the size of the Grand Falls and Corner Brook mills, clearly these things will provide jobs for a good many Newfoundlanders. Clearly the opening of new mines in the Tilt Cove development to be followed reasonably soon, we believe, by the Gull Pond development and other mineral developments; and we believe great developments are imminent in Labrador — All of these things — But, Sir, whereas in 1923 the beginning of a five hundred ton paper mill at Corner Brook, the great Humber project, absorbed virtually the whole of the unemployed in Newfoundland, and gave a job to virtually

every man who needed one in Newfoundland, and opened up a great new and adequate field of opportunity for hundreds of young men of education and technical training. Today it would take far more than just another paper mill, because our population in 1923 was of the order of a quarter of a million people, compared with something over four hundred thousand today. In 1923, notwithstanding the depression of the years following immediately after the First World War, notwithstanding the declining conditions of our foreign fish markets for our fishing industry, in 1923 our fishing industry was a far more substantial thing from the standpoint of the number employed than it is today. The number is absolutely smaller. There are absolutely fewer men engaged in the fishery today than there were in 1923, with a population of a quarter of a million then compared with four hundred thousand today. So that the need for jobs at this moment is far more urgent than it was at that time. That is only today. In the next decade we must find additional jobs. We must not only maintain the jobs of those who have jobs, but we must find thousands of new jobs — When I say jobs I really ought to be saying, means of making a living whether it be in a paper mill, in the mines or in great hydro-electric development, which we expect to see or in agriculture.

Now, Sir, I want to say this about this report: There is a vast amount of information in it. A vast amount. They were two years working on it. Very, very able men with the scientific touch, and men who wanted the facts, the invoices, the vouchers, men who took nothing on say-so. It is a great and productive piece of work. But honourable gentlemen will have missed the real meaning of this report if they do not grasp the fact that, after the

report has dealt with root crops and has said what it has to say about root crops, and has dealt with dairy farming, and has dealt with poultry and has dealt with fruit farming, fruit production and even fur farming, it comes to the heart and essence of the whole thing, which is livestock; beef cattle, sheep and pigs.

Now I have had the assistance of the Department of Agriculture for months past gathering together information to enable me to compile a table which I find to be eminently interesting. The table shows or deals with mutton and lamb on the one hand and pork on the other, then with poultry, with eggs and with beef both fresh and salted. And with regard to each one of these I have a careful table here dealing individually with each. Mutton and lamb show the consumption for 1954 and I will take two years. Last year, 1954 and, with the help of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, what we can foresee for the year 1964; ten years later. Now, so as not to confuse honourable members I will take the latter figure only while I, just as a matter of interest, run very briefly through the existing situation.

Last year Newfoundland consumed 1,990,000 pounds of mutton and lamb, nearly two million pounds or just ten thousand pounds under two million. That is the equivalent of one hundred and nineteen thousand sheep. Now of that (and this is one foodstuff in which Newfoundland is most nearly self-supporting) of that one million nine hundred and ninety pounds of mutton and lamb, one million two hundred and ninety-five thousand were produced in Newfoundland, or the equivalent of seventy-eight thousand sheep. The imports were eight hundred and ninety-five thousand pounds, the equivalent of forty-one thousand four hundred sheep.

Now the figures for pork in 1954: We consumed 16,716,000 pounds, or sixteen and three quarter million pounds, the equivalent of eighty-nine thousand pigs. Of that we produced ourselves in Newfoundland a half a million pounds, and we imported from the Mainland of Canada, 16.1 million pounds. We produced the equivalent of three thousand pigs and we imported the equivalent of eight-six thousand pigs.

In poultry we consumed 4.3 million pounds, the equivalent of 3,560,000 birds. We produced a quarter of a million and imported 4.1 million. That included chicken, turkey, geese and ducks.

In eggs: Our consumption last year was three and a half million dozen, produced by 398,000 hens. Our local production was greater than our imports on eggs on the one hand and in mutton and lamb on the other, two great foodstuffs in which Newfoundland has come close to becoming self-supporting. We produced 1,082,000 dozen and we imported 1,700,000.

So it goes on. Now I will take the figures projected to 1964, ten years later. In other words what happened last year is of interest only as something showing what the situation is and I take 1964, nine years from now, ten years from the year of these figures, because ten years is a period in which we can devise a policy and attempt to carry it out with the object of reaching a certain point at that date. Now the figures are based on statistics given to us and estimates made for us by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the local office. These figures are only, until I say otherwise, for the purpose of meeting local consumption, to supply the local demand.

Now take mutton and lamb; (it is

for 1964 from here on all through until I say otherwise) mutton and lamb in 1964; 2,625,000 pounds. Now that is 157,000 sheep. Now that is not killed and dressed. That is having that many so that the yield of that flock can be slaughtered and the flock kept as a breeding flock. We should have a total of 157,000 sheep to yield the number that will give the 2.6 million pounds of mutton and lamb. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you put that at 250 sheep per family, that would give a living to 630 families in Newfoundland, raising sheep. (The table is compiled to show how many families might be given a means of a livelihood.) 630 families producing sheep in Newfoundland in ten years hence, to meet the actual local demands of our population of that day for mutton and lamb, an actual demand of 2.6 million, unless the standard of living increases still more, in which case the demand will be for a greater quantity of mutton and lamb than that.

Now pork: The consumption of pork will be 22 million pounds or the equivalent of 125,000 pigs. At a hundred pigs per family, that would mean 1,520 families. It may be argued that a hundred pigs would not be enough to support a family. It would depend on the standard of living a man had in mind when he argued on a thing like that. I had seven hundred pigs at Gander, and I made a very good living out of it. I made more than a good living. I made a pretty substantial profit. I had a disaster which wiped out my profits and they became a very bitter loss. Nevertheless, that was the number I had. I have know men with fifty pigs who made a fairly comfortable and decent living. At a hundred pigs per family it would mean 1,520 families.

Now poultry meat, including turkeys,

ducks and geese as well as chicken: The consumption will be 5.6 million. That is the equivalent of one million birds. That is what we will consume in 1964 in Newfoundland. If there is a slump we will consume less than that, and if our standard of living continues to rise we will consume more than that. Now at five thousand birds per family — I am thinking of broilers, a great new industry in the United States and one sweeping across Canada, the production of broiler chicken for the purpose of eating — raising them for broilers — So at five thousand birds per family, that would mean 225 families, and they would make a very good living raising five hundred broilers each per year.

Now eggs — Our consumption will be four and three quarter million dozen in 1964. That is five hundred and twenty-five thousand birds. At a thousand birds producing eggs per family, that would be 1,525 families producing eggs.

Beef, fresh: 12,000,000 — Now it ought to be said that as refrigeration increases in Newfoundland the consumption of salt beef will decrease. It won't on my part because I want to eat salt beef as long as I live. I like it. But I think the consumption will gradually decline. If it does, the consumption of, and the production of, fresh beef will go up accordingly. We will take that twenty million pounds and quarter it and make it three million pounds; the equivalent of thirty-seven hundred head of cattle. Given fifty head per family that would be another seventy-five families.

Now that brings up the number of families to 3,293. But, Mr. Speaker, already 475 families exist doing precisely this thing. Let me explain how I got that figure of 475 families: You

have hundreds of families producing eggs in Newfoundland and hundreds of families producing sheep and hundreds of others producing beef. But I take the same unit, for example take the number of sheep that exist now, that would come to 250 sheep per family, 630 families — So take it on that basis, with 475 families now producing and you have to deduct 475 families in 1964 which would mean a net of 2,800 new families, over and above the present number. Now all of that is for local consumption, and assuming that our rate continues as about now, that there is no slump, no depression and that there is no great acceleration of the rate of growth, and the growth continues at about the same rate as it is doing at this moment.

Now I move out of the domestic consumption field for a moment into the export, but only with regard to sheep. Newfoundland at the moment has about eighty thousand sheep. Newfoundland at the moment is the sixth province of Canada in the number of sheep she has. Newfoundland at the moment is third province of Canada, per capita, in the number of sheep per capita. I make this assertion of which I hope to establish the truth: I begin with the assertion that we should export five times as much — I mean to the other parts of Canada — Export is not truly the word, but the House knows what I mean — We should export five times as much as we consume. We could do that. There is a market for it and we are capable of doing it. That would be thirteen million pounds of mutton and lamb and it would be the equivalent of 795,000 sheep — Not that we would market that number, but that would be what the flocks would be to yield that quantity of mutton and lamb. That would be three quarters of a million of sheep, which is more than any one province

of Canada has today. There is no province in Canada today with three quarters of a million sheep; and for a very good reason, as will appear. Now at 250 sheep per family that would be over three thousand families, and at five hundred sheep per family that would be half that number or fifteen hundred and something families. Now if I am right, and if we add to the two sets of figures, the number of families over and above those that existed last year that would be needed to produce all that will be consumed locally in 1964; add those, put those in the table and then add to it the number of families that would be needed to produce that many sheep to give us that export to the rest of Canada, put the two together and it is 4,950 families, call it 4,900 families. In other words, Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is this: Theoretically we can find a means of living for six thousand families, a comfortable means of living under this heading in 1964. We have not now got that means of living for these families — It is a theoretical situation in a sense, and in a sense it is not theoretical. It is not theoretical in the sense that that will be the consumption. The consumption figures are pretty accurate. There is not much room for debate. It might be a little lower or a little higher. So that we will be consuming these quantities. And if we produce ourselves what we consume it will be that number of families. And if, in addition to that we can build a sheep industry in Newfoundland that can export, and if the markets in the other parts of Canada can absorb that number of pounds of mutton and lamb and we can produce it, then that would be another number, which would bring the whole thing to six thousand families.

Now the question is, can we in fact

produce that number of jobs of that type in the next ten years? The first thing we need, of course, is people. The next thing we need is land. Have we got the land? I would like to invite the attention of the House to a section that deals with that. First may I say that when the Royal Commission came here they looked at every bit of data we had to give them, and that data was not enough. It was not enough to enable them to make an appraisal of the land mass. After all the very first thing you should do, I suppose, if talking about farming of any kind, is to find out what land you got. And that had never been done in Newfoundland, rather absurdly, but nevertheless had never been done. Like a good many other things in Newfoundland, it had not been done. What they did is this: They discovered we had aerial photographs up in my honourable colleague's office of every square yard of Newfoundland. They discovered that. They then brought down from Ottawa and elsewhere in Canada a number of men who were highly skilled in the art of interpreting aerial photographs. They examined them carefully through special types of glasses etc., interpreting the terrain agriculturally, that is, classifying the land in natural divisions. As a result they have classified, amongst other things in their two years work, the entire land surface of Newfoundland. It is an astonishing fact, utterly astonishing, and they have reduced that to maps. I am sorry I did not think of bringing the maps in. They are now out in the next room. Now I want to reassure the House — Most of us have born within us a little suspicion, a little doubt about the real skills of allegedly skillful experts. And we might say; is it actually possible to take aerial photographs of forty-two thousand square miles of rock, forest

marshes, and rivers and ponds, is it really possible to take these vast masses of aerial photographs and really be able to classify the land, the surface of Newfoundland? Well it is. But, so that they could feel quite confident they were not going off the rails, they spot checked on the ground again and again and again. Having made their interpretations of given areas from aerial photographs, they then went to that area on the ground to see if their own interpretations from the photographs were correct, and it was — it was — It is in the back of this edition that all honourable members will get later on that are to be found the reproductions of these maps indicating the different classifications of the land surface. They could not do it for all the copies. I think my honourable colleague's copy has it, and mine. I think just these two copies — But in the reprinted edition of the report the maps will be reproduced in colour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I had a map of Newfoundland, of the forty-two thousand square miles that have been made by men who have designed the map to show by the arrangement of colour the nature of the land surface, how much of it is bog, how much of it is barren, how much of it is bare, bald, broken rock, how much is forest, how much scrub forest, how much lake and pond and stream and river and brook, how much of it — they have all kinds of names which are new to me and don't mean anything to me as they don't mean anything to most of us here in this House. But in addition to the maps they come now to tell us what these maps mean, and this is most exciting — Mr. Speaker, during the last war the Commission of Government conceived what I think is about the silliest idea that they had conceived in the whole lifetime of the Commission system of Government,

and that is saying a lot. They conceived the idea that, as the Mother Country was with her back to the wall, fighting Hitlerism and in danger always of being terribly mauled and crushed, they, the Commission of Government in Newfoundland, ought to do something to help the Mother Country in the way of agriculture.

Now if it had been fish, minerals, timber, manpower and you would understand, but that it should have been in agricultural was the silliest idea of the Commission of Government. So they asked the British Government to send out a man, and a very able man came out from the British Government, a very able man. It was a little pathetic to have one man landing here in the midst of war. I suppose they flew him out, and he landed here in Newfoundland to advise the Commission of Government as to how Newfoundland could assist the Mother Country agriculturally. It was the biggest "cod." I suppose even Lord Morris never pictured anything as funny as that. But this man travelled around Newfoundland. He was not the first, but he was the latest up to then in a series of visitors who became mesmerized, fascinated by our great bogs. He travelled over the island and he saw those bogs, thousands of acres and tens of thousands of acres and hundreds of thousands of acres, and if he had travelled more he would have seen millions of acres of pure, flat, level land consisting of bog of two types, muck bog and peat bog, most of the muck bog on the west coast and most of this side of the island being peat bog, running eight and ten and sometimes twenty and thirty feet deep, rich in humus, rich in plant food but waterlogged, soaked to the very surface with water. You cannot walk on it because it is waterlogged. But he said: if you could lower the water so that these

bogs would be dried out sufficiently to carry tractors and machinery, what would you have? You would have the prairies. You would have a prairie province, not in one great unbroken run but in patches of a thousand acres here and five hundred acres there and three thousand acres somewhere else. You would have a prairie province in Newfoundland, dark rich soil, if you could drain it, if you could lower the water table. So he wrote his report, and the report, once you had read that part, you might as well throw away the rest of the report. I have done it. I know. I have read it. So the Commission of Government — I can picture — I can imagine at a commission meeting — (that was before my honourable colleague was a Commissioner, needless to say. If he had been a Commissioner at the time, with his knowledge of Bay de Verde, he could have advised them) — but dutifully deciding to carry out the recommendations of their own man brought out from the Mother Country, sent by the Mother Country's own Government at their request — Now the man had gone out and had done his duty. There, Mr. Speaker, was the possibility at least of altering the course of our four centuries of history. They were at the very trembling edge of the possibility of Newfoundland not becoming a Province of Canada, of Newfoundland becoming anything you like to think of. There it was in that report. And instead of the Commissioner shedding his dignity and getting a crowd of men and saying, let us go and dig. Instead of that they said to my honourable colleague; the people out at the prison camp must get out and dig. So a handful of prisoners, a handful of desperate men went digging because they were ordered to dig, out there on the Salmonier Line, near Colinet, and they dug some ditches — I am glad we have become a Province

of Canada. If they had done a good job perhaps we would never have. They dug a few ditches here and there, too narrow and too shallow, and the sides caved in. The main ditches should be ten feet wide and ten feet deep and then there should be other ditches running at right angles, probably two feet wide and deep, shallower, to drain into the main ones. The walls foundered in, yet in spite of that, by shovel, there was forty six acres which managed to get drained and seeded. The hay on that area grew and grew four and five feet high, and to this very day you can go out on Salmonier Line and get out and walk on these bogs — Astonishing — So Dean Shaw does not claim any originality, when he comes and sees these bogs — He asks, is there anything in there — And he travelled over bog after bog after bog, fascinated by them. And why would he not be? If any man in this House ever had anything to do with land clearing, going out and taking an acre of land and getting the trees out somehow, being careful while doing so as not to take all the land there is on the roots of the trees so that only little rocks are left; getting the trees out and then picking the rocks off by hand, by the time he gets an acre of land cleared it takes five, six or seven hundred dollars. Any man who has had any experience cannot but help getting excited at the thought of getting a thousand acres of land cleared in a month by ditching with dynamite.

Now let us be fair: At the time that they dug or attempted to dig these ditches on the Colinet bogs the technique of dynamite had not come in. At least, it might have come in, but it was not well known here in Newfoundland, else they would have used it. They would not have gone in with picks and shovels. But Dean Shaw has travelled

in every nook and cranny of Canada, every nook and cranny of England, every nook and cranny of Wales and Scotland and Ireland and all the farming countries of the earth. Dean Shaw, who is familiar with bogs, who knew the work that had been done in Britain, and Ireland especially and in Wales with bogs, was fascinated. He came across an old fellow over in St. Georges, or a few miles outside St. Georges who had two or three acres of land right in the midst of bog, on the side of the road. He went in, climbed over the fence and asked him how this land came not to be bog land when all around was. The old fellow told him that thirty odd years ago he got out, and with hard work and digging and draining he had changed it into farmland. And the crops — the crops that he grows are fantastic on this bog land now today.

Now in the Report the House won't find any enthusiasm about these boglands. They are being very cautious about it and very conservative. But privately they are very excited I know, because I have discussed it repeatedly with them. They are terribly excited. And Dean Shaw is going over now in a few days, with the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Murray, to England and Wales and Scotland and Northern Ireland and Southern Ireland, to see the machinery actually in use, and then to go to the manufacturers of that machinery. They have already had correspondence, to buy the equipment — because the House will be asked to approve, and if the House approves we are going to spend pretty substantial sums of money this year draining bogs. Now it may be money down the drain, in which case the Opposition can have grand fun with us next year or the year after. If we fail, we will fail. We are prepared to fail, prepared to gamble. We are prepared to risk the

public money, if it all goes down the drain, it is in a good cause.

MR. BROWNE: Down the drain?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In a good cause — win or lose — I do not agree to that "down the drain" but it is a good cause, win or lose. Now if next time they drive in Topsail Road if honourable gentlemen would look in the direction of the birch plant, turn their heads a little to the left —

MR. HOLLETT: We certainly won't be allowed in.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Some honourable gentlemen would and some would not some time ago — Under the new regime I think any honourable gentleman would be permitted in there. But if he would turn his head to the left as he drives in the Topsail Road he will see two or three miles in from the road, to the left, he will see what road used to be called "Old Flannegan's Nap." We used to go picking blueberries in there. I was in there last year several times to see the Government flock of sheep. The Government have a little flock of sheep, and that is where they are, "Flannegan's Nap." Now when you go in on "Flannegan's Nap" you are in great open country, a little higher than the surrounding ranging country. As you look out Topsail Road you can see the cars which are going by and going on west up to the Octagon and you can see Topsail and keep going west right to Holyrood, from Donovan's to Holyrood. And as you are up on that open country, about three miles wide and about twenty or thirty miles long, to your left is the Southern Shore all open before you and you see the Atlantic Ocean on your right, Topsail Road and further west, Conception Bay and Bell Island. It is a great open country with magnificent grazing

ground, magnificent! magnificent! Now when you get to Holyrood you turn left and go across Witless Bay Line, and on the left going over, and to some extent on the right, but mostly on the left, more than half way over to the Southern Shore the ridge turns left, this great wide ridge, and goes for miles. There again is the most magnificent grazing land. But you can turn right, and you can keep on going until you come to Brigus (inside from Brigus, I mean, not out on the shore) and from there keep going to Carbonear, and from Carbonear keep going to Western Bay, and from there keep going to Grates Cove. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it runs from Donovans to Grates Cove. Just think of that. It varies in width from a mile to three or four or five miles, this great grazing ground of open land in open country. Now some of it is taken up in ponds and lakes, of course. Last summer I went over it by helicopter and I have gone several times by plane, and I travelled over it, I suppose if you put all my walking together, for hundreds of miles, on foot and on horseback. And I went in Roches Line and in the line from Conception Harbour to Brigus Junction. The next line you come to is Roches Line and Hodgewater Line, then come to New Harbour Road across to New Harbour and then across Heart's Content Barrens from Carbonear, all down through that country you could graze a million sheep — graze a million sheep.

Now if you go up the Southern Shore, any point along the Southern Shore road and look to the right, a half mile in and sometimes only a quarter of a mile and sometimes a couple of miles, all the distance right down the Southern Shore to Cape Race is another great grazing land, vast open country with magnificent grazing. You can go anywhere in Conception Bay, go

in anywhere in Trinity Bay on the southern end of Trinity Bay, anywhere on the Southern Shore, anywhere in Trepassey Bay and anywhere in St. Mary's Bay and on the east side of Placentia Bay — Now as my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition so well knows, when you get on the west side of Placentia Bay and take the Brin Peninsula — I have flown over the great peninsula — or if you trample over it as he has done, no doubt, fishing or shooting, the magnificence of those hundreds of thousands of acres of magnificent grazing ground can be seen. I will tell you how good the grazing ground is: Mr. Murray the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, returned recently from a tour across country, down in the States and then back again across the States. He was in Wyoming, Utah and in Wyoming, the great cattle and sheep country, the place they write the ballads about the great saddle and sheep country — and he went over it — He knows our own Newfoundland terrain. He has been in every nook and cranny of Newfoundland himself, largely on foot, and he was able to compare the great grazing, the grass in Wyoming with the grass here in Newfoundland that he knows so well; as I was able to compare the grass in Alberta and in the foothills of Alberta. Last year when I went out to British Columbia or on my way back I got off at Calgary and went off through the foothills by car and saw the grass there, and was able to compare it with our grasses in Newfoundland. And he and I say and agree that there is better grazing here than there is in the foothills of Alberta or in the State of Wyoming.

Now, if that is so — if that is so — it means that Newfoundland has been spurning God's gift, it is a great gift, a very great gift, grass. Let the House cast its mind back around the world

today and tell me any single item of wealth so universal and indispensable as grass. It is found in every climate of the world. Grass — In every climate. It is to be found even, they tell me, in the North Pole, under the ice. It is to be found in all kinds of history. The most ancient times knew grass. It is wool. Grass is wool, Grass is mutton — Grass —

MR. HOLLETT: Hay too.

MR. SMALIWOOD: Grass and hay are the same thing. It is land. It is mutton. It is wool. It is milk. It is leather. It is beef. It is meat. It is the greatest single beneficial bounty. I don't suppose it is the greatest — I suppose air is the greatest and water, but it is in a class with air and water. And God has endowed Newfoundland very bountifully with grass. Now we are not making any use of it, because instead of using it what we are doing is this: If you drive around Conception Bay, start now, go up this afternoon, go up tomorrow or go Sunday, around on the Conception Bay, and see the green of it. If you have been around recently you will have seen it in every settlement. Between the edge of the road and the fence sheep are to be found. Now the practice is that sheep come in the morning to the back door, sit up to the table and have breakfast with you, practically. That is our Newfoundland method, our Newfoundland technique in raising sheep. You bar them in carefully, bar them in healthy little houses for the whole winter when they should be out in the open. I know of a flock of sheep five hundred that were accumulated last year, local sheep, local lambs born last spring around Conception Bay, five hundred new lambs. These new lambs have never seen the inside of a building to this minute. They were born late last spring, five

hundred ewe lambs that have never yet been under a roof and are out yet, and they lamb next month. The lambing will start again out in the open and their lambs will never see the inside of a building or be under a roof — ordinary Newfoundland lambs, five hundred of them. I can take you over and show you on Roches Line. I was over there this winter, wrapped up in snow boots and a sheep-lined coat and a muffler around my neck, and the hood of the coat over my head, and big mitts on my hands — a very cold day, and have seen these five hundred sheep. It is funny that for the first time in the history of this island sheep have been wintered out. As a result of that experiment, I can tell you that for the first time in our history it has been shown conclusively — the Department of Agriculture know all about it, have been over and have seen it and have been immensely interested. They have been over there on two freezing days this last winter and have seen five hundred young sheep out all the winter. Fifty of them died. Fifty out of five hundred. Now I can tell you how that came about. We should not have had them. When you buy you go to a woman and buy five or six ewes from her, lambs last summer. Not much of it, pretty poor stuff. However you have to buy the six, if you leave one you will not get the other five. To get the good ones you have also to buy the very poor. And we got about fifty out of five hundred which we did not want. These died. They perished. In other words, normal sheep won't perish. Now these sheep would paw down through ten and twelve inches of snow, and eat the frozen grass. They did it. I saw hundreds of them do it. It is true we fed them a bit of hay daily. The shepherd would take shifts. We have a Scottish shepherd there looking after them, and

he fed them daily a bit of hay. He would spread it on the trees, not on the ground, so they would have to get up and get at the hay on the boughs of the trees. These are not north-country sheep; these are not hill-sheep brought from the north of Scotland, these are local lambs, the same as you see going around anywhere.

Now, our practice in raising sheep in Newfoundland is just about as wrong as it could be. To begin with you do not need to house them. They do not need any housing. Leave them out for the whole winter. Take the hay to them. Don't bring them in to the hay. Don't put them in warm houses nor drafty houses nor damp places. Leave them out in the open all together, and take a bit of hay to them. Then they become healthy and hardy, and their lambs are hardy. They have them born out in the open. Don't have them born in February and March, have them born in May and June. Have the breeding done in January, and have only pure-bred rams. Then the lambs are getting better and better every generation. In the last five or six years, as a result of the Government's little flock of sheep which they imported from Scotland, and the distribution of pure-bred rams, the quality of sheep has improved appreciably. But it has to be better than that. Now what ought to be done is this: The sheep should be taken off the roads, from around the houses and the back roads, taken out of the garden, taken away altogether. We should be able to go around Conception Bay and never lay an eye on a sheep. They should be in the country, with this beautiful grazing. Right now here is what happens: The sheep are out on the edge of the roads going around Conception Bay and have their lambs. The sheep are wormy inside. They have internal parasites.

As soon as the owner lets them out they are roaming all over the roads picking at the few blades of grass. It is pathetic, pitiful, when you think in over the barrens are magnificent strands of grass for sheep. It is beautiful to see it. But here they are picking at these few blades of grass along both sides of the highroads and contaminating that grass. Already that grass is all wormy, and already these little lambs are wormy, because, although the frost will kill the worms over the keen winter, the spring comes and they come out again, the grass becomes wormy and presently their lambs become wormy. That is on the inside. Then on the outside there are ticks. Take them away from that. Take them in and leave them in the country. Never bring them out until they are brought out to slaughter. Have them lamb in there in the country, sheared in there in the country, dipped, wormed, have it all done in the country. Never set an eye on them unless you go in the country to see them. That is the way to do it. That is how it is done everywhere else, in Wales, in Northern England, and in Scotland.

Now is there enough land for it? As we would say in Newfoundland: "There is a good amount of it." The Department has just completed a survey today, and they gave me the figures, the last thing here before lunch. There are 1,300,000 acres on the Avalon Peninsula. Think of that—a million three hundred thousand acres of good grazing land. That is after you exclude the lakes and ponds and what forests there are, etc., one million three hundred thousand acres. Mr. Speaker, if you put sheep out like that they get the grazing for nine months of the year, or eight months of the year. That means three or four months a year they do not get the

grazing, especially if the snow is deep, as it was this year. Now if you get three or four feet, the best of sheep will get down at the grass. You have to give them hay. Therefore, the number of sheep you can safely have is not determined by the number you can successfully graze on these barrens. The number is determined by the number you can successfully winter, winter-feed. In other words, how much hay you can provide for them for the winter. That is where the bogs come in. These great barrens are for spring and summer and fall grazing for sheep and cattle, and the bogs are to grow grass against the winter, tens of thousands of tons of hay for winter-keep. So that the House will understand the importance of the experiments that are to be carried on this year by the Government, the Government of Canada have agreed to match our money up to a limit of a hundred thousand dollars. They have agreed to match our money on that great and historic experiment of draining the bogs.

Can you go to a great bog and can you by dynamite ditching lower the water table three feet so that a year later or even less or a bit longer it is sufficiently dry to take your trailer and tractor out on that bog and with the new types of machinery that rotate and tear up the surface and pulverize the surface of any twigs and little bushes so that you can spread your limestone and your seed and get a field of hay? That is the experiment. That is what is going to be found out. It will cost a lot of money because what you got to do is do it under a number of conditions, take different kinds of bogs, some of it bog probably up on the Southern Shore or probably up towards St. Vincents, another up on the west coast another up in the Burin Peninsula and over on the south side of Trepassey, one somewhere between

Hodgewater Line. There are some magnificent bogs as you drive along the Hodgewater Line on the left side mostly, over towards Whitbourne. It means taking ten or twelve different bogs, perhaps four or five thousand acres, and draining them. And I am happy to say Dean Shaw has been able to get a man from the great dykelands project of the Maritimes. The House is aware, doubtlessly of the Maritimes of the early settlers on the Bay of Fundy in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and the dykelands they built to keep the salt water back. Behind these dykelands, because the water had been overflowing them for aeons of time, the land was extremely rich. And they dyked it off and planted it and had magnificent farms. In the course of time these dykes wore out and were carried away and the land inundated. Here recently, three or four or five years ago the Government of Canada joined with the two Provincial Governments in a joint scheme to rebuild the dykes, to reclaim the land. Today on thousands of acres of that dykeland you have the most magnificent hay that I have ever seen. So one or two from that project will be made available to us here in Newfoundland this year, to assist us in this work of draining the bogs. They are going to try and find some man in North Ireland or Scotland or Wales or Northern England, where there are bogs and where they have quite a bit of experience with draining these bogs and growing crops on them, to bring over to assist in this work.

Of course one thing we are determined about is that it is not going to be half done. We may waste money, but it will be wasted by overdoing rather than by not doing it enough. We are going to know if it can be done. We are going to know if we can drain these bogs, and if we can, by

what machinery; if we can cultivate these bogs and if we can grow crops on them, and if we can — if we can, I say, the history of Newfoundland will be changed at that point. It will change our history, alter the course of Newfoundland history, if we can, by relatively modest expenditures, because the big expenditure will be made by the Government, that is experimental — Everything wrong there is to be done we will do. No doubt we will make every kind of a mistake there is to be made, but by sheer slugging and expenditure we will prove it. Then when it is proved, a man can go in commercially. He will know how much dynamite he has got to buy, how close together it has to be put in the ground, how deep in the ground. We will know all that. We will find out and be able to tell any man what he can do commercially to clear a thousand acres of bog. Here in Newfoundland there were families who came here from Ireland in the 1820's and 1830's and they went out in the suburbs of St. John's — I am looking at the descendant of one of them right now — they went out and cleared five acres of land, and finally after another five years got another five acres. A most back-breaking toil, a peasant kind of existence — but to go and clear a thousand acres in a summer — If that is possible then we will have a revolution in our economy, will make cattle raising possible and will make the winter feeding of cattle and sheep possible.

Now I have a few estimates here on that. If you had this number of sheep that I have envisaged, under a million, 942,000 sheep (that is to meet the local demand and this export I spoke of) for grazing at five acres per sheep. Or that five acres possibly ought to be six or eight or maybe ten, I don't know, but I doubt it. I think perhaps

five acres should support a sheep. That would be 4,710,000 acres for grazing sheep. And then twenty thousand cattle at twenty acres per head, if twenty acres of that wild open grazing grassland will support one head of cattle, that would be 400,000 acres. That is a total of 5,100,000 acres for grazing, to graze that nearly a million sheep and twenty thousand head of beef cattle. Now winter keep: Now at 500 pounds of hay per sheep for winter keep it is 235,000 tons of hay — at two tons to the acre — I have averaged about that — I believe if this bog thing works you are going to get more than two tons to the acre. But I will accept the figure of two tons an acre, 117,000 acres. Now the cattle: Twenty thousand with three tons of hay to winter one animal — which is fairly generous — that is sixty thousand tons, at two tons to the acre that is thirty thousand tons. That is a grand total for hay for winter keep of two hundred and ninety-five thousand tons.

MR. BROWNE: Have you got that in a table?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I am hoping the figures will appear in the newspapers. I think it is sufficiently interesting to be printed. If not they will be in Hansard. And I will give the honourable member the figures when I am through.

That is a total of two hundred and ninety-five thousand tons of hay growing on 147,000 acres of bog land.

Now I want to say another thing before I leave this: Last fall on Roches Line a farmer on Roches Line started an experiment. He was the first, and he was very anxious to be the first. It was sentimental with him to want to be the first person in Newfoundland to do this, that is to go out on that open range and improve the

range. He did it by liming it. He went out on what is known as the back ridge and he limed, two tons to the acre, and he put a little fertiliser in at the same time. And shortly now he is going to seed it with wild white clover, and some grass known to be good grass for Newfoundland seeding. And on these fifty acres and another ridge he has done since, another fifty or sixty acres, about a hundred acres he is trying to seed with a cyclone seeder and have it trampled by the sheep. Have the shepherd and dogs just walk the sheep, and the lambs when they come along, just up and down to press the seed into the land. By that means we think that the number of sheep that a given acre would support can be doubled. If say five acres, for the sake of argument, will support with grazing ten sheep, for the sake of argument, by improving the pasture, the wild, open pasture grazing you make it twice as much sheep.

Now I don't think that there is any doubt that in that great area between Grates Cove and Brigus or coming right up to Holyrood or right on to Donovans, probably half a million acres of good grazing land. I believe it is going to be necessary to improve it, and tens of thousands of tons of limestone will have to be spread on that land and re-seeding will have to be done. But, Mr. Speaker, among the very many farm and agricultural men that I referred to, I have learned, we must not imagine that the open range is there naturally perfect, and a man has to do nothing except to put the animals on it. It is not like that, far from it. Literally millions upon millions of acres of the rangelands, the great grazing areas of the United States have been improved. In 1931 Senator Taylor introduced an Act which is known to this day as the "Taylor Act," and the Taylor Act is an Act under

which the Government of the United States assists cattlemen and sheepmen to improve the rough, open rangeland by various means, and they subsidize the doing of it. I think it will be necessary, not at first, not at all at first, and not for many years to come, but perhaps in eight, ten or fifteen years or more, I think, it will prove necessary to improve these rangelands by liming them so as to alkalize the acidity, and thereby improve the growth of the grass, and maybe to fertilise it just a little, using a little chemical fertiliser, and re-seed it. In that way, if you can support a half a million sheep you can double it and make it a million and double it again and support two million, and double the number of any grazing animals you support just merely by improving the land.

MR. BROWNE: You will have to import people then to look after them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know about that. I think we have imported a great many people already, our population has gained by several hundred who have come in. I would rather see them coming in than going out. I would rather see foreigners from any part of the world added to the population than see tens of thousand of Newfoundland people pour out of Newfoundland as they did the years before Confederation. In the year immediately before Confederation twenty-five hundred Newfoundlanders moved out of Newfoundland and the year before that again twenty-four hundred Newfoundlanders moved out.

MR. BROWNE: How much have moved out since?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Very few. The population is growing, so obviously very few Newfoundlanders moved out, but a few moved in.

MR. HOLLETT: They will be all back if they hear this, I think.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hope so. I hope so. And that type of remark and the spirit that prompted that type of remark is the explanation of why we are so numerous over here and my honourable friends are so pitifully few over there. That is really the spirit that caused that.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes?

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend asked for it.

MR. HOLLETT: And got to take it too.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now I am not nearly through, but I think perhaps a recess of ten minutes would be in order, Mr. Speaker.

The House then recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I will be a great deal longer, but there are one or two points I have yet to make. The first one that I would like to deal with is my own personal conception of exactly how this sheep programme can be made practical. It is all very well to say that we have ten thousand sheep and should have ten times as much. It is easy to say but it is not at all easy to do. And if it is to be done it must be done. I believe it can be done, and I believe it can be done in a very practical fashion. Now it seems to me that the first thing of all is that use must be made of these great grazing areas about which I was speaking. If we don't use these great grazing areas we must be content merely to have a few sheep hanging around the highroads and trying to poke their noses in through the fences to get an occasional blade of grass in the gardens. That is the first

point. We must have them out on the open ground back from the seashore, out of harms way, where the grass is good, where infestations, worms and other vermin can be kept down. And it seems to me this is how it would happen:

Let us take, for example, Shearstown, in Spaniard's Bay. Now you might take other examples equally well, Brigus, Bay Roberts, Carbonear, Ferryland, Trepassey, the Cape Shore, St. Lawrence, Burin, Marystown, Lawn, New Harbour, etc., there are many places you could take as an example, but I would like to take Spaniards Bay and Shearstown together. The reason I think of those two places is that in Shearstown there they already have a very good sheep breeding association, and they have an annual sheep fair. And there is already on the part of the people over there a fairly considerable interest in sheep. So that what I would like to see is this: All these sheep raisers of Spaniards Bay and Shearstown form themselves and be encouraged to form themselves into a sheep breeders association. That is number one. That association then bring in from Scotland a shepherd, a trained, professional, Scottish shepherd, with his dogs. He should have a house in Shearstown or Spaniards Bay for his family to live in, and his children to go to school. Every member of the association would pay in to the fund of the association one dollar, say, for each animal, and the Government to match that money. And by paying in that one dollar to the fund this would happen: The three or five or seven or ten hundred sheep, or whatever it might be, the number of sheep owned by each member would be passed over to the control of the shepherd. He would keep a sheep register. He would tag every sheep, and every sheep would be num-

bered, and the number across from the owner in the sheep register. That would be the job of the shepherd, perhaps checked and assisted by the secretary of the association. The shepherd would take these sheep, first he would worm and dip all the sheep, that would involve, no doubt, the building of a regular sheep dip, which is inexpensive anyway. Then having wormed and dipped the sheep he would take them off with his dogs in on the selected grazing ground to say five thousand acres or more, or less, depending on the size of the flock. I think the grazing grounds will have to be regulated much as fishing grounds are now regulated. I don't think it can be done by tossing a coin. I think it will have to be laid down by the Government. The Government will have to apportion and map out areas for flocks of sheep.

Now the shepherd has wormed and dipped and taken the sheep and entered them in the herd registry and tagged the sheep. Say there is a maximum of two thousand sheep, you could not expect a shepherd to handle, even with a couple of good dogs, more than two thousand. Then he takes these two thousand sheep off into the grazing ground, and there they remain. They never come out of that except to be slaughtered. He goes in daily — and in the summer, no doubt, with a small trailer or tent he lives there all the time, and possibly comes home for the week-end. In the winter he goes in daily with a horse and slide or a jeep, with so many bundles of hay daily, when the snow is deep and it is necessary to hand feed them. But the point is that while the shepherd may come back and forth between his home out in the settlement and the grazing ground, two or three or four miles in. The sheep don't. They stay there. The owners of the sheep never see them

except by going in to see them. They are never seen on the roads nor in the gardens nor hanging around by the back doors or in the back yards. The sheep are in on a clean range.

Now a scheme of improvement of these ranges will have, of course to be adopted. That will be part of the job the Government will have to do, assist and undertake to improve, say, four or five thousand acres a year, by liming and some fertilising and some seeding of wild white clover and other types of good native grasses. On that we can get extensive advice from Dr. Stephenson.

Now at lambing time the shepherd no doubt would need to have a helper and no doubt also at shearing time he would need to have help as well. But except for lambing and shearing and dipping them (that is only once a year except for dipping which is probably twice) he would not need help. But except for that a good shepherd can handle up to a couple of thousand sheep. And what I visualize is that all of these sheep raisers, sheep breeders association, would be affiliated, and would each affiliate to the central association for all Newfoundland, and would have, in that country from Grates Cove to Topsail, say, or even further out this way to Donovans, would have dozens of these flocks of sheep, each in charge of a shepherd and would have as many shepherds brought out from Scotland as there would be flocks. And have the same thing up the Southern Shore, and the same thing all around the Avalon Peninsula and around the Burin Peninsula, on the north side of Bouavista Bay, as you get well down, say, from Wesleyville and on towards the cape, in back there where there is a magnificent area for sheep raising, and in certain other parts of Newfoundland. But the ideal place is the

Avalon Peninsula and the Burin Peninsula. In the Botwood area too there are various areas. Of course in the interior of the Island, it is a little regrettable, you have got open spances suitable but they are pretty far removed from settlements and centres of civilization.

Now all rams, of course, would have to be under control, complete and absolute and relentless and remorseless control. If you are going to raise the standard of your flock — if you are going by breeding to improve your flocks you are going to do it by breeding your ewes with pure-bred rams, to get the quality of the flock raised in four or five years, until you have practically nothing but pure-bred or about 99% pure-bred flocks. Therefore we must adopt a firm and relentless and remorseless policy of ram control. It is almost a capital offense in a great sheep scheme to have dogs at large or rams uncontrolled. That should almost be a capital crime, because the best plans can be ruined by a few scrub rams at large, as the House is well aware. The less said the better. But, Sir, everybody understands exactly what I mean. We must have good, pure-bred flocks, the hill sheep of the northern country, sturdy and hardy, good milkers, good mothers, good sheep suitable for Newfoundland.

Now with controlled breeding lambing takes place in the summer, that is to say in the month of May, when the young shoots are coming up and the weather is fairly mild, and it is easier on the lamb. Remember all the lambing is done outdoors — no more lambing or sheep keeping indoors, but out on the open range. There the lambing is done, when the spring has come and the grass is green and succulent and the weather is a bit temperate for the

birth of young lambs, tens of thousands of young lambs a year.

But that calls for cold storage. Right now, Mr. Speaker, with a mere 80,000 sheep in Newfoundland, every fall the few sheep owners we have, each of them owning just a few sheep are really quite embarrassed in their efforts to sell the few lambs they have, the reason being obviously that all lambs are for sale at one time, and we cannot expect the people to absorb a whole year's production of lambs in two or three or four or five weeks. That is not reasonable. Therefore there must be a holding system, to have controlled temperature in which the mutton and lamb would be kept.

Now we are going to try this year — I am personally going to call the first meeting in Spaniards Bay and Shearstown, and I am going to invite the sheep owners of these places to form the first association, and to form the first community flock with a competent shepherd. Then, before the summer is over, I am hoping to get personally to five or six or eight other places in Newfoundland, around Conception Bay and up on the Southern Shore and maybe in St. Lawrence and Placentia Bay in places where there is a good chance of success. If I can get that far, as to get five or six or eight of these associations formed, then we will bring in that number of shepherds from Scotland. It will mean a trip over for someone, I hope I won't have to do it, but if I have to do it I will do it. We will have to check carefully the right type of men who when they come to Newfoundland won't feel too strange. Another thing; I think these shepherds will probably have to form themselves into an association of their own, so that there will be a sort of guild of shepherds.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, this sort of

thing, if it is done right, will attract a tremendous amount of attention. I will give the House an example: I have a letter from the big Scottish outfit in Nova Scotia, with a sort of Gaelic name, which I forget. It is the big outfit in Nova Scotia which holds a great annual celebration of Scotsmen. They wrote to say they had heard that I had brought in a shepherd from Scotland, and asked would it be permissible for this Scotsman to go to this big Scottish do they have in Nova Scotia. I think that the coming of a number of Scottish shepherds to Newfoundland and the formation of these flocks of sheep would attract a tremendous amount of attention. Indeed I don't mind saying that my own strong hopes is that Newfoundland will become rapidly not only Canada's leading province in milk but also Canada's leading province in sheep.

Now I know that it is not going to be easy. I know that. I know it as well as anyone can tell me. I know we will make many mistakes and blunders in an attempt to do it. I know a lot of people are going to be very sceptical about it. I know there will be a lot of sneers and jeers about it. But I was never one to care very much about that. But we will persevere and try to carry out the policy of building up Newfoundland into a truly great sheep province.

You know in Nova Scotia they have 95,000 sheep. But every one of these sheep except a few in Cape Breton is kept inside a fence. They are not out on the open range. They have not got open ranges in Nova Scotia. They have not got the great stretches of open country that we have here in Newfoundland, and there they can only keep a couple or three thousand sheep, and they can keep the type that will thrive on succulent green grassy

fields and inside a fence. Well, that limits very severely the number of sheep. And it is only because Nova Scotia has been a farming province from the beginning and has a population double ours that they have today 95,000 sheep. If Nova Scotia had the great open countryside that we have in Newfoundland they would become Canada's leading sheep province instead of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking of grass: Let me put a conundrum to this House. I wonder if the honourable gentlemen here could answer it right? In the last ten years in Nova Scotia the production of grains has gone sharply down. In the same ten years the importation of grains into Nova Scotia from other parts of Canada has gone sharply down. In the same ten years the animal population has gone rapidly up. Now, what is the answer to that riddle?

The production of grain in Nova Scotia has gone very sharply down. The amount of grain that is brought in from other provinces has gone sharply down. But while that was happening the population of animals began sharply up. The answer is grass. In Nova Scotia they have gone in for the production of grass more than has any other province of Canada, relatively speaking, and have gone in very heavily for green forage. Now green forage is a remarkable new development; and instead of building these massive perpendicular silos of concrete blocks or cement or wooden staves or anything, great structures that dotted the skyline right across Canada, they have a new type of silo, horizontal, laid down on the ground. And this for Newfoundland is terribly important because our climate is such as to make it difficult to dry hay in Newfoundland. In fact it had come to

the conclusion up to a couple or three years ago the only hope was artificial dryers for hay. They are doing that now in various parts of the world, drying hay artificially. But I dreaded the thought of our having to get artificial dryers for hay. It was bad enough to have to do it for codfish. Then I learned about green forage. Here is what happens: They go along with a tractor and cut the grass, then another tractor comes along and picks up that grass, or a machine hauled by a tractor chops it automatically into short lengths of two or three inches, and tosses it into a wagon. Now from the wagon you take it and dump it in the ground, and the tractor goes back and forth over that pile of green grass, back and forth all day long for a whole day, and presses and presses it until it presses the air out, then covers it with sods or earth or agricultural limestone. And all through the winter and the succeeding spring, until the grass is green again the cattle can just eat the green forage, with all the vitamins and all the food nutrients that are in grass, and so much of which are lost when dried as hay. All these are retained, and in fact, the animals are on green grass all through the winter, and there is no waste to it, and it eliminates the terrible hazards of drying hay. Last year I know there was one field my son-in-law was very proud of. There was three tons to the acre on a ten acre field, thirty tons. And it was a pleasure to see it, full of clover, beautiful stuff. And it was two weeks after that before it stopped raining and that thirty tons of hay was lost. But now he can go out and cut the grass while it is raining and make green forage and the sheep and cattle have that beautiful green grass all through the winter. That is happening in Nova Scotia, and it really is astonishing to see sleepy, unproductive back-yard old

Nova Scotia that can't hold a candle to this little province, yet rapidly becoming a successful beef cattle province in Canada. A province which ten years ago was bewailing and beeling and grinding their teeth because Ottawa did not come down and make them rich and happy, suddenly Nova Scotia becomes a progressive, modern, forward-looking province with significant development in beef. Why? If she had our great millions of acres of grassland -- You can wrap up the whole population in Nova Scotia -- Had she that she would lead North America as a sheep country, which is precisely, I claim, what Newfoundland should do.

Now that is sheep: The same thing applies to cattle. I don't say we are ever going to become the great cattle province that other provinces are, but I don't see why we should not be at least self-supporting -- And why should not every bit of wool be manufactured in Newfoundland? Why should it not be turned into beautiful woollen garments and woollen blankets. If we grow sheep why should we not use the wool. And it would be nice to have two or three little factories. Tiny little towns in Scotland and in the north of England do it and have this as the only excuse for being in existence. Honourable gentlemen in this House have been in them during the war. In the countryside surrounding these towns were lots of sheep and in the town a little wool factory, dozens of them, making tweeds of various kinds. We can have that in Newfoundland. We can have a packing house handling the beef and hogs. We can have employment flowing out of it, prosperous people who make their living off the land -- Then, Mr. Speaker, every factory we have -- just think of them, name up our factories, paint factory, boot and shoe factory, clothing factory,

birch factory, plywood, all your secondary industries, all your industrial plants suddenly get new customers in every prosperous farmer we get. If we can build up these five or six thousand families in the next few years, all excellent customers for our local industries, the best kind of customers — So one fits into the other.

Now I would not want the House to think for one minute I have just gone so much overboard for this type of activity I am not interested in the fisheries. That would be stupid and silly. I hope I am not stupid and silly. I would not want anyone to think I was so interested in this agricultural phase that I have lost interest in minerals and mines, because I would be foolish and silly to do that, nor that I had lost interest in the great new third paper mill. I say all these things are needed. If there is the meaning that I attach to these facts, great, glorious facts, yet facts that may be terrible, the growth of our population, the enormous acceleration in the rate of increase of our population — If these things are true — if our Newfoundland population is to become half a million in the next ten years or less than ten years, half a million in the next five years and a million in the next twenty-five years, what are they going to do — we will have to maintain twelve hundred schools and spend a couple of thousand dollars per student. Is it to train Newfoundlanders to build up Ontario? Or are we going to train them to build up Newfoundland? Are we going to hold our own people here and make use of them here in Newfoundland? If we are we have got to find jobs for them. If we are we got to develop our economy on every front — *on every front*.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not even scratched the surface of this magnifi-

cent Report, this most thorough-going, this most complete Report seven hundred pages of wisdom on the subject of agriculture, not a peasant agriculture, not a few, poor, poverty-stricken farmers scratching at the earth to produce a few potatoes. Not that — but people living with the dignity that comes from a decent income. I could take four days on this report. I have now read it all. Perhaps I am the only member of the House that has read it right through, and I am going to read it again. I don't know what it cost, fifty or a hundred thousand dollars or over. But it is worth every cent. Before this year is out it may be the cause of altering the course of our history because it is the cause of those experiments we are going to conduct on hogs. And if these are successful it may well alter the course of our history.

I want to say how wonderfully lucky Newfoundland was to have had Dean Shaw and Dr. Drummond and Dr. Carr. Dr. Carr is here in the House this afternoon; and Pat Murray. A remarkable thing, Mr. Speaker, is that Dean Shaw and Dr. Drummond and P. C. Murray, the three Commissioners were all born on farms. Dean Shaw is still a farmer. He has a big farm outside the city of Ottawa, which he still operates. Mr. Murray has never lived anywhere except on the farm on which he was born. His family has been farmers for three generations. So that if anybody thinks this is a lot of long-haired stuff, just theoretical stuff, dreams, he is making a mistake. Obviously this is the Report of highly practical men, who have travelled over thousands of miles of our Newfoundland scene and who have met thousands of our Newfoundland people; and who out of the richness of their tremendous personal background in farming under every circumstance

conceivable and every kind of condition in Canada, have set down in writing their views. And while I find a great gulf between the sober, cautious verbiage of their Report, and that they say when you sit down and put your feet up on the table and talk for three or four or five hours and swap ideas, and the enthusiasm they have — there is a great gulf — Dean Shaw has not got any doubt in his mind at all — I am sure he has not — that these bogs can be drained and that being drained they will be successful. But as a great professional man he cannot go out on a limb in print and say so. There is always just the chance it won't work, and so he has refused to do so. But I know what he thinks. I know what Mr. Murray thinks and what Dr. Cary thinks and what Professor Drummond thinks. They think enough of it to have gone to Mr. Gardiner and said that there is a great experiment which ought to be tried and asked, will you back it to the extent of one hundred thousand dollars? Mr. Gardiner himself has faith enough in it to say he would put a hundred thousand dollars of Federal money behind it. The Newfoundland Government has enough faith in it to put a hundred thousand dollars in the experiment. We are going to try it and see what comes out of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I suggested that I start the ball rolling on this Report. My honourable friend indicated they might want to wait until next week and have a little longer to study the Report before they take part in the debate on it. On the other hand they may be prepared to start the ball rolling now, on the undertaking it could be continued later, after today, but that is entirely up to them. There may be honourable members on this side of the House who feel it a duty and would like to

say something about what is, after all, a very historic document.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I should like to have available the words that would be necessary for me to describe all the things that I imagine. That is a very difficult task for anybody. But I have to congratulate the honourable member on being able to paint a picture, a word picture of the imagination, better I think than any other man that I have ever listened to. I have had the privilege and the honour on various occasions in the past to hear the Honourable the Premier describe reports and refer to them. I could always refer to the enthusiasm of the Honourable the Premier on each and every one of these occasions when a new report was brought in to this House. So that you will pardon me, Sir, if I do not become too much over-enthusiastic as yet on this particular Report.

I was somewhat, I should not say amused, but I wondered how the Honourable the Premier — Of course he informed us that he had the Department of Mines and Resources working on this thing for two or three months. Consequently he was in a position to go ahead and make a very excellent speech, but I was somewhat intrigued, shall I say, when the Honourable the Premier carried us all forward for about five or ten years into 1964 and spoke of the mutton and lamb and pork and pulllets and eggs and beef and salt pork. After a moment of course, I was inclined to, in my own way, throw cold water on that, and then I remembered a piece of poetry of Tennyson: For I dipped into the future, far as human eye could see; saw the wonders of the world and all the glories that would be. If we get all the Honourable the Premier envis-

ages then we are going to get somewhere in sheep raising.

Now, Sir, we on this side, received this Report, I believe, the day before yesterday. We were not clear last night until 11 o'clock. After I went home at about midnight I started to read it until I went to sleep — casting no discredit on the compilers of this report — But I did go asleep — I think I read for an hour and a half. I started again this morning at 5 o'clock and read until I got up at 7 o'clock. And I started again at 11 o'clock today, and I have been reading it in spots ever since. Now that is the only study, if you can call it study, that I have had, at any rate, or opportunity I have had to give to it. So, far be it from me, Sir, at this stage, to say anything that would throw any cold water on this Report, because we have just been informed it has cost fifty to a hundred thousand dollars or more. It does not matter what it cost, we know it cost considerable, and we are not saying anything about that at any rate, because it is as much as this year's experiment is going to cost the Government. We will remember, of course, that some time back the Honourable the Premier lifted out of this Report that part which referred to the mink industry and the statement which the Honourable the Premier has given us on the mink industry conforms very nearly to the suggestions (I say suggestions) made in this Report by the honourable Commissioners. As a matter of fact one would almost think that the Honourable the Premier had himself written that particular part with regard to the mink, because of the activities that have been taking place ever since early last summer relative to mink, or at least early last fall — They conform very closely and very nearly to the suggestions which have

been made here by the honourable Commissioners.

I followed very carefully the historical account of agriculture in this country by the Commissioners. That was not new to me because I had read of it before. But I could see that the Commissioners were going to base their conclusions on the experiences of the past, on the mistakes of the past, therefore they started out and gave us about eighty or ninety pages of historical data, and they came to certain conclusions. They came to the conclusion that we did have very poor land in this country. I think they found out that our land in Newfoundland is about one-third bog, one-third forest land and one-third bad rock and barren. And they came to the conclusion that the temperature in this country is not as good as it might be for success in agriculture. They also decided the temperature is undoubtedly the result of the amount of sunshine we get. They decided we don't get enough sunshine to equal some of the provinces on the Mainland. They then spoke of the location of the various agricultural land which had come under their gaze.

I was impressed by this Report — and it is to this Report I am speaking, Sir — and I am not floating away on the wings of imagination in any way, shape or form. I was impressed with the Report what I read of it, because of the fact that these Commissioners have not allowed their imagination to roam far afield. They have set down facts and figures, and on these facts and figures they have suggested things that might or could be done. They do not say "we shall" or "we ought" to spend two million dollars in mink raising. They do not say how much money we should spend in improving the breed of our sheep. They did not say what plans should be gone into

with regard to the raising of cattle, but they do make suggestions based on the facts which they elicited during their two years study. So I was greatly impressed with what I have read, and, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, I do not consider myself at this moment competent to properly size up that report. As you see, Sir, it is a huge thing consisting of over seven hundred pages. And how any man on the opposite side of the House could expect to slap that across at us yesterday and ask us to debate it today is beyond my comprehension. As a matter of fact, Sir, the Government is giving Opposition absolutely no time whatsoever to study anything much less this voluminous Report. And I must deprecate on behalf of the people whom I represent the actions of the Government not only in this respect but also with regard to legislation which is being brought in — Everything is done — Everything is copper-fastened before it is brought in here. Then somebody gets up and makes a glowing speech and tells what may be, what can be and what will be, and then close the House on the 23rd and be done with it.

Now, Sir, I submit, from now until the 23rd of the month would be very little time to study even this document. As a matter of fact it would be disgraceful for us on this side of the House or anybody on the opposite side to say they could properly discuss this Report which took three or four or five or probably more men high in their profession two years to compile. And anybody who gets up and puts his feet on the desk and sits back and brings all that into a sort of picture on the screen before him, then I say he is a man. We cannot do it on this side of the House. I will admit that.

I have been impressed by that Report, Sir, because, as I say, of the

honesty which I see written on every page. The men who compiled that Report were not visionaries. They were practical men, and they did not suggest that we would have hundreds and thousands of men in a year or two raising sheep and milk and cattle. And they did not suggest that we would have thousands of acres of bog land growing rich grass. Oh no. They suggested that there was a possibility that some of the bog lands could be cleared sufficiently to grow grass, and they suggested how it might be tried. They said, even with our poor land, Sir, that something could be done with our fur farms and poultry farming, and that undoubtedly vegetable and fruit production could be gone into on a more extended scale. They suggested that the production of lambs and beef cattle could be properly increased. But they said (I may be wrong on this, but I don't think so) it would be imperative that we get more arable land — more land would be necessary to grow the necessary feed for these cattle. And one of the ways they suggested was to make that sort of land out of our bog land. And we all know, as the Commissioners say, one-third of this country, is bog land, small ponds and so on. If we are going to keep cattle and get feed for them for the winter we either had to import that feed or else we had to reclaim that bog land and grow grass to feed them. I believe the Commissioners came to that decision.

Now everyone who has tried to raise cattle in this country knows that winter feeding is one of the great obstacles to successful operations. And I say, if as a result of this, the Government or somebody can turn our bog lands into grassland, then I am quite sure a lot of us will be keeping cattle and keeping them in a way which will bring in a revenue and not bring in deficits.

They said also there was a high-priced market for cattle and beef. Undoubtedly with the present prosperity in certain parts of this country, it is a high-priced market. And for that reason they suggested that if we could get these cattle we can market them readily.

They spoke also of the sociological and the psychological effect upon the country or any country of having an agricultural policy which took care of quite a proportion or percentage of the people. Of course that was a logical conclusion for the Commissioners to come to. We all remember the old days when we were youngsters. We did have agriculture then, but it was a family agriculture. It was an agricultural policy which was carried on by the family. The fisherman and his wife and family had their garden and raised certain things. They raised cattle also and sheep. They always had sheep. When I was a boy we always had sheep and two or three cows, and we only had a couple of acres of land. I agree with the Commissioners that it does have a sociological effect on the country when people can engage in raising material goods and food from the soil.

I believe the Commissioners decided that experiments of this nature would justify certain expenditures by the Government. Then they went on to describe the soil, mineral soil and organic soil etc., and told how we could grow feed back here in these bogs etc. and what could be done along the line of blueberries and poultry. They believed we could carry on very well. And I believe there is a lot being done here now. I believe even the Honourable the Premier himself, on his own farm is producing quite a large number of poultry, and not only the Premier but many people are raising

poultry by the thousands. So that we don't need any report really to show us that we can raise poultry. Nor I don't see here where the Commissioners show that it could be done more economically. I have not had, as I said, a proper chance to study it.

The fur farmers business, I spoke of that already — and they based their opinion with regard to the raising of mink on our pothead whales. And I believe there is an Act to be brought in here about that. They say with the fish and whales it should be a success. That is what the Government has done and has already handed out thousands of dollars, and I believe the Honourable the Premier said they are going to lend some two million dollars, if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, if it is in order, I would adjourn the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman would ask the Chair to see 5 o'clock he could resume at 8:30 o'clock, after the Civil Defence exercise.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 of the clock, I do now leave the Chair until 8:30 of the clock tonight.

FRIDAY, April 15th, 1955

NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:30 of the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Leader of the Opposition, on motion to adjourn:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, there is scarcely time to get one's breath between the sessions of this House. I think it ought to be recorded in the minutes that we scarcely

have time to eat in this Year of Our Lord, 1955.

I have referred, Sir, to the enthusiasm of the Honourable the Premier. His enthusiasm, of course, is not only Newfoundland-wide but it is world-widely known. The great trouble, of course, about that enthusiasm is that it runs into dollars and cents, and for that reason, far from paying any respects to anything the Premier has said, and far from saying anything about what is good about this Report — because I believe it is a good Report — I do want to caution, I do want to hand out a little caution to the Government on this Report and also on the other reports which we have received from time to time.

I don't think I will be allowed at this stage to go back to certain other reports on which the Government have acted, and on which many millions of dollars have been spent. I don't think I would be allowed to refer to them specifically, but I think I am entitled to ask the Government to go slowly. It is not good enough to say; if we fail everybody will know that we did our best. If the money goes down the drain, well, what of it? That is not good enough. It is all very well to say that with regard to our own personal money, but it is not good enough to say it about the moneys which are taken out of the pockets of the people who pay the taxes.

Now I was looking up during the tea hour, the scope of agriculture as defined in this Report, and I have a note in reference to page 503, I think it is. I think if we had time we could properly evaluate this Report and we would find there is an awful lot of good meat in it, and some other things, of course, which are good but merely historical. They tell about Australia

and about Great Britain and they tell about New Zealand and so on, and they tell about this country away back in the 1800's and about the Commission of Government days. That is all we find in a good many pages. Some of that we could, of course, very well dispense with.

Now with regard to the scope of agriculture they say: "The above evaluation of land resources provides the basis for a preliminary assessment of the possible scope of agriculture in Newfoundland, that is, the possible extent and kinds of agriculture likely to be most profitable in Newfoundland. Thus far, the major physical limitations to agriculture have been examined. That is, it has been observed that the area of land suitable for agriculture is limited by location; that the kinds of crops that can be effectively produced on this limited land area are restricted by other physical conditions such as climate and stoniness, as well as soil, and that the kinds of livestock and other products that can be produced are limited, also partly by the kinds of crops that can be grown for feed and partly by climatic factors that make extra feed or shelter requirements necessary. The next step, therefore, is to summarize broadly the extent of the agriculture that may be carried on effectively within the physical limitations imposed by these land resources."

Then they go into the matter of the amount of land that is available for agriculture. They say: "In total, almost 16,600 square miles of land in Newfoundland were reported as having some potential for agricultural use. Most of this is forested. Only a small part, about 700 square miles, of this area was classed as having possibilities for even limited cultivation, however. Over half of the 16,600 square miles

was classed as barren, that is 8,467 square miles. Almost 95 per cent of it was poorly drained while 480 square miles of it so dominated by bedrock at or near the surface that it was rendered all but useless for any kind of agriculture.

"Thus, of the total of 16,600 square miles of mineral land that might have potential value in agriculture, about 95 per cent, or 15,900 square miles of it could not be cultivated even if it was accessible, in other words, that proportion, 95 per cent, is too rough, steep, wet, stony or devoid of soil for tillage as it is, and costs to level, drain, remove the stones and build up a soil to make cultivation possible are likely to be greater than the value the land would warrant."

Now, I merely quote that to show the honesty of this Commission. They have not gone to wing. They have not allowed their imagination as agriculturalists and economists to run away with them, and they have evaluated the resources which we have, very fine, if painfully. It was painful for us to learn that our resources agriculturally are not as good as we would love to have them.

Then it goes on to speak about our barrens. I won't quote any more of that. They refer to two areas in connection with what they call the "land-use survey."

"The location of the agricultural land areas, in relation to available transportation facilities and markets may effectively determine whether the land areas which appear suitable for agriculture can be used or not. There seems little doubt that because of the lack of transportation facilities or other physical disadvantages much of the land with some agricultural potential must remain in forest uses. Most of

the land indicated by the land-use survey as having possibilities for cultivation, for example, is not at present served by public transportation facilities of any kind."

Now it is nice to know that one of the first things would be to build some sort of transportation facilities. They say:

"The two large areas of ground moraine identified as having possibilities for tillage, that is the 80,000 acres southwest of Badger and the 57,000 acres lying west of Cape Freels, are without roads or railroads."

Now these are good areas of land which would have to be serviced by road.

Then they speak of the physical influences on the kinds of agriculture which are likely to prove profitable in Newfoundland:

"The kinds of agriculture that are likely to be profitable in Newfoundland are limited by various physical restrictions. Thus, on much of the land designated above as suitable for agriculture, rough topography, stoniness, poor drainage, and lack of soil, which prevent use of the land for cultivated crops, obviously prevent such land from being used for anything but forestry, rough grazing, blueberries, or, where conditions are relatively good, for hayland. This is the situation on most of the land designated on the land-use maps (Appendix I) as having limited agricultural possibilities, on nearly 16,000 square miles of it."

Then on page 513 they refer to our climate. I believe I referred to that this afternoon. And they thought that, although the climate was not the best for agriculture, still certain accomplishments could be had. They said: The

large supply of atmospheric moisture is a distinct advantage in the production of leafy crops such as kale, cabbage, potatoes and turnips, since it reduces the rate of transpiration and, by this means, conserves moisture in the soil. Climate thus, gives an advantage to the production of grass and leafy root crops on arable land in Newfoundland, and, in consequence, livestock and vegetable farming appear likely to be most profitable on the basis of these factors."

So that they do think that livestock can be increased and very much so in this country. And this is the point, I believe, on which the Premier has waxed enthusiastic.

Poultry and fruit, they say, we can grow a lot of that.

There was a reference of the Premier to population, the increased population rate: "Newfoundland in 1931 had 84 non-productive workers for every 100 productive workers, while the remainder of Canada had only 61. Only 29.5 per cent of the Newfoundland population, is occupied in the labour force relative to 38.0 per cent for the rest of Canada. This situation is one cause of the low per capita income in Newfoundland." Now these are facts which may be helpful, of course, but I don't think they could help us here to make up our minds. It rather comes as a surprise to me that there are 84 non-productive workers for every 100 productive workers in Newfoundland whereas in the rest of Canada there are only 61 non-productive workers as against 100 productive workers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I wonder if my honourable friend would allow me — He referred a moment ago to the amount of land available for possible agricultural use. Would he turn to

page 477 and take that second paragraph?

MR. HOLLETT: The second paragraph — "The most valuable of these organic soils for agriculture in Newfoundland are the muck deposits." Oh that is where you refer to hogs.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Go on, I would like to have the paragraph read.

MR. HOLLETT: "These are not extensive in area, however, most of them are found in the western part of the Island. One of the most important deposits is in the Cornack area where many small areas of alder muck occur in the lowlands of the rolling topography. These contain some silt and clay and a medium to high proportion of the essential plant nutrients but are slightly acid and usually short on potash. Such soils can, with comparative easy drainage, be made into some of the most fertile soil in Newfoundland. Rich in well-decomposed organic matter they require less fertiliser and being unusually free of stones they can be quite easily cultivated when the alders, with which most of them are heavily clothed, have been removed . . ."

I might say, Mr. Speaker, it is the recommendation of this Commission that an experiment be tried with regard to the draining of these boglands with a view to grass growing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not only grasses.

MR. HOLLETT: If that can be done. Well it is only grass really, that you are going to feed your cattle on. I think they say, if we can experiment and find that can be done and that it can be done successfully, that is to drain some of these thirteen million acres of bogland, then we can raise sufficient feed to raise cattle and sheep.

Now it was on that statement, I believe, that the Honourable the Premier told us what would probably happen in ten years time, and I do not blame the Premier, because he is a most enthusiastic man, and, as I say, his imagination is second to none. I would say he has a marvelous imagination, and, Sir, he has the ability to paint it in words in such a way that his listeners are enthralled and they are intoxicated (that is a good word) and finally they find themselves wondering if there must not be something in this, and think, anyway we will have to believe it, and they do believe it. They have believed it in the past.

Knowing that it is my duty as Leader of the Opposition to advise caution — I don't mean to advise the people but to advise the Government to use caution in the spending of large sums of money on an experiment — I think an experiment of this nature need not cost so much money. Surely it is possible to find out whether our boglands can be drained properly, and that they can be drained practically, and that they contain the necessary ingredients to support a growth of grass, and what else. That can be done, I think, without any great expenditure of money. At least I hope so. If it can't, I fail to see where we are to get the money to do it.

As a matter of fact I have a note here — The Premier should have reminded me of it at this particular time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not see the honourable gentleman's notes.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not going to accuse him of stealing them either. I have something about page 186, I believe, about bog. I know as much about bogs as the Premier, I was born in Burin.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is still bogged.

MR. HOLLETT: I may be bogged but not bogged down. I walked over lots of bog, and country full of bogs, and I believe the Commissioners are right when they say there are thirteen thousand acres of bog. Most unfortunately we have so much bog — I wonder what will happen to the country when the Premier drains them all and gets all this green grass growing — "The green grass grows all around," a piece of poetry goes that way — I forget it now. At any rate I was about to remark — I come from Burin District, and I have travelled quite a bit in that district, and I know there are huge areas and acres of level land, boggy land, marshy land, and grass land. And I do know that in the southern end of the Burin Peninsula, the people there, in the past, having raised better beef cattle than ever I saw imported into this country. And I myself when living in Burin purchased a lot of meat from that area. And I am quite sure there, that if on this Commission's recommendation, something could be done in the Burin area particularly, now I don't know about the rest of the country, as far as I know, in Bonaville North there might be a bit too, but I know in the Burin area, if something could be done to further develop the growth of grasses which feed these oxen which they have up there, then I am quite sure a lot of people up there could make a decent living in raising beef cattle.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Here! here! — and sheep.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know about sheep. There is scarcely enough wood up there to shelter sheep. They have to have some shelter of some kind. The Honourable the Premier

said they don't need to build houses or shelters. I dare say you can grow sheep particularly in the end of the Burin Peninsula. The land is very level, with very few hills, but very little shelter. I suggest you should have sent the Commissioners up there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They were up there.

MR. HOLLETT: They were not up there in a gale or a northwester or northeaster with snow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know how the wind was blowing at the time.

MR. HOLLETT: If they went up there they would have to be clothed exactly as the Honourable the Premier was clothed when he walked across Newfoundland a short time ago; with big mitts on. He accused us of thinking it was funny. It was really funny, I am quite sure. I would like to have had a photograph of that — but there is something wrong with my story here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What story?

MR. HOLLETT: The hundred thousand dollar story written by the Commission. But I don't want to keep the attention of the House, if I could keep it up, but the only thing in this story about which I do know something now is the mink story.

The Commission said, that since before Commission of Government days our mink farmers did not have the know-how, although they have been at it for many, many years, and I believe Mr. Victor Clouston has been at it for quite a while — in any case they did not have the know-how, and that is why they were not able to make a do of it or make any money at it. But out in Alberta and Saskatchewan there were people with know-how going a-begging — a-begging is a very good word. And if we could get some of

these to come here to Newfoundland and combine their know-how with some of their male mink with some of the female mink of our people, who did not have the know-how, then there was the possibility that we could have the mutations and that sort of thing, and everyone would know-how. Everybody would know how to get a mink coat. And they recommended strongly that something be done about that. Now it is a strange thing that long before we received this Report, the Honourable the Premier went up to P.E.I. and met a few mink ranchers up there at a convention, and he just had to hold up his finger (like this) and say, come down to Newfoundland, we will fix you up. We will give the meat at 2c. a pound. They came. They came and brought their mink and are now established over there. And each one coming in, I believe, is given a loan anywhere up to twenty-five or thirty-six thousand dollars. And the Honourable the Premier has told us that the Government is prepared to loan money to the amount of two million dollars, if necessary, to get the mink industry going. Now these are the things that make me so worried, Mr. Speaker. I dare say I am a nervous type — But if on just one little recommendation there the Government are prepared to spend two million dollars in loans to raise mink in this country, I am distinctly worried as to what they are going to do, how much money they are going to spend in order to make other dreams of the Honourable the Premier real. I am quite sure it is going to take a lot of money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They do cost money — would not be worth much if they did not.

MR. HOLLETT: Unfortunately some of them are not worth much now.

I think that has been proven to the satisfaction of this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not to the House — to part of it.

MR. HOLLETT: And the satisfaction of the Government. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we were told of one of these dreams, for one dollar, and it cost three million, six hundred thousand dollars (I think it was).

MR. SMALLWOOD: For a dollar?

MR. HOLLETT: Shares sold for a dollar.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twenty-five thousand dollars worth of shares.

MR. HOLLETT: I see — for one dollar.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. Not for three million, six hundred thousand.

MR. HOLLETT: It was a dream that cost this country one million, six hundred thousand dollars. And let me remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that dream was brought into this House and laid on that table and had been produced and presented to the Premier, and from the Premier to this House, and was the work of Dr. Valdemis.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It never was. Never was.

MR. HOLLETT: Well we were informed of that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The House was never so informed.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, not even the one in Corner Brook either.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What one? That was his, cement and gypsum.

MR. HOLLETT: But I can't go into these. I am quite aware, Mr.

Speaker, I am going a little far afield, but I am just quoting to show how careful and cautious we ought to be. I am not criticizing the Government. I am not blaming the Government. That is gone. We can never get it back. I do hope these things work out. But here is something on which I want to advise caution. I believe something could be done, Sir, with regard to agriculture in this country. I remember, as a young fellow, in our home we raised almost sufficient vegetables for our family and trap crew. But not quite. We always had to get a barrel or two of P.E.I. potatoes. And we did it in just a few little gardens. That can be done by family work. And surely with up-to-date methods and machinery there are areas in this country which can produce large quantities of certain vegetables including root crops. Speaking of root crops, I would like to interject here, Sir, a story told me today by a householder in this town. He told me that he had gone to six or seven different stores this morning to look for potatoes. He did it as an experiment, he said. He found the price of potatoes, imported potatoes varying in price per gallon from 37c. to 55c. I merely pass that across the House so that the proper department concerned might take due notice. Because if stores in this town can sell imported potatoes, all of them, I dare say, coming from the same source, at a price varying from 37c. to 55c. a gallon, then, I think, an inquiry should be had into that to see just what the trouble is. I just mention that by the way.

MR. HEFFERTON: If the honourable gentleman will allow me for a moment — In reference to the matter just mentioned — It may be a matter of interest. Potatoes delivered here for \$2.75, \$2.87 and \$3.00 up to three days ago suddenly jumped, landed

cost, \$4.75. Could that account for the difference in the retail price the honourable gentleman mentioned?

MR. HOLLETT: That was this morning.

MR. CURTIS: Probably some old stock and some new.

MR. HOLLETT: May be, I don't know. Maybe the story is not absolutely correct. I just mentioned it to the Government so that the story may be checked.

Well, the Honourable the Premier got these people down, and he established in Dildo and other places — and I do hope — incidentally it is mentioned in this Report here. Consequently, we could say a lot about it now. But I prefer to leave most of what I have to mention until another occasion, because I have to bring in other matters with regard to certain loans.

I repeat, Sir, we would not say anything which would possibly pour cold water upon any effort which can be made in this country to increase our agricultural potential. I do know that we are importing too much. I do know that we ought to be able to produce sufficient for our own needs or nearly so. We are told here that our soil is not the best. We are told that our climate is not the best, that we don't get enough sunshine. We are told that we can raise sheep and cattle if we can drain our bogs, and if, after draining them we can grow grass on them. That is as much as I have been able to absorb from this. I repeat, Sir, it is highly unfair to expect those of us who only received these reports, and they are not little reports, you know, to have to go through in less than a day, seven hundred odd pages. We have not had it long enough to do

justice to it. But from what I have read, I will say that I am quite convinced of the honesty and integrity and ability of the Commission which was set up by the Government to inquire into our agricultural potentials. I am glad of it. I read enough to know that. But let us not go to wing. Let us take time out. I am quite sure the Honourable the Premier will realize I am sincere when I suggest that to the Government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, if there is nobody else on the other side wishes to speak at this time, I would like to say something.

First of all I would like to confirm what the Leader of the Opposition had to say about the difficulty that we are in, of being presented with a Report yesterday, and having other business to keep us here until 11 o'clock last night, and then being expected to come in and debate a voluminous Report of seven hundred pages, which the Premier was able to digest while we were doing other business, or largely while we were doing other business. And I suppose he has had the opportunity of discussing very phase of this Report in conversation with some of the officials. Certainly he has been familiar with them, and all the various experts who came here to advise the Government on agriculture have been consulted by him, and have had the privilege of going to his celebrated farm on the Roches Line and talking over all the different phases of agriculture. But having made that formal protest against the difficulties, I want to thank him for the most interesting talk that he gave us this afternoon. I could not help thinking, what a pity it is to have to run off to Ottawa when we could spend so much more time here, I think, for the benefit of ourselves and the

country, discussing this Report, this long Report which has been prepared with so much labour, and indicates so much intelligence and application of labour behind it. What is the use, Mr. Speaker, of having a Commission sit down for two years to prepare a Report like this, and then for us to spend three or four hours discussing it, then it is put in a pigeon hole where nobody will ever hear of it again. If we want to get the benefit of this Report then we should be able to read it, in the first place, and be able to discuss it in the second. We have not had the opportunity to be able to read it. How then, Mr. Speaker, can we discuss it intelligently? Yet I would not like the opportunity to go by without speaking and expressing some views on such an important matter as agriculture.

Now, Sir, most people have heard of the interest which the Premier has taken in agriculture. He has a reputation in that matter, which I suppose he is proud of, in connection with raising pigs at Gander and various other schemes he has been connected with, and he knows a great deal about it. He described himself today, out there watching the sheep scratching away the snow from the grass, and I can imagine him going over Roaches Line on horseback. And someday I can imagine him going along singing a cowboy song "Get Along Little Doggie, Get Along."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't forget the ukelele.

MR. BROWNE: It is easy, after listening to the Premier, the enthusiasm, the passion that he has put into this matter — it is infectious, it is fascinating. We all sat here today, spellbound. And the people who missed the opportunity today, missed the opportunity of their lives.

I was a member of the Conservative Party at Ottawa, and a member of the agricultural committee up there for four years, and went to all the meetings and met celebrated farmers from Saskatchewan, Alberta, Manitoba, and there was not one you would turn your head around to listen to if talking.

MR. COURAGE: It is dull up there.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, maybe. But these were farmers, practical men, from Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario, and Quebec, farmers, and there was not one of them could talk with the same amount of fascination that the Premier talked this afternoon — not one of them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thank you!

MR. BROWNE: When I listened to him this afternoon I could not help thinking — I was listening to Mr. Dawe this morning, the man that came from British Columbia and brought mink from British Columbia to start a ranch at Whitehorse, and I heard this gentleman talking in his mild voice on the radio, answering Mrs. Muriel McKay, telling of how he brought the mink down, how he looked after them and that sort of thing. And if he or any of his companies could hear the Premier rhapsodize about the opportunities down in Newfoundland, why they could not possibly resist him. He has sold them on the idea. And that is how they came here. And I am only afraid that, if he gets loose amongst the Saskatchewan and Alberta ranchers and cattlemen he will have them spellbound in the same way, and the next thing we will hear is that all the freight cars of the Canadian National Railway being blocked bringing the cattle from Saskatchewan and Alberta down here to put them on the magnificent ranches that we have out on Roaches Line.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Far better than in Alberta.

MR. BROWNE: And thousands of acres of grazing land, miles of grazing land he has pictured for our fancy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Far better than they have in the foothills of Alberta, and not so much snow and frost.

MR. BROWNE: Exactly — If they only knew that they would be coming down here and instead of mink, which I suppose, after all are insignificant compared with the value of cattle, we would be having cattle ranches in the hundreds of thousands, and this country would be the rival of the prairies.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't forget the sheep.

MR. BROWNE: I notice when the Premier talked about sheep he left out one thing. He told about the wool factories to manufacture the wool, he forgot about the leather. The skins can be made into leather. And every sheep has a hide. Produce a million sheep and you have a million hides, and make a pair of shoes out of every hide.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Gloves.

MR. BROWNE: Then we have a million pairs of gloves. It is marvelous to contemplate the picture as painted here by the Premier. Yet, Mr. Speaker, although so entertaining, so interesting, so fascinating and so compelling, I am just wondering about those poor people whose sheep must go along the side of the road and pick at the grass or put their noses in through the fence and pick at the weeds in someone else's garden. I am just wondering how they are to get around to that five hundred sheep. How are they going to do it? The Honourable the Premier may be

in a position to get five hundred sheep in a short time, but how is the little man in Topsail and Manuels and Kelligrews, or one of these little settlements, how is he going to become a sheep rancher? There is a practical problem there. The man has a family, someone is sick, his wife is not very strong. They all have different problems, and to be able to do these things on the scale contemplated by the Premier seems to me to be a long way off, too, even the vision that he has painted for us this afternoon.

Now, Sir, it is not very often that I get an opportunity to talk on a subject in which I have an interest as well as he has.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But about which the Honourable gentleman knows practically nothing.

MR. BROWNE: I am interested, and I don't.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is another word beginning with "I" also.

MR. BROWNE: The Honourable the Premier means "Ignorance." I don't mind confessing to my ignorance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the technical sense only.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think I am completely ignorant. I have had the opportunity of observing other experts. And in relation to that I wish to make some remarks. Now, as has been said here by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, farming has been practised here for a long time. He has said that the people up in Burin used to be able to produce vegetables to feed crews of their banking ships. My father came from Sound Island. Nobody lives on Sound Island now. But I have heard my father speak of all the vegetables they grew there, and how they used to

have their cattle and sheep and ducks and hens, and that sort of thing a hundred years ago. A hundred years ago they had these things. I say agriculture has declined in this country.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course it has.

MR. BROWNE: And declined because of the incompetence and ignorance of many of the governments that have been in power. The men who envisaged the railway across this island, as it is noted in this Report here, had the idea that we would have these great central plains turned into grasslands and raise cattle, and we would be able to bring them over from Europe, people looking for a good way of living, although they had a better way of living than we ever had here in this respect. Well they thought the railway was going to do that. The railway did not do it. And for a long time there was no assistance from the Governments, or very little assistance. And I am not sure when the Department of Agriculture was set up. I do know that in the Government of Sir Robert Bond, Sir Robert Bond himself was very interested in agriculture. But I don't think he had anybody else associated with him who was enthusiastic about agriculture, unless it was Mr. Dwyer who had a farm here, Johnny Dwyer's Farm where he used to raise such beautiful cabbage. However, Sir Robert Bond lived at Whitbourne, and he had an extensive estate there, which when he died he wished to leave to the Newfoundland Government. And he had a model farm in where Harold Macpherson has his farm today, I believe, if it is not already taken in by the housing. And he brought down there a celebrated professor who visited him in connection with the operation of the farm. I believe he was in charge of it for a certain length of

time. And when Sir Robert Bond was defeated in 1909 and the Morris Government took over, they appointed, as Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Honourable S. D. Blandford who was a lawyer and afterwards became sheriff. He was a very estimable man who had his own visions, one of which was to be seen in the Newfoundland Hotel. Mr. Blandford, however, did not agree with the policy of Sir Robert Bond having a model farm demonstrating to the public how farming should be carried on in Newfoundland, and he had the whole thing sold off. But I remember, Sir Edward Morris had a policy of making the Southside Hills white with sheep and making two blades of grass grow where one grew before. However, the two blades of grass never grew, and the Southside Hills were never white with sheep.

Then along came the next Liberal Government, the Government of Sir Richard Squires. They started a model farm out near where the Sanatorium is today, and it ended in disgrace. I don't know how many hundreds of thousands of dollars were lost in that experiment, and the whole thing was sold off in 1924 by the Warren Government which succeeded Sir Richard Squires. Then we had the Monroe Government and Mr. Walsh (Billy Walsh) became Minister of Agriculture and Mines. There was not then much of a Department of Agriculture at all for several years. In fact, to my great regret, there was no Act on the Statute Books dealing with agriculture. There was nothing for anyone to deal with, except, of course, the people who still carried on farming. When Sir Richard Squires' Government came back, the Liberal Government of 1928, the only thing that I can remember they did in connection with agriculture was to appoint seven or eight agricultural commissioners, members of the House

of Assembly, all with salaries, and no Act to administer, and none of them knew a potato from a turnip or were reputed to be of that type of men. However there was no Act to enforce nothing that they did. Then after the debacle of 1932, when the county came so low, and the Alderdice Government came into power, and a group of citizens got together and we formed a Land Development Association. We met weekly and we talked about land development. When the Alderdice Government came into power and things were very bad, a great many people were on relief, 25% of the population at least. The Alderdice Government decided to bring in thirty-five thousand barrels of seed potatoes, disease-free potatoes. They brought them in from Scotland and England, all the varieties they could get that would be suitable for growing in this country. And it was a wonderful thing that they did that, because that year there was a blight, and if they had not been brought in and distributed to the people on the basis that one barrel of seed should be compensated by one barrel returned in the fall of the year — if that had not been done a great scarcity of potatoes would have occurred that year, and God only knows what calamity would have occurred then. They encouraged exhibitions amongst the people, and several exhibitions were held. If I might say so, I was at that time the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island. We had an exhibition over there. And it was really amazing to see the enthusiasm amongst the people over there. They were only working two days a week, and they had a lot of time to spend on farming, and they grew everything they could get hold of. And I remember how we furnished them with potatoes. I remember being in here, acting as Attorney General at the time,

and Mr. Tom Cooper came in with a note for me to sign for six thousand dollars, and I backed a note for them to get six thousand dollars worth of potatoes. They planted them on Bell Island, and Bell Island that year was, in my opinion, like a great farm. It was wonderful. They paid off the money, so much a week out of their small earnings. And the Island became a farm, and it looked better than in more prosperous days of mining over there. They grow every kind of vegetable. And when the exhibition came around there were people there with tobacco and huge pumpkins. The enthusiasm was infectious, and there was the sort of atmosphere in which farming should be encouraged in this country.

Then the Commission of Government came in. And I remember very well, if I may be pardoned for making this reference. It is a subject in which I have always been interested although I don't know much about it. I remember giving a lecture at the Knights of Columbus, and who should be there but Mr. Thomas Lodge, who had just newly arrived from England. The subject of my talk was on agriculture for Newfoundland.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): You were the indirect cause of Markland, perhaps.

MR. BROWNE: I will tell you about that in a moment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't admit it.

MR. BROWNE: No, I am not the cause. But I will tell you how the idea came about. I made a study of our rivals in the fishery business, Iceland and Norway. They were our two chief competitors in selling fish in Newfoundland. We sold fish but what did we do with the money that we got?

We sent it out again and brought in flour and salt beef and tea and sugar and everything else we needed, practically — Almost 90% of our requirements we had to buy with cash. We were the greatest trading nation, for our size, in the world. Well, what happened in Norway and Iceland when they sold their fish? Did they have to buy their agricultural needs? No. They produced them. Iceland, in addition to exporting fish, was exporting mutton as well. I said, if they could export mutton why can't we? Like the Premier said today. Perhaps I am the only one here tonight even amongst his own party who would have any faith in the idea put forward, the idea of exporting mutton. Why should we not as well as Iceland? The chief product of Iceland is not codfish. The chief product of Iceland was mutton and hides. It is since then, with the mechanization of the fishery in Iceland that Iceland has become a great fishing country. But at this particular time, in 1934, Iceland was chiefly a farming country, and Norway was the same. I remember reading about the herdsmen in Norway, who took their herds of sheep and cattle into the highlands of Norway and lived with them, as the Premier has envisaged today about these herds being brought into the uplands of Newfoundland and being allowed to feed there.

Well, as I said, I gave this talk to the Knights of Columbus and Mr. Lodge was there, and he seemed very much impressed by it. Later he spoke at "MCLA," I believe, and I believe the Premier was there that evening when he spoke, and also another friend of the Premier's, I believe, Mr. Perlin, was there. I remember Sir John Pudister brought me along. Perhaps the Attorney General was there that same evening. By that time he was convinced that agriculture was the best

thing for Newfoundland to develop. And he wrote a book, after he had been expelled as a Commissioner or was asked to resign: He wrote a book in 1939 called, "Dictatorship in Newfoundland" in which he analysed the various industries of Newfoundland and the various natural resources of Newfoundland and the prospects of Newfoundland. And after examining them all he said — If this can't be done and that can't be done, the only thing that can be done is to develop the land. And he was convinced that the things which he said at "MCLA" that night, the thing to give the best results was the development of the land. And I agreed wholeheartedly with him, but there were very few that did. Which now reminds me that this report has come four or five years too late. We should have had this report two years ago. What kept the Premier so long, for four years, before he asked Mr. Gardiner to appoint a man to investigate the position of agriculture? The Premier has put the cart before the horse. We should have had the horse, agriculture, first, before the industries. That was the mistake they made. They found out at last, but unfortunately found out too late. Twenty-one million dollars or a large portion of it has gone down the drain, which if applied to agriculture at the beginning would have given and would still be giving better returns than we are getting or are likely to get from the industries in which he invested that large amount of money.

Agriculture is something about which we can philosophize. And I am not the least bit deterred from philosophizing in regard to life by the remarks of the Premier this afternoon. We got to have a sound view of life. We are not here to make millions nor to have big farms of five hundred acres nor big flocks of sheep and big herds

of cattle nor big anything else. We are here to live a decent life, and work for a better one in the next. So we should be animated by this desire, either individually or collectively or nationally, and not make a tremendous amount of money. We should be animated by the desire to live decent lives. And there is nowhere where people should be able to live better lives than on the land.

Now, Sir, the point about the land is this: Everybody has to eat. Not everybody has to have a motor car nor an aeroplane nor a train nor anything, but everybody has to eat, therefore everybody is a consumer. Everybody must buy food, everyone. And if people can't afford to buy food, well perhaps they can afford to produce it. I have had a man in my office, not much more than a month or so ago, who is working in the city as a carpenter, getting \$1.30 an hour for an eight hour day and making ten dollars a day, about three thousand dollars a year. And this is what he said to me: "I was just as well off when I was in a certain settlement," (represented by my honourable friend the Minister of Provincial Affairs) "in Ferryland, getting \$300 a year for my fish."

MR. MURRAY: He would have been better off still if he had stayed there.

MR. BROWNE: That is what he said to me. He was a very intelligent man. "I was better off with \$300 a year. I had my own home, a cow, land, and we had our milk and butter. We had sheep and some hens, and we had our cream. The only things I had to buy were tea and sugar, everything else we produced. We had the vegetables and we could pick berries and go and catch 30 or 40 quintals of fish. We had fresh fish regularly, and salted during the winter, and all that sort of

thing." That is the way he spoke to me, and I say, he spoke sensibly. But I don't mean for a moment that the fisherman or the farmer or the man living in a rural settlement should have to live other than in decent comfort. There is no need that a man should live in any other way.

The Federal Government has provided the Farm Improvement Loan Act. And I would like to see an extension of that provincially, so that fishermen or farmers may be able to take advantage of the loans that are available for Farm Improvements Acts or the Central Housing and Mortgage Act, to enable the man to have a comfortable home. Because, after all, a home is more than half living. What is the good of having sheep and cattle if your home is uncomfortable, and if your wife does not like living in a home like that. And so many women today have travelled outside the settlements and have seen the conveniences in other places, and are reluctant to marry a man and live back in these settlements where they have to endure hardships. And I don't see that in these modern times that they should have to do so. Every effort therefore should be made to bring these communities electricity, as they did in the United States to bring it to the farmers and settlements where people are living.

So that farming is a fundamental business in this country, and should have been regarded so. But it was so hard to convince people of that. There was so many people ready to say Newfoundland is not a farming country. Well we are only four hundred thousand people here, and we don't have to have it all arable, 99% arable land. If there is only a small percentage, as the Commission has found, arable land there is plenty on which to raise vege-

tables and meat and poultry sufficient to maintain our people, at least keep them happy and supply them with the greater proportion of their needs in the matter of food.

Now, Sir, the Premier this afternoon referred to the Commission of Government, and ridiculed the efforts of the Commission of Government in bringing a certain expert out here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. I ridiculed the purpose — to help the Mother Country agriculturally.

MR. BROWNE: I believe the Premier has made a mistake about that. In Mr. Lodge's book he makes reference to Professor Hanley, and gives a very different explanation. He said the Commission of Government invited Professor Hanley to advise Newfoundland on agricultural development in general.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Excuse me—the report itself—Professor Hanley in his report explained how he was invited to Newfoundland by the Commission of Government to advise the Commission of Government how Newfoundland could help the Mother Country agriculturally. He explained that in his report. Mr. Lodge, perhaps was ashamed to say that in his book.

MR. BROWNE: No. I think at that time Mr. Lodge was not a member of the Commission.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In that case, perhaps he did not know what he was talking about.

MR. BROWNE: If anything hostile to the British Government, and if any criticism —

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was not acquainted with the facts.

MR. BROWNE: Here is his book. And he maintained the Commission of Government invited Professor Hanley to visit Newfoundland and advise the Commission of Government on agricultural development in general. He doubtlessly advised also the disposition of the awkward land settlement, but the baby refused to die, that is Markland and Midland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was his baby.

MR. BROWNE: However, I wanted to explain, for the benefit of the Minister of Provincial Affairs about his land settlement idea. This idea was presented to the Land Development Association before the term of Commission of Government. It was all worked out beautifully, I have it here somewhere, where there would be fifty families go to Markland (not to Markland not to this area, I think on the Whitbourne Colinet Road) and they would settle there and have farms and so forth, I believe still that there is a possibility that it might have succeeded under different arrangements. But I think it was doomed from the start by the somewhat pig-headedness of the Commissioner himself, Mr. Lodge. I think there were certain matters in connection with marketing experiments which were wrong. However, at the time I mentioned, I never thought for a moment the idea would be put into effect. But there it was, and it was put into effect, and the Commission of Government spent a great deal of money on it. And Professor Hanley, so Mr. Lodge says, could not find any fault with it. However it did not prove successful. It is still there. But I don't think anybody could say it is successful.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They spent

well over a million dollars on Markland alone.

MR. BROWNE: Is that so. Perhaps they did. I am not defending Markland. I was not asked to approve of it, and I am sure I would never have approved of it. I did not believe in it at all. My ideas about agriculture were very different. Agriculture, it seems to me, has to be built up gradually. That is why I can't fall in line with the ideas announced here by the Premier this afternoon. They are too grandiose. We may get them in twenty-five years or thirty years time. We may get them—Let us hope we do. But I do not think they are practical at all. There is an awful lot of hard work, and ground to be built up to make a farming community. And you cannot get rich quick at farming. I don't believe you can do it. That is the picture given here today. The same applies in connection with milk raising, a get-rich-quick business. You certainly can't do it in farming in this country. It is hard work.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It took an average of two hundred and fifty sheep per family, and a hundred pigs per family a year. Does that suggest getting rich quickly? I suggested fifty head of cattle. Does that suggest getting rich quickly? And I suggested ten years to do it.

MR. BROWNE: When you mentioned a hundred head of cattle.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fifty.

MR. BROWNE: And two hundred and fifty sheep.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But not for the same people.

MR. BROWNE: I think you are getting out of the realm of practical politics.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Out of the realm of peasant farming.

MR. BROWNE: That reminds me of what the Royal Commission said about farms. There are two schools of thought. The man mentioned from the Southern Shore might be a subsistence farmer, he and his wife living on a little plot of ground, having one cow, getting milk, butter, cream, eggs, fish and berries and all the rest. And he sells his fish for \$300 a year, and having that much cash he can live comfortably. That is subsistence farming. The Royal Commission on Agriculture does not approve of that. And the reason given is because that sort of thing can only be stimulated in times of depression, and no government can get people to prepare for times of depression. They have to wait until the depression comes before being able to convince people that they should be growing vegetables. I do not agree a hundred per cent with that. I think if we had the proper attitude in regard to farming and gardening that people would take more interest and would produce more than they are doing at the present time. However, the Royal Commission believes that the best results can come from an encouragement of commercial farming on a large scale. That is why they advocated land clearing and the use of these bogs, if they can be made available. They are a bit cautious about the result of the experiment. The Premier I think, was over-enthusiastic about their possibility. Now it must be remembered that this Commission is not the first to draw attention to the bogs. The Commission of Government did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And even long before the Commission of Government, as the Report here says, it was

advocated back in 1880, this Report says that.

MR. BROWNE: I can believe that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have fascinated anybody who has ever looked at them.

MR. BROWNE: I remember back, perhaps my honourable friend here on my left will also remember — It seems in Burin, Mr. Simms —

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right, I have been on his farm.

MR. BROWNE: I have never had the pleasure of being on his farm. I have heard of his advocating the utilization of the vast areas of native grass in certain parts of the Island. I remember in 1918 seeing grass grow breast-high, and hearing of horses which grew fat from feeding on these wild grasses. I have no doubt there must be many square miles of land of that kind which could be used for the same purpose.

MR. SMALLWOOD: J. P. Howley first drew attention to these bogs and said if ever they could be drained they would become tremendous assets to Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: In any case it won't do any harm.

MR. SMALLWOOD: As early as 1886, as you will find on pages 674 and 675, James P. Howley reported, a large portion of the country hitherto looked upon as useless marshes or swamps could, he said, by a system of drainage be converted into the very best grassland — That is taken from the Geological Survey of Newfoundland. So it is not original.

MR. BROWNE: It is a great pity an opinion expressed by such a learned man as Mr. Howley was not given more attention.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We did not have the right government until now, you see. They did not have the right enthusiasm.

MR. BROWNE: If the present Government does not do any better with this experiment than with all the preceding experiments, I am very much afraid of their being able to settle the problem.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We will see.

MR. BROWNE: In 1935, at the request of the Commission of Government, the Director of Soil Research at Aberdeen visited Newfoundland to advise on the possibility of the reclamation of such land. And he expressed the opinion, the prima facie condition in Newfoundland appears to be more favourable than in Scotland where successful results have been achieved. He left instructions as to land on which experimental work was to be undertaken. Some work was done at Markland, but they finally decided to do the work, which the Premier referred to, on the Colinet Road, where prisoners dug ditches. But they did not dig wide enough nor deep enough. Anyhow, as Mr. Lodge pointed out, when he came back there was grass growing on them. They got as far as that. He claimed the necessary operation could be carried out mechanically, at low cost. That was in 1939. I am quite sure, with the development which has taken place since 1939, it is a comparatively simple matter to get machinery to prepare those lands for cultivation at much lower cost than by hand.

But, speaking of another experiment, which I believe was under the care of Mr. Herman Archibald of Harbour Grace, I called him on the telephone tonight, unfortunately he was not able to find out what year it was. But I find here it was in 1935 they drained

lands over there and cultivated them. He said: "I cannot say of my own knowledge what happened in 1937, but in August 1938 there was a crop of grass growing to a height of nearly six feet." I have seen estimates of cost at which some lands could be commercially drained which are too fabulous to be easily creditable. It is however one of the simplest of engineering problems in the world, with no deep drainage. It is just a question of digging a shallow trench, and there are any number of machines that could have done that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I suppose in the first place the Royal Commission went to see the land Mr. Archibald had drained, and was tremendously impressed by it.

MR. BROWNE: Now what a pity it was that the present Leader of the Government, when he came into office in 1949 and had such a tremendous opportunity ahead of him, no man in the history of this country was so well endowed as he was, at the head of the Government, to be able to carry out and to complete these experiments.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hope the honourable gentleman is not suggesting I am a has-been.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, I am afraid so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I got at least until the next election.

MR. BROWNE: I won't say you won't. However, nobody had the opportunity before — Here he was at the head of the Government, which has just been returned with an overwhelming majority. Here was the Liberal Government at Ottawa rolling in hundreds of millions of dollars, a surplus every year, and only anxious to help Newfoundland. And if he just whis-

pered: "Look here, I wonder could you give us a couple of hundred thousand dollars for a few experiments in agriculture down in Newfoundland?" Why he would have gotten it immediately. There would be no difficulty about it. And he waited so long, and as I said a moment ago, he wasted four years before he got Dean Shaw to come down here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But am getting a hundred thousand dollars this year.

MR. BROWNE: I know. But it is not the same value as in 1949.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And will get another next year.

MR. BROWNE: Even so you lost four valuable years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is true.

MR. BROWNE: And I cannot help emphasising, with all the fervour and conviction I am capable of (as a certain celebrated lawyer said) what a great pity it was that he did not give this primary industry primary consideration when he took office. First things should come first, and if agriculture deserves to be considered as a primary industry, it should have been considered before the secondary ones. In this the Premier failed, and in this his Government failed, and in this he deserves to be censured. It is certainly a great tragedy for the country that the Premier did not apply his enthusiasm and the benefit of his knowledge — I know there is hardly anyone in the country, if there is anybody, that has such a wide knowledge as he has of the history of the country, almost any phase of it — and yet he seemed to miss this tremendous opportunity.

Now he spoke about Mr. Gardiner being one of Canada's greatest Ministers of Agriculture. Undoubtedly he

is. He was raised up on a farm, and all his life he has spent in connection with farming. Undoubtedly he is a great man. We had another great man in our party although he was not as successful as a politician in Federal politics, John Bracken. He was a professor of agriculture, and he had great ideas about farming as well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If my honourable friend would allow me. I spent many and many a night on the front porch with Mr. and Mrs. Bracken talking farming, five to ten miles outside Ottawa — a great person.

MR. BROWNE: I had the same pleasure. The Premier referred this afternoon to Nova Scotia, and spoke about the backwardness.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was pulling Nova Scotia's leg.

MR. BROWNE: I know he did not talk very seriously. I want to draw to his attention that although Nova Scotia possessed, apparently, a lot more agricultural land and had many more families, thousands of people have deserted and left Nova Scotia. And there are as many Nova Scotians in Boston and Toronto and in New York that left their own beautiful province. I always considered it a very beautiful province, especially in the Annapolis Valley. Nevertheless these farms have been deserted. I never analyzed the situation to see what the reason is that they left their farms, but it certainly goes to show that unless there is some means of keeping people on the land that they are going to leave it for other things. I suppose the truth is that people leave the farms because they want to earn what the Premier called cash money. The people are not satisfied to live on farms and grow crops for which they have to wait for months before they see the returns in

the fall of the year. Anywhere there is opportunity of jobs for the men and jobs as stenographers and nurses for the women and the girls they are going to leave home. And it is happening today. That is one of the causes of the rapid mechanization of farming, because no farmers are available. The Canadian people don't want to stay on the farms, with their high standard of living, and the same will be true of Newfoundland unless we can get the young men who are going to be interested in farming to have the right attitude towards farming, otherwise they won't be satisfied to work on the farms. The same applies to England. England is importing coal today. The young men, with good education, don't want to work in the mines. Maybe we will have the same trouble in regard to the mines in this country before very long, which are also being mechanized. So that Nova Scotia was deserted to a great extent and its farming went backwards instead of forward.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is coming back.

MR. BROWNE: Well, the Federal Government has been assisting, in the renewing of the apple trees, for example. They gave bonuses of four dollars for every tree pulled up and a new one planted, and there have been many thousands of apple trees.

I was glad to see in the Royal Commission's Report a reference to fruit raising. I always maintained that in the Salmonier Valley, we have a location — I don't know whether the Commissioners referred to it or not — I believe in the Salmonier Valley there is a location where fruit could be raised, and it could be a profitable sideline for some of these farmers. As I said before, one of the important things is to make the homes more com-

fortable so that people would be willing to stay in them, if we want to make farming successful.

I believe too that the Commission has stressed another thing which has been somewhat neglected of late, and that is the practice of co-operative methods in regard to farming. The Premier was a little put out with me last year when I criticized the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives for falling asleep at the switch, and allowing the co-operative movement to disintegrate. I believe it is regrettable that the co-operative movement has not been able to keep up the fast pace that it started at, but I don't think that was possible. It was a new idea. It came in here at a time of depression, and it is much easier to get people interested then than it has been in prosperous times. But I am very glad now to see, that from some of the reports of co-operative societies, there has been progress made, and in places where there was some difficulty in establishing the co-operative movement they have made very singular success. And I think enough people have been trained in the techniques of introducing co-operation now that it would not be a hard thing to revive, especially in connection with agricultural places.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The biggest development is in housing.

MR. BROWNE: Oh yes. But that of course won't be permanent. That is only a temporary thing, and is not as valuable in the long run as a co-operative movement integrated with the agricultural movement.

I may say that, during the time that I was at Ottawa, I was constantly urging the Federal Government to come down here and give us assistance in this regard, in regard to our agriculture. But I know now it was not

their fault. They had to wait for an invitation from the Provincial Government before they could come down and do anything. I was continually urging them to set up these experimental stations of which there are hundreds right across Canada, sort of model, miniature farms.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Demonstration stations. We have a few here now.

MR. BROWNE: Well of course it may be largely due to the fact I was urging them so frequently about it. A demonstration station should be in every settlement where there is a considerable quantity of land, where they would set up a sort of a little farm and show the people in the settlement how things could be done, and the best methods. I believe our people are apt enough to learn these methods, if they are demonstrated in a convincing manner, such as these demonstration stations do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the only way they do learn, by seeing it done, or almost the only way.

MR. BROWNE: Well then, I hope the Government will not be too much influenced by the Premier's ambition. He should be sensible enough now to know he is over-enthusiastic. If he has one defect more than another it is an excess of enthusiasm, a tendency to be carried away by an idea. And his followers are so loyal to him that they may be less inclined to criticize that approach than we are in the Opposition. But he should know himself that he should try and keep more or less straight to the line laid down by the Commission in their recommendations. And where they advise caution he should practise caution, and not throw their Report to the wind.

On motion the House then recessed for ten minutes, after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have very little more to add to what I have already said. Many of the people who live in my district are farmers. In Killbride and the Goulds and along the Topsail Road there are very good farmers whose fathers before them and grand-fathers settled in these areas. The first farmers in St. John's were in St. John's West, or what was formerly known as St. John's West — Unfortunately it is no longer known as that.

MR. MURRAY: You will have more farmers now.

MR. BROWNE: St. John's West became an urban district. But these men when I think of them in relation to the picture drawn this afternoon by the Premier, I cannot see at all the great vision that he has put forward for us. Perhaps I would say, like someone who referred to one of "Turner's" sunsets, "I never saw a sunset like that." But would you not like to have seen one? Would we not all like to see the vision the Premier has painted for us to see.

MR. COURAGE: That is why he is going to stay Premier.

MR. BROWNE: I don't know. If he keeps on going the way he has been going I don't think he will be Premier long. However, Mr. Speaker, I think an agricultural policy must be conservative. The Conservatives have been always interested in conservation of natural resources — conservation of the land — and believe in that sort of life. They have not got the rapid policy of development or perish, and gambling with the country's future and gambling on the lives of the people. An agri-

cultural policy must be a sane and sober thing. If agriculture were the only thing that the Premier was interested in it would not be so bad. But he has so many other schemes about which he is in raptures as well. He has too many irons in the fire for all of them to be kept hot. It is an old maxim, but true in regard to the Premier. It seems to me the sort of thing anybody would recommend in regard to agriculture would be; land clearing, bonus for land clearing, training of youth to be farmers, to be interested in farming and farm developments, and the extension of 4-H Clubs, the extension of co-operative ideas in regard to agriculture. But not get-rich-quick ideas. I don't believe in them.

There is one thing, before I sit down, I want to draw to the attention of the Government, and that is in regard to the idea of holding an exhibition, an agricultural exhibition. Now that we have the arena in St. John's I hope that every year from this time forward we will have a big agricultural exhibition in St. John's. I remember in the old days when we had the exhibitions, and, although I was city born and city bred, and know very little about farming from the practical side, it was certainly most interesting and most instructive to be able to go down to the Prince's Arena and Curling Rink and see the exhibitions there, and the products of our land. And I think it would be very instructive to the younger generation today, especially the city born people, to see what can be produced in Newfoundland. I hope therefore, beginning this year, there will be a big exhibition. It may not be possible to have an All-Newfoundland exhibition this year, but I do think that an exhibition, at least of the Avalon should take place and next year, at any rate, have an All-New-

foundland Exhibition in the Arena. By developing Newfoundland exhibitions and having the best products brought to the exhibitions, or to the central exhibition, that would be doing what should be done to encourage agriculture. Then gradually, with greater acceleration as the years go by and our agricultural products increase, we will have, I think, sounder agriculture than if we make a big splurge all of a sudden and go into big fantastic schemes that are interesting, fascinating to listen to, but which have not got solid foundations.

(Applause from the Liberal side.)

MR. JANES: Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the honourable member for St. John's West on his very interesting and enlightening address. But in all speeches, addresses and reasoning which I have heard on agriculture, Sir, there seems to me always to be the same tone of confusion. And the confusion which we are faced with is the one probably in connection with the month of July when we go out on the farm and we wake up and say "beautiful." The cows are out grazing, everybody is happy and willing to go out and walk, a beautiful morning with the smell of flowers and the smell of the earth in our nostrils. That is one side of farming. But there is another side to farming which we have to think of; the month of February; the farmer's wife trying to bring water and the farmer out trying to get a bit of fuel to keep the stove going, and probably the farmer's wife trying to fill the kerosene lamps -- In that there is confusion. That confusion is carried a little bit further when we think of farming, as the Honourable the Premier calls it, as "peasant farming" as against farming as we think of it as an industry, farming as an industry. Farming as an industry, not subsistence

farming not subsistence agriculture, as we have known it.

I don't blame the honourable member for being confused in this matter. As I said, I think we are all confused. I don't believe any of us know just what exactly is to be the pattern in this thing we call agriculture. We say it should be mechanized like all other industries are mechanized, like mining is mechanized or the pulp and paper industry. We say this is the way to do it because it is the most economic, or that is the way to do it. We can only buy a paper each day for five cents because the paper industry is highly mechanized. Somebody here spoke about the price of potatoes, from 37c. to 55c. a gallon -- What would be the price of potatoes if they all had to be dug out, each one individually, with a shovel?

There is another thing, Sir, which bothers me -- and we could have a dozen other reports and that problem would still not be solved: Here in Newfoundland, Sir, where we have so many of our people living in rural communities, there must be for some considerable time subsistence farming -- and probably is regrettable -- Trying to think of agriculture as an industry, to think of agriculture where it is going to set out to accomplish the necessity of feeding people living in industrial areas, working in factories and mines, that is one problem. That is one problem when we think of agriculture as an industry which is highly mechanized. When we think of agriculture as a highly mechanized industry, on the other hand, we know of a certain number of people in our population to whom agriculture is not that type of thing at all, but something that is going to help them to feed themselves and their families. Both types need to be encouraged. Both

types are necessary. But we need, it seems to me, to encourage them in the correct proportion. It is not sufficient for us to encourage only subsistence farming. We got to go beyond that. People here in Newfoundland, as probably are people all over the world are again tilling the soil as a matter of necessity. To till the soil was a necessity to the people who came to this country as pioneers. It was necessary to the people who went to all of the North American Continent. Subsistence farming was to them a matter of getting enough food, and clothing to wear.

But we are approaching the day, Sir, when we have no longer any time for that. It is becoming increasingly difficult for people to find time to give to this thing called subsistence farming. All around the coast of Newfoundland today we have fishermen who are putting out their lobster traps, up at dawn in the morning tending their lobster traps. Or if they are not doing that they are in with Howaters or the AND Company driving the timber to try and get it out to the shipping point. They come home from that and start to get their traps ready. Then the trap fishery starts. After the trap fishery is over they cure their fish. Then it is time to go into the woods to get a bit of fuel for the winter. Now, in all that, where is the time for subsistence farming? Actually the time was there only once in the history of our people, and that was when there were fishermen and only fishermen. Then they started what they called their "work season" (By that I mean, their active production season) in May or June and they worked through until the trap season was over. But today, Sir, these people, in order to live and because there are so many things that they are short of,

so many things that they want, can no longer live on \$300 a year. A man has to have a house and just to be barely able to get enough food to eat and his family enough to wear, that day in Newfoundland is finished, ended. People are no longer content, although economically it is possible for a man to live on \$300 a year in some of our rural communities where he owns his own home and is able to have a certain amount of subsistence farming, and be at home and attend to it properly all the time. Perhaps it is possible he can have as high a standard of living as persons in industry earning a few thousand a year. That is perfectly true. But because it is economically true we must not think people are content with that. They are looking to more than enough food to eat and enough clothes to wear and a house. They are looking to more than that. Their influences are the same as for the people in the towns. They may not receive as many magazines and might not read as many, but they certainly read some. They might not hear as many radio programmes but they certainly hear some — and all these things are playing a part in rural communities where we have this type of subsistence farming, where people can engage in and become jack-of-all-trades and make a livelihood. That they are happy because their elementary needs are served is no longer true. They want water in their homes. They want to do away with kerosene lamps and they want electricity. There is only one way they can get electricity, and that is to get generators or something of that sort and buy gasoline. If they want water they have to have money to buy plumbing fixtures and pumps in order to put it in. All these things are expensive. When we talk about our people being able to be as well off as the industrial worker living

in industrial areas, I would say his elementary economic needs are satisfied but other needs, just as important to him as they are to other people living in industrial areas must be satisfied. And these needs cannot be satisfied through subsistence farming. That is the reason we find today the fishermen putting out lobster traps and from that to the trap boat and out of the trap boat to the woods again and home before Christmas — They are trying to earn the dollars to get for them the things only dollars can buy. They cannot make bathroom fixtures nor generators nor radios themselves. They must buy them. So that instead of spending their time and concentrating merely upon growing food, these people are looking for the cash with which to buy the things which they consider to be just as important as food. That is why subsistence farming that is just subsistence farming is on the way out, and I don't see much opportunity of being able to restore it to any place of importance in the economy of Newfoundland.

We have to get beyond the thinking in agriculture that agriculture is something which is only supplementary to able-bodied relief of 6c. a day. We have to look upon agriculture as something quite different. Otherwise we are doomed to very big failure. If that were not so, then surely all of the land settlement schemes would be a great success. If we are always going to say that all a person requires is to earn \$300 a year to be as satisfied as the industrial worker with a few thousand. Instead of scorning the idea of land settlements we should be considering them a success and promoting more. But we know that is not true. We know it is not true. If we are to see agriculture recognized as an industry we have to get beyond thinking it is

merely something to supplement able-bodied relief or something of that kind. We have to look upon it in the sense of industry. There may be times, because of economic conditions where it is practical for a Government probably to bring in thirty-five thousand barrels of potatoes and distribute them among the people in order to improve the stock which they might have. But while it is desirable it should not be taken as something which is going to promote very much improved agriculture in Newfoundland.

Agriculture has to be approached scientifically in the same sense as any other industry has to be approached. The fact that we have derelict farms all over Canada, the fact that young people are moving away from farms, there are reasons for that. These reasons are not easy to find. But the fact that they are doing it gives rise to the question, where is agriculture heading? It is heading into the type of industry where we have capital mechanization moving in, and that in twenty years time agriculture will be operated the same as we operate the paper mills, the same as we operate the mines, that people invest great amounts of capital and pay for the matter of growing food and distributing it amongst the consumers. Or can we continue with the lauded population as we have. I don't know. I have not the answer to that. But it is surely important to us, starting as we are, starting now almost from scratch, to try and promote and build up an agricultural industry. Are we going to waste time giving land to people, a few acres of land to people to misuse it or to use it for a few years and give it up as a bad job, so that the Government would have to come back in twenty years time and take it away from them in order to pass it over to

someone else to mechanize and build into an industry? These are questions which must be asked. And any agricultural programme this Government or any government tries to promote must first answer these questions, otherwise we shall have a lot of capital spent for very little return other than temporary returns of a few people being able to get a small livelihood out of it for a short time.

Now, in Fogo District, Sir, we have a few areas, in Musgrave Harbour and Gander Bay and Carmanville, where we have a fair amount of subsistence farming and a small amount of cattle raising. I don't know what the possibilities are down there for those people. I don't know if the land is down there. I don't know if anything can be done about the land. The fact is that these people have proved this; They are satisfied at least they can do some small things. Whether mechanization, whether improved agricultural education, can help that sort of thing today or whether we must start, and say, take a crowd of young men and train them to be good farmers and good agriculturists and provide them with capital and loans, and give them all the necessary scientific knowledge which the Government has at its disposal — Whether we should do that or whether we should build up from the roots which are there — These are questions we cannot answer. These are questions which I am not going to make any attempt to answer tonight. But, if there is a future in agriculture in Newfoundland, if there is a future in roots, then I would suggest that in many places along the long northeast coast we have a population which is very well attached to the land and from whom you could expect great things. I have recommendations, Sir, to make to the Government with re-

gard to this Report. As a matter of fact I have not yet been able to read it. These are just a few notes I have made along the way as I heard my honourable friend, the honourable member for St. John's West speak on this subject. And I am sure there are many more enlightening minds than mine on this subject that can advise and guide the Government in the policy it is about to announce.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to debate this matter at all, because truly I am not qualified to do so. But as a member of this House ordinary good manners would seem to indicate that an acknowledgment of the debt of the people of this province to the gentlemen responsible for this Report is in order. I don't think there is anybody in the House less qualified to discuss agriculture than myself. While the Honourable the Premier is a practical farmer and while my colleagues to my right can boast of their ancestry being in various parts of the Island, my roots, and I think I am the only one in the House, are exclusively in the city of St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: God help you. — It is too bad!

MR. HIGGINS: I believe the Attorney General has the same distinction. It is not our fault, Mr. Speaker — but as I say, my knowledge of agriculture is nil.

MR. SPENCER: Is the honourable gentleman apologetic?

MR. HIGGINS: No — I am a citizen of no mean city, Mr. Speaker. The only root crops I know anything about is that I grew a radish once. It said on the package to broadcast the seed. I broadcast the seed and got a radish.

But it is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, from the remarks of those who can

claim to have some measure of informed opinion on this matter, that this is a Report the like of which it had not been the good fortune of this country to get before. It is also quite obvious that it is going to require a very great deal of thought before it is implemented. It is purely on that line that I propose to say one or two words. I have a healthy respect for the Premier's ability to explain anything. It goes further than respect, it is almost a dread. Because his enthusiasm for anything, whether it is making rubber or catching fish or growing sheep or drying up the bog, passes my understanding. I am driven to admit, he is a dangerous man to listen to, Sir, because if at any given time this afternoon, whilst the grass was rustling over the bog at Colinet, he would have asked for a vote, I am half afraid I might have voted for him. It is one of the great good fortunes of life, you get the chance to sit back sometimes and say, this cannot be quite as good as that. But the thing, Mr. Speaker, that I do hope, is that the Government, who are the authority in the implementation of this Report, will not let enthusiasm outweigh ordered and considered progress. Because, Sir, the Report of the Fisheries Authority came in, and last year we had that discussion — To date, Sir, we have not witnessed the implementation of that Report which we had envisioned. It may perhaps be that time has not yet permitted the Fishery Development Authority to do the things, that we had all hoped they were going to do.

Now the same thing, I submit, Sir, applies to this Agricultural Report. We all remember the day when Mussolini drained the Italian marshes and did a great thing for his country. This afternoon we had the Premier envision doing the same thing. Last evening

he told us about "Fog Free Thompson" and, if he will pardon application, this time we are listening to "Bog Free Joe." The Report itself, as I say, Sir, according to the comments of the more informed members of the House who have spoken to it, seems to be an excellent one. Those of us, few though they may be, like myself, who are free to confess their ignorance, can only hope and pray that the Government in supplementing or implementing the recommendations of this Report will be guided by wisdom as well as enthusiasm.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in rising to withdraw my motion, if Your Honour would allow me for one minute only, I would use it to say how impressed I have been by the speeches made here this afternoon and tonight by honourable members who discussed the Report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture, and who, in addition to that, disused my speech and my enthusiasm, with something rather less than enthusiasm, I thought. I do feel that the speeches, especially of the honourable and learned member for St. John's West was a valuable contribution to the debate and to the thinking of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member must be careful now not to make a speech.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will certainly not make a speech, Your Honour. I have risen merely to withdraw my motion, on which I have already made a speech.

MR. SPEAKER: A favourable comment on an honourable member's speech is just as much out of order as an unfavourable one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Your Honour. So I don't intend to offer any opinion, except to say they made a valuable contribution indeed to the subject of the debate today.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion to adjourn the House has been withdrawn.

I might point out that Item 4 on the Order Paper of the Day is not a committee but rather a third reading.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Perhaps we might now have it Mr. Speaker.

Third Reading:

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Elections Act," on motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Second Reading:

A Bill, "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and the Union Electric Light and Power Company Relating to a Franchise."

MR. SPEAKER: The second reading has been proposed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, and the debate was adjourned at the request of the honourable and learned member for St. John's West.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Leader of the House would agree to a further postponement of that until Monday.

MR. CURTIS: Yes.

On motion order deferred.

A Bill, "An Act to Confirm to the Rowaters Newfoundland Pulp and

Paper Mills Limited Certain Rights and Powers."

MR. SPEAKER: The debate on second reading was adjourned at the request of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: Just one thing struck me, Mr. Speaker, in that connection, and I had not had very much time to go into it. I don't suppose it would be quite fair to ask to have it postponed again until Monday.

MR. CURTIS: Surely.

On motion debate on second reading of this Bill postponed.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Trustees Act:"

MR. SPEAKER: I am glad to see the House agrees on something.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would move the second reading of this Bill, which is really a very, very minor piece of legislation. The object of the Bill is simply to recognize the city of Corner Brook, by a local trustee investment to be made on property there. I don't think anybody could have any possible objections to Corner Brook as a very popular centre and recognized place. And it is necessary to have this legislation so that trustee investment could be used. The motion is that the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Attorney General a question? Does he mean this is the only provision that is introduced on this?

MR. CURTIS: I think that is the only one.

On motion Bill read a second time and ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the city of St. John's Act."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, although there are some six or seven amendments in this particular Bill there, I believe they are of relatively minor importance from the contentious standpoint. The first amendment simply provides for an enlargement of that area which is already designated as a public park, Quidi Vidi. A subsequent addition there also, provides for setting up of a park committee to look after that vicinity, on behalf of the council.

The next small amendment, Sir, simply allows for the fixing of a quorum for a meeting of a town planning committee.

The next amendment deals with the measuring of water. Under the present Act owners and proprietors of certain premises are charged a water rate after they have reached a certain volume of water consumption. Since that section was incorporated in the Bill, the council has throughout the city incorporated the water tax so that it makes it unnecessary to have that particular provision.

Another amendment, merely empowers the Municipal Council of St. John's to appoint boards and officials and entrust to them discretion and powers to do certain things, for instance, to issue licences to certain people, electricians, plumbers and so on.

Under the present section, 193, power to restrict unsanitary or unsightly erections is limited to the city limits — the present or proposed amendment prohibits the creation of a nuisance within the city limits or within one mile of the city.

Then there is a small amendment

dealing with taxes which may be levied on snack bars.

There are provision in the St. John's City Act already empowering the council to discontinue water to premises if the water tax is unpaid. This provides that unoccupied buildings, if the water tax is unpaid, and the council has power to collect from the persons liable for taxation.

Then there is the clear-cut definition of the word "occupier," as an interpretative clause. And finally there is an amendment to Section 256 whereby the licence fee charged by the council on travelling salesmen who come here from outside is raised from \$25 to \$200.

This is the end, Sir, of the amendments, and I move the second reading.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have something to say in connection with Quidi Vidi Park Committee. This is long overdue. The idea, as I understand, is to have a committee somewhat similar to the Bowring Park Committee, to operate the facilities down there. And I do feel that we are going to have, as a result of this authority, people who in the east end of St. John's will now have facilities not as good for a long while, I am afraid, as Bowring Park, but as nearly comparable thereto as we can do.

The other things, as the Minister said, are purely routine. The last one, if I am correctly informed, is the raising of the fees for travelling salesmen, is at the request of the Board.

I must say, Sir, I support the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I agree with what the last speaker has said about the rest of the amendments being routine. I am look-

ing at Section 6 of the Bill, here which says: "the council shall have and shall be deemed to have had power to appoint boards and officials for the purpose of carrying out the powers vested in the council and delegate to such board or officials such powers or discretions for such purpose as the council may deem fit."

That means the Municipal Council may delegate any of its powers to a board. I think it is absolutely wrong, and I cannot agree with it. I don't see what right the council should have to delegate its powers, any of them, to a group. They have certain powers themselves, which as a council they may perform. But I cannot see that any of the powers which they as a council may perform can be delegated to somebody else. There is a legal name which means they cannot delegate to someone else what they are supposed to do. They have been elected as a council to carry out the duties of the council. I know that they have officials to do their subordinate duties, but to do the duties for which the council was elected, I think that would be a very dangerous provision to have in the Act. I cannot say that I can agree with that unless the explanation is given to me more elaborately than it has been given by the Minister. Perhaps he may not have noticed it. The council has a very voluminous Act now, and some of these provisions are far-reaching, and passed through the Chamber of this House unnoticed, I believe. But when they are making an application for the Municipal Council for something it goes on a couple of weeks, and they get an answer, "According to Section so and so you cannot do this and you cannot do that," I believe it is because these clauses were especially drafted and were ignored probably by mem-

bers, thinking they were routine, whereas they were very far-reaching in their effect. So that I think this section here should be explained more fully before we could agree with it.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred. Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House I should like to say that by arrangement with the Opposition we will not meet tomorrow, Saturday, but instead we will meet on Monday forenoon at 11 o'clock, the House being agreeable to that. On Monday I hope to move the House into Committee of Supply to deal with Supplementary Supply, relating to the year just passed, and on Monday afternoon I hope that my honourable colleague, the Minister of Finance will be recovered sufficiently to enable him to introduce the budget. He is still in bed. He has a very bad cold, a bad attack of the flu, which I am sorry to say has attacked his throat, and which at the moment leaves him incapable of delivering any kind of a speech even with the aid of a public address system. But I hope that by Monday afternoon he will be sufficiently recovered.

Now we have a pretty heavy week ahead of us, meeting in the forenoon, the afternoons and the evenings, and I can only express the hope, as I have already done, that we may be able to complete our work as a House by tomorrow week.

Now, unfortunately, tomorrow week, is, I believe, St. George's Day, and I don't think any one of us would wish to meet to do business on that day any more than we would on St. Patrick's Day or St. Andrews Day, which

means that we have only five days. On the other hand, it is absolutely necessary, I think, that I should go to Ottawa on Sunday, this coming week, being accompanied by three Ministers. Possibly therefore the House could continue on on Monday, and if we can have most of the business, composed of heavier items, done, we might continue on Monday and prorogue on Tuesday. That would be our hope. We want to go to Ottawa feeling quite free to devote our attention completely to the business of that extremely important conference.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the House is rising to adjourn until tomorrow, Monday at 11:00 o'clock, may I ask the Premier if it would not be wiser to adjourn the House instead of trying to rush it through? Why rush legislation? Is it fair to himself or to his party or to the Opposition to continue to rush legislation through? Everyone knows now, it just won't be done properly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, we won't rush any legislation. Any legislation that cannot get sufficient time will just be dropped.

MR. BROWNE: Why not adjourn the House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We thought of adjourning until the fall because of the Bill for the constitution of Corner Brook, which has three hundred sections. We cannot tackle that now, as we would be here half the summer. We thought of adjourning until the fall, so that we could have a week devoted to that Bill. This is a long Bill, three hundred sections. But we made an agreement with the city of Corner Brook under a short temporary Bill which will enable them to function until the next session when we will bring in the complete charter of Cor-

ner Brook city for debate here in the House. That would be probably the one big piece of legislation, which we can't handle in any case in this session. I think we can complete everything that is necessary and prorogue in a week and a half perhaps.

On motion the House then adjourned until Monday, April 18, at 11:00 of the clock.

MONDAY, April 18th, 1955

MORNING SESSION

The House met at 11:00 of the clock in the forenoon, pursuant to adjournment.

MR. M. M. HOULETT (Leader of the Opposition): Before we go on to the petitions, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Premier could give us any information relative to what progress is being made, if any, in regard to the subvention on coal, in this province?

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): That is one of the matters, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to discuss when I go to Ottawa next week. Actually we have received a brief from Mr. Wyatt, of the Wyatt Coal and Salt Company, a very well-written brief. Copies of that brief have been circulated to all our Newfoundland Senators and to all our Newfoundland representatives in Ottawa and a copy to Mr. Pickersgill, and everybody else whom we think might assist us, particularly to Premier Hicks of Nova Scotia and Mr. Forsyth, the President of the Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation.

I might say, apart from acknowledgment and a promise of support we

have no report, but, as I say, it is a matter which we intend to discuss.

MR. HOLLETT: I thank the Honourable Minister.

Presenting Petitions

MR. JANES: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from two hundred residents of Ladle Cove and Apsey Cove. The petitioners request a continuation of the highway on the Straight Shore, which now reaches Apsey Cove in the Musgrave Harbour area, to continue to Apsey Cove and Ladle Cove. There is a further six miles to be completed in that section, when they would be connected with the highroad now at Musgrave Harbour, and thus give them an outlet to the north side of Bonavista Bay. They are especially thinking of the Springdale Hospital which now serves that area.

I may say, Sir, this road on the Straight Shore, has been a great thing for the people down there. I don't think, in the history of Newfoundland, anything served an area as well as the road going up the Straight Shore has served the people in that area. They are very grateful to the Honourable Minister of Public Works and to the Government who initiated the programme. And they would like to see the completion of it, at least as far as Ladle Cove and Apsey Cove.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

HON. C. H. BALLIAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Petrics Crossing and Cooks Brook. The road from Petrics Crossing to Cooks Brook at the present time is closed to traffic, and the bus service has been discontinued, causing inconvenience and physical hardship to the

residents of this area, especially the working men, working a distance of thirty and forty miles away. This has been the position for every spring, and the petitioners pray to have this road open and the situation corrected.

I know this section, Mr. Speaker, and it is the only road through the area. I must say it is a great inconvenience to these people, and I see no reason, personally, why this section of road cannot be kept open.

I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and ask that it be placed on the table of the House for reference to the department concerned.

On motion petition received, for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that the Committee on Standing Orders, have considered the Bill, "An Act to Incorporate the Newfoundland Association of Architects," and the Committee has found that in the case of this Bill all the rules of the House pertaining to private Bills have been compiled with.

On motion report received.

Giving Notice of Motion

None.

Giving Notice of Questions

MR. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House the following information:

- (1) A statement showing in detail to whom the sum of \$8,300.00 was paid for supervision of the repairs to the House of Assembly, together with an explanation of the basis on which such payment

was made, including rate or rates at which such payment was made, and the nature of the duties and the length of time for which the supervision was exercised.

- (2) A statement showing separately the cost of scaffolding and general labour giving the number of people who were employed under this head with the rates at which they were paid and the amount they received.

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay upon the table of the House the following information :

- (1) A statement giving the names and positions and present salaries of persons employed in that Department with the date of appointment, and titles or other qualifications of persons so employed in the case of all those receiving \$3,000.00 or more annual salary.
- (2) To lay upon the table of the House a copy of the Report of the Power Corporation of Canada or any other party employed to survey the water power resources of Newfoundland since 1949.
- (3) Who are the sales agents for the Atlantic Hardboards Industries Ltd? When were they appointed? Who were the previous sales agents, and why was a change made, if such change was made?
- (4) What is the daily production of wallboard or hardboard in square feet?

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply to lay upon the table of the House the following information :

- (1) A statement showing the amount spent month by month for ad-

vertising, giving the amounts and names of parties to whom such amounts were paid during the past fiscal year.

- (2) A statement showing the amount spent for publicity by the Tourist Development Board or any Department of the Government giving particulars, showing names of publications, quantities and costs, etc.

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House the following information:

How much has been paid to architects during the period Jan. 1st, 1954 to March 31st, 1955 giving names of architects, amount or amounts paid to each and dates of payments with names of project for which payment has been made.

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources to lay upon the table of the House the following information :

To what persons have loans been made during the past fiscal year for

- (a) the purchase of livestock,
(b) land development purposes,
(c) the purchase of equipment.

Giving date and amount of loan in each case.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called — We have a considerable number of questions outstanding. I wonder if the Honourable Ministers could try and make an effort to have them tomorrow, because, if not, they won't be much good unless we have them by that time.

Hon. the Minister of Finance moved the House into Committee of Supply (Supplementary) :

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister) : Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

The Honourable Minister of Finance :

I, the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums aggregating Five Million Six Hundred and Thirty Thousand Eight Hundred Dollars (\$5,630,800) required for the public services of the Province for the year ended 31st March, 1955, as supplementary supply, and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act 1867, as amended, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

(Sgd) Leonard Outerbridge,
Lieutenant Governor.

April 13th, 1955.

MR. SPEAKER; Motion is that I do now leave the Chair.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair, Mr. Courage, Chairman of Committee of Supply :

MR. SMALLWOOD : Mr. Chairman, the Bill has been distributed, or the resolutions, rather, are being distributed to the Committee. I ought to explain to the Committee that I am acting in this capacity this morning on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Finance, who, as the Committee knows, has been ill for over a week, and who is to bring down the budget speech at 3:00 o'clock this afternoon, and who, on my advice, is conserving his voice for that occasion.

Now I ought to say to the Committee at once, that, although this Supplementary Supply is in what appears to be a large amount, five and a half million dollars, this does not, as the Committee undoubtedly is aware, mean that the actual expenditure for the

year past equals the amount shown here. It does not mean any such thing. Because to get the actual expenditure for the year it would be necessary to take from the amount given in the budget last year the amount now spent and then to the net result add this figure of five and a half million. The result would be such as would be shown in the budget speech this afternoon. But I should like the Committee to be fully aware of the fact, that it would be quite mistaken, quite wrong, to think that you can at this stage anticipate what was in fact the expenditure last year. The budget and the estimates said that a certain amount would be probably the expenditure for the year. You cannot by just taking that figure and now this figure and adding them together come to what was the expenditure, for the simple reason that, whilst this looks like additional expenditure, it is not in fact. This is to give legislative sanction to certain expenditures made by the Government in the year past. But as against this, large amounts that were budgeted for were not spent. So the net figure, as will be shown in the budget speech this afternoon, will show.

Now I have had some notes provided me by the Department of Finance. And on the basis of these notes, I think I will be able to answer the questions, that the Committee may wish to ask, with regard to the various items that are shown in the resolutions. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the best way for me to deal with the items would be when we come to the schedule, taking it section by section, and then on the schedule listing the amounts, on the back page of the resolutions, take them up one by one.

Resolutions :

Item I read :

1. From and out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund there may from time to time be issued by the Minister of Finance sums not exceeding five million seven hundred and thirty thousand one hundred dollars (\$5,730,100) and the said sums so issued shall be paid and applied by the several Departments in respect of the financial year extending from the first day of April one thousand nine hundred and fifty-three to the thirty-first day of March one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four and the financial year extending from the first day of April one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four to the thirty-first day of March one thousand nine hundred and fifty-five towards defraying the charges and expenses of the Public Service of Newfoundland as set forth in Schedule A and Schedule B.

SCHEDULE A

For the financial year extending from the first day of April one thousand nine hundred and fifty-three to the thirty-first day of March one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four:

Head of Expenditure	Dept.	Amount
X	Health	\$ 99,300

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, could we have the date of that warrant?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The date is not shown here in the explanation of the Controller of the Treasury, but I have just asked to have it checked by telephone, and I have requested him to come to the House so that I will be in a position to answer such questions as may be passed on to him from members of the Committee here.

MR. HOLLETT: Let it stand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, we could let that stand.

On motion item deferred.

Schedule B read:

SCHEDULE B

For the financial year extending from the first day of April one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four to the thirty-first day of March one thousand nine hundred and fifty-five.

III. Legislative	\$ 14,300
III. Executive Council	41,000
IV. Finance	278,400
V. Provincial Affairs	47,900
VI. Education	362,900
VIII. Mines and Resources	211,500
IX. Public Works	1,636,900
XI. Public Welfare	538,400
XIV. Fisheries and Co-operatives	200
XV. Economic Develop- ment	2,499,300
	<hr/>
	\$5,630,800

MR. BROWNE: I take it, Mr. Chairman, it is customary to take each vote here. Would the Minister give an explanation of that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is made up of several amounts of which \$100 is for the purpose of books for the Library, \$12,000 is required for the printing of Hansard.

MR. BROWNE: For what year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know for Hansard anyway, for whatever year it is due, to accelerate the progress of the work. An effort is being made to speed up publication of Hansard. The cost falls mainly in the printing.

MR. BROWNE: How many copies did they do of that one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think one hundred copies. And \$2,000 covers the

cost of Mr. Speaker's attendance at South Africa last year at a meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

MR. HOLLETT: On Hansard, would the Honourable Minister tell us what progress is being made?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are making every effort now to speed up the printing.

MR. HOLLETT: Could you tell us what staff is employed there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't employ any staff. The printers employ the staff. We pass it over to the printing firm.

MR. HOLLETT: I see.

MR. BROWNE: Were these books or magazines purchased for the Library?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I imagine both. Publications.

MR. BROWNE: I don't know what is the use. If there was a type-written list of anything new coming in I don't think it would be a very heavy expenditure to get that done, not a laborious job.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is a Committee of this House to deal with the Library. Perhaps Mr. Chairman might take note of any questions made.

MR. BROWNE: I don't know the Chairman, I have never known of the meetings of the Library Committee.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is under the control of Mr. Speaker.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Going back to Hansard. The honourable gentleman must have received the 1950 copy. The 1951 will be out in the

next week or ten days and 1952 is very well along. In answer to the honourable member of St. John's West I might say we have bought up several copies of the Newfoundland Journals. All these things are expensive.

MR. HOLLETT: Could the Honourable Minister tell us who is doing the printing of Hansard?

MR. HEFFERTON: The Guardian Press.

Legislative carried.

Executive Council — \$41,000:

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the voters list, that is all.

MR. HOLLETT: Could the Honourable the Premier tell us what stage we are in in regard to the taking of the voters list, and what time the work is likely to be completed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not the foggiest notion, not even the vaguest idea.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): I think all the lists are ready. I know that Mr. Short is looking after them. The lists are all in and just awaiting a Minute of Council ordering the lists to be printed. They have been taken in and revised.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In other words, we could have an election quite soon.

MR. HOLLETT: I appreciate that remark. We could have it on the old one, could we?

MR. BROWNE: No.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, according to the Terms of Union — If the Honourable the Premier is in a hurry we could go ahead of that one. But he is not in a hurry.

MR. CURTIS: We passed a new Act.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, surely we have here a Bill to Amend the Elections Act — until that is passed I don't think it will be of any value.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We might get that passed this week. We might have an election three or four weeks from now, after our return, with a big pocketful of good things.

MR. HOLLETT: Propaganda.

MR. BROWNE: There is another feature too — Only a couple of days ago we passed the House of Assembly Act in which extensive changes were made at the demand of the Government, and I imagine that will involve a certain amount of re-organization, and that will hold up things.

Carried.

Finance — \$278,400:

MR. BROWNE: I wonder would the Minister give an explanation of that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The provisions were short by the following amounts — Civil Pensions, \$15,000; Railway Pensions, \$25,000; Management of the Public Debt, \$88,900 and the Royal Commission — there is something wrong there — The actual provisions for Civil Pensions, Railway Pensions, Management of Public Debt, Royal Commission on Terms of Union and contingencies were inadequate by an amount of \$15,000, \$25,000, \$88,900. No provision was made on account of a non-interest loan of \$100,000 made to assist in the construction of the Corner Brook Stadium, and the vote for the liquidation of Pre-Union Liabilities proved to be short of requirement by \$18,900. These were offset by savings, leaving a net amount as shown.

MR. BROWNE: While we are on that, Mr. Chairman, it seems to be an opportune time to ask the Premier if he knows anything about the matter I raised here last year regarding married women's gratuities. I brought it up because of a woman who has sworn she knew nothing about the arrangement made with the Federal Government, it was necessary to sign a document saying whether you did or did not come under the Federal system of contributions to pensions. She claims she never saw this document, and as a result, under Federal Law, she comes under the Federal Civil Service Pensions. I brought this matter up last year, and contacted the Minister of Public Welfare and the Attorney General, but over a year has gone by and there is no definite decision. This seems to be an unfair case, because the girl was not working in the main office but in a branch section of the Department of Post Office, and was not told she had to make a choice. Afterwards she married, and under the Newfoundland Civil Service Act would have been entitled to a month's salary for each year of service. Instead of that, what she received was a much smaller amount from the Canadian Government, and the money that she had paid in. There are only two or three cases like that. The new Minister of Finance in Ottawa told me he is ready to do all he can to facilitate these payments, and it looks like it depends entirely upon this Government. The amount is so small as to be hardly worthwhile refusing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I am sorry. I am not familiar with the details of it. I think, perhaps, the best way to do it is the way the honourable gentleman did it, by discussion with the Minister concerned. I

know, as a House, we could not do very much about it, without bringing in legislation.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is the proper place it should be settled. It was announced what the Government proposed to do last year was to refer it to a sub-committee, I understand, and the sub-committee would ask for legal advice on it. We know the Government is so powerful, in justice should they not, in a case such as I have brought to their attention, make a payment like this?

MR. CURTIS: That matter, Mr. Chairman, was referred to a Select Committee, I think, consisting of three Cabinet Ministers, and we have met and discussed it, and are not in a position yet to report. We are giving the matter very careful consideration. If it were only this case it would be a very simple matter, or if it were only two or three cases. We will give it very careful consideration, in any event we will do that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, general contingencies, is there any breakdown of that? There must have been a very substantial expenditure on something or other. I should like to know what that \$20,000 was for.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not entirely but very largely the unexpected cost of the helicopter service. In the fall the Government decided to experiment with the use of helicopters. So we made a contract for the months of November, December, January and February and March, I think it was five months but might have been four — no five months for operations. It was for the operations of the helicopter. That is mainly for that but not entirely. I may say we intend, as a

result of our experience in the operation of the helicopter to continue the work this year, this coming financial year, and indeed to expand. We find that it gives simply magnificent service, such as we cannot possibly get from the fixed-wing aircraft, in reaching places in Newfoundland where there are no airports or runways, and where it is too rough or shallow for seaplanes to land. Also, in certain seasons of the year we find aeroplanes with floats or wheels cannot land anywhere because of the changeover in the season of the year. So that the experience of these four months tells us we ought to continue and expand the helicopter service for this coming year.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that is certainly very interesting. We have no idea what work the helicopter is being used for. It is being used, I hope, not by any politicians. I imagine it is used principally in connection with public health. I wonder if the Minister could tell us if any other department uses it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know if the honourable member would regard me as a politician. I have not yet used it, but intend to make very frequent use of it in this coming season. I am just waiting for the snow to go and the weather to become less unpleasant for travelling around Newfoundland, not for getting from one place to another but rather for looking at terrain. Also in addition I hope the Minister of Fisheries and Agriculture makes use of it, and the Minister of Mines and Resources, for their department and their permanent officials. But I do not think a Minister of the Crown, because he is a politician, should be barred from making use of a public conveyance. And if the honourable gentleman means elections,

clearly we are not going to use government helicopters for political purposes in times of elections nor at any other time.

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Chairman, they get the RCAF for things like that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is quite true.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it the Honourable the Premier would be just enough to place the helicopter at the disposal of the Opposition any time, if it wanted to go trouting, for instance?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Chairman, I was going to add, in reply to the honourable member for St. John's West, our department has, in line with the policy established by the Government, been endeavouring to integrate some of the activities with the helicopter service from Gander, particularly as far as forestry inspection is concerned. I find we can plan to land a helicopter and take men in perhaps fifty miles into the interior so that they can get a first hand view of what is going on, also, I may say, we endeavour to integrate the helicopter service for forest fire protection.

MR. HOLLETT: On that management of public debt, \$83,900, I see by last year's estimates what was cut out for that amount. That has been overspent. Would the Minister tell what was that made up of?

MR. SMALLWOOD: When we made provision last year in the estimates for brokers fees we did not, nor could not, precisely know what they would be, so we put in a sum, feeling that it would not be enough. On the

other hand we did not want to put in a precise amount, which would rather indicate to the brokers what we had thought would have to be paid. We put in a part-provision. That is the balance.

MR. BROWNE: You did not fool them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One can always try.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it their charge was the amount plus the \$83,000

MR. SMALLWOOD: No not necessarily plus — Yes it is. One half per cent on twelve million dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: Did not the Government know that one-and-a-half was the brokerage fee, when the amount of twelve million dollars was voted?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We had an idea, yes.

MR. BROWNE: There is one other point I would like to ask about — the increase for the Royal Commission, what is the cause for the increased estimate of that vote?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We could not possibly know in advance, any more than that Royal Commission itself would know, precisely what expenses there would be, what travelling they would want to do, what additional help they would engage, what additional research they would need to conduct. They found out they wanted more done than had been provided for.

MR. BROWNE: How was the \$30,000 distributed. There must be some contract — What particularly would it be under in the estimates. The contract with Mr. Lewis and Mr. Hunt?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not the particulars.

MR. BROWNE: In other words, during the financial year just ended, the Royal Commission of Enquiry — they are not a Royal Commission, surely not. The Federal Government appoints?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are a Royal Commission.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it then they cost us during the past fiscal year \$80,000.

Carried.

Provincial Affairs — \$47,900:

MR. SMALLWOOD: The original programme for Civil Defense estimate was \$25,000 of \$30,000. The revised estimate is \$82,000, of which half will come back from the Government of Canada, accounting for this \$47,900.

MR. BROWNE: Half this amount or half the total amount comes back?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Half the total comes back.

MR. HOLLETT: \$82,900 for Civil Defense?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It costs Newfoundland exactly half that.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words, \$41,000. We will get half from the Federal Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: Can the Minister say how many persons are employed and motor cars used?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The actual paid staff is only three or four people altogether. It is for equipment, largely, fire fighting equipment. In fact they are acquiring quite a lot of fire

fighting equipment and we are hoping still more will be made available for the city of St. John's and also for other Civil Defense centres to be set up. There is a thought of setting one up at Grand Falls and Corner Brook, and I think fire fighting equipment is to be brought in for them as well. The salary of the Director is \$7,000.

MR. HOLLETT: That is an increase, is it, of one thousand dollars?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is now seven. If it were six it is an increase of one thousand. I don't know. I know it is \$7,000.

MR. BROWNE: What does Mr. Rabbits get?

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$4,000.

MR. HOLLETT: That includes the cost of photographs in the "Daily News" this morning?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No that was done by the "Daily News" itself.

MR. BROWNE: It is worth keeping.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman may feel pretty happy. I know he feels like smiling all over every time he thinks the Director of Civil Defense is no longer his Leader.

MR. HOLLETT: In this picture there is something very definitely bad on his mind. He does not look happy. I felt it as I looked at the Director of Civil Defense there, all in uniform, and I thought of him making a charge, with three Ministers behind him. I believe that is what worried the Premier.

MR. MURRAY: The thought of H bombs is enough to make anybody nervous.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, may well feel very happy. No wonder he laughs. He just chuckles with glee when he thinks who is the Director of Civil Defense and not Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: We are laughing. I am quite sure the Honourable the Premier feels very happy too. He has the Civil Defense taken care of, and he is not here in the House going into financial affairs, as we are doing now. I am quite sure the Honourable the Premier when he decided to get rid of that man by giving him \$7,000 he was doing so in his own interest. I don't like that. He should do things in the interest of the country and not in his own particular interest. He takes that man and puts him out at \$7,000 and that is the thing that shows in his mind in that photograph. He cost \$7,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I now exonerate the Honourable Leader of the Opposition from having to do anything whatever with getting this job for his former Leader, after he dumped his former Leader, and after that the appointment was given to him.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I will have to ask the Honourable the Premier to take back a certain statement he made there — "After I dumped my former Leader," I assure you nobody ever dumped that man. I ask the Honourable the Premier to take that back. I certainly had nothing to do with any dumping, and I would not dump anything on this country that was going to cost \$7,000.

Item carried.

Education — \$362,900:

MR. SMALLWOOD: This was largely the vote for pupil teachers and, of course, teachers' salaries, including the teachers in the colleges, which were heavily underestimated. Now on capital account there was an additional provision had to be made in the net amount of \$136,100 for an extension of Prince of Wales College. That was \$150,000. The Salvation Army School at Corner Brook, \$150,000 and at Windsor, \$37,000, which the Salvation Army there were advanced by way of loans. All of them by way of loans.

MR. BROWNE: Does that make up \$362,900?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will check over the items.

MR. BROWNE: How much was spent on college teachers and training teachers?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not the individual amounts here for that.

MR. BROWNE: Does that mean the Memorial College?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the denominational colleges, St. Bon's, Prince of Wales, Bishop Field, Bishop Spencer.

MR. BROWNE: What heading does that come under?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think in the estimates it is Teachers' Salaries. There is no differentiation between colleges and schools.

MR. BROWNE: That is a big item of nearly four and a half million dollars. That was an increase of a quarter of a million last year, and still was not enough.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. Education has become a very expensive item.

MR. HOLLETT: Was there another \$40,000 in connection with film?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The amount for the year was over \$100,000.

MR. HOLLETT: That particular one "Five Years of Confederation."

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think you are right, that is the year just past. But that will not cover the cost of it.

MR. HOLLETT: Of five years of Confederation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. BROWNE: Is that amount included in this?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The exact amount I do not know. The excess cost not voted is covered in it.

MR. BROWNE: Can the Minister say precisely which vote?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Films.

MR. BROWNE: That was supplied by Atlantic Films?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. We are hoping it will be a full-length feature film of two and a half or three hours, and we are hoping to have it shown right across Canada and down in the United States. Perhaps this is going to be the greatest piece of Newfoundland film ever produced in connection with Newfoundland. We are hoping this will be an outstanding film. In other words, the practice has been in previous years to get a series of four, five or ten films a year for different departments. We decided in connection with last year to have one for all of Newfoundland covering everything.

MR. BROWNE: That does not come under this vote?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: What has it got to do with education?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is educational.

MR. BROWNE: It is propaganda.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is information—put it that way.

MR. BROWNE: If that is so, I should like to know who is in charge. I would like to get some information so we could have some idea whether it is going to be a political film or unbiased.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, politics has had nothing whatsoever to do with it, and no politician, not one.

MR. HOLLETT: There must be a star somewhere.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have not made any of me. I would think I would be one of the stars. They have not come near me yet, no one in this party nor the Government has had anything whatsoever to do with this film.

MR. BROWNE: Who is in charge?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know that even. I know this, the submission to them was to make a picture showing the story of the last five years, what has happened since we became a Province of Canada, industrially, in health, in school building, hospitals, building of roads and bridges, building development, housing, in everything social and economic, but no more than that. The rest is up to them. They are doing it. We have nothing to do with it. I don't know anything about it. Strange as it may seem, the members of the Opposition

may know more about it than I do. I know nothing except what I have read in the papers.

MR. HOLLETT: Surely, Mr. Chairman, this vote for \$84,000 and it is said now it may cost more than that, surely this vote comes under the Minister of Education. It has to be scrutinized and passed by someone.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It will not be as yet. We obviously are going to look at it when it is ready to be shown, we will see it first, and we will say, take that out, that is not good, and should you include that, etc. Then we will see it again, and see it probably a dozen times before it is finally approved, and call in possibly a hundred different people, newspapermen, newspaper editors, journalists and the like to look at it, and probably call in the honourable members opposite. This is not a political picture. If that is what my honourable friend has in mind, forget it. It is not.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the possible cost, or probable.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A hundred thousand dollars. That is what we have been spending annually with them.

MR. HOLLETT: How is the cost arrived at by the Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have been spending a hundred thousand with them annually for a maximum number and a variety of films. We now decided that instead we would have one decent picture which could go anywhere across Canada. Estimates were made for a hundred thousand dollars, about the same figure.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to go into this too fully. But I am not unmindful of the fact

that this company cost this Government a considerable amount of money, and money has been advanced them from time to time, and is being advanced now. Surely we have to be very careful. There is a whole story about this. I know, and so I think the Honourable Premier does, and he knows it has to come out one of these days.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am willing to come out at any time with anything I know.

MR. HOLLETT: There is one amount of \$2,250 in connection with the vote for the Education Department, individual re-adjustment for the salary of Assistant Superintendents of Education. Could the Honourable Minister tell us about that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: When the estimates were brought in they were put at a salary. They discovered and reminded us of the fact, there had always existed a difference of only ten per cent between them and the Superintendents. So they came to us complaining that we had broadened the difference, and requested that we restore their salary to a figure which would make the difference the same as it has been, ten per cent. So we did raise them to the old differential. That is what it cost us to do it.

MR. HOLLETT: That is retro-active?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: What grade are assistant superintendents?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is in the back of the estimates. Officers Grade VII.

VI Carried.

VII—Mines and Resources—\$211,500.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is provision made here for two new services that were not foreseen when the estimates were being prepared last year—\$20,000 for mink farms and \$500 for creature hounties. That has nothing to do with my honourable friends nor the party. It is strictly non-political.

MR. BROWNE: Tell us what it means?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Creatures, lynx and the like—strictly impartial it may be a Tory lynx or it may be a Liberal lynx, but "lynx" not "mink". We want to exterminate them. Give hundred dollars for lynx. These additional costs are offset by counter-veiling savings making a new provision of \$11,500 only. Then we have to add to that a further amount of \$200,000 for an amount of \$100,000 for advances under Farm Development Loan Fund and \$100,000 for a new service, that is, construction of a public cold storage plant, making a total supplementary supply of \$211,500.

MR. BROWNE: What cold storage plant is that. Whilst waiting for the Minister—The \$100,000 for the loan board. Have you got figures there showing how that was distributed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that was advanced to the Board, and the Board made loans of it.

MR. HOLLETT: Under Farm Development Loan Board, \$142,000 to enable that board to make loans for mink raising?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. HOLLETT: That is included in that amount?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honour-

able gentleman is talking about last year now. Supplementary for last year, which ended March 31.

MR. HOLLETT: In December the loans were made.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The only cold storage we know of is Dildo. We don't know of any other cold storage.

MR. BROWNE: How much did that cost?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are lending the Co-operatives, I think, \$100,000. They are building now, and it was granted before the New Year began.

MR. HOLLETT: What Co-operative is doing it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Mink Breeders Feed Co-operative. That is the one building, the feed plant. That is to enable the mink ranchers to provide their own feed for their own mink on a co-operative basis.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that Trinity Mink?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. The honourable gentleman does not seem to understand. Various mink ranchers call themselves by different names, some by their own names and some by a company name. And one of the ranchers is "Trinity Mink." It is just one more, not even the biggest. Now all of the mink ranchers have formed themselves into two different associations, one a general professional association, "The Newfoundland Mink Breeders Association", and secondly, "The Mink Breeders Feed Co-operative Association." That is the one building the feed plant.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to know whether the Honourable the Premier really knows

what he is talking about when he is talking about "Trinity Mink Limited." I visited the Registry of Deeds relative to that company. It is a very mysterious company as far as I can find. The Trinity Mink Limited are B. Tucker, St. John's, stenographer, Millicent Seymour, and John A. Neal, solicitor. And according to the terms of incorporation, the objects for which this company is established are (1) to enter into an agreement with the following people: Veran Spence of Toronto and Earl Maxim of Vermont, fur ranchers. In other words, Trinity Mink are set up purely and simply to enter into an agreement with these fur people. Now I ask the Honourable Minister, who were the directors of Trinity Mink, and I got the surprising answer, the directors were: Bernard Andrews, Victor Clouston, Veran Spence, and Earl Maxim. In other words, the directors of Trinity Mink formed themselves into the Trinity Mink Company, in order to enter into an agreement with themselves. Now I don't know whether the Honourable Minister could explain to me properly. I would like to know the particulars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman might go and ask the directors, of course, for such particulars as they care to give him. The only particulars we have is that this is just another one of the mink ranchers. This is a company of mink ranchers, as a company. Mr. Clouston is a well-known rancher, and Mr. Spence and Mr. Maxim. In fact, Mr. Maxim is a member, I believe of the National Executive of Mink Ranchers in the United States, an association of very prominent mink ranchers. Some three of the owners and directors are well-known mink ranchers, the fourth is Mr. Andrews who is the manager of

Arctic Fisheries, and the others are also directors of Arctic Fisheries, who have formed a mink-raising company. They have taken in their own manager as one of the directors in their mink company. What is mysterious about that?

MR. HOLLETT: It certainly is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Go and discuss it with them.

MR. HOLLETT: I discussed it with the department lending them money. And I find the agreement was made the same day this was set up in the Registry of Deeds office. Anybody can find it. I recommend that the Premier go and find it. That very same day the agreement was made by Andrews' Company, these four individuals with Trinity Mink, of which they are the directors, would purchase from them all the common shares they desired, and preferred shares for \$40,000. I have come to this conclusion, and I would like to be corrected, if I am wrong.—It looks to me as though Trinity Mink is a company set up merely and simply to get a loan from the Government, so that it will not appear that any of these four gentlemen have received a loan, but that Trinity Mink, of which they are the directors received a loan, and immediately they get a loan they enter into an agreement with these four gentlemen (Trinity Mink does, of which they are the directors) to take over all their assets. The only assets Trinity Mink has is the \$25,000 loan the Government has given them. Now I would like to know on what has the Government been given any security. I wonder if the Minister could tell me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not in order at this point. That was all dealt with in answer to a question earlier in the session.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, may I say some questions were asked here earlier in the session in respect of Trinity Mink and others, and we answered them to the best of our ability. One was: "Who are the directors of Trinity Mink." I explained at the time, we did not have to answer the questions at all, but in order to save time we thought we would. It was a matter of courtesy. That is what it amounted to. And according to our records these directors are as I listed them in the answer to the question. If the honourable gentleman has further questions he wants to submit to the House or to our department in the Government in connection with the mink industry we shall be glad to answer them at the proper time.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us what the \$20,000 was for precisely?

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$27,000 that was,

MR. BROWNE: Yes, what was that for?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think that might well be the preliminary and preparatory expenses in connection with the whole thing — For instance for the aircraft to bring the mink ranchers down last summer, the conveyance of them to Dildo and to Chapel Arm and other expenses. We gave them a dinner here, a luncheon rather, out at the Brigus Tearooms on the way over to Chapel Arm, and we had other expenses. We brought them down as guests of the Government.

MR. BROWNE: I take it that \$27,000 represents the transportation of the mink ranchers and their families.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No,

MR. BROWNE: Their mink?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No for preliminary and preparatory expenses in connection with this whole idea.

MR. BROWNE: Has any money been spent on bringing down the mink?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, of course.

MR. BROWNE: It is not being included because it is estimated in the current year? This is only just preliminary, this \$27,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: Do you know what the cost of the hiring of the aeroplane was?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not in detail. I could get it.

MR. BROWNE: It should be a single item here for aircraft.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I can't seem to be able to add up these figures correctly to the total amount of \$211,500.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have given all the explanation I know.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this item of \$142,000 paid in December. There must be more than \$27,000 spent without authority in connection with the mink business, unless that includes the \$100,000 loan for the cold storage plant.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, the Honourable the Minister has not yet accounted for the total.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have \$27,000 for mink farming; \$500 for creature bounties. These additional costs are, however, offset in part by counter-vailing savings making necessary a net

provision of \$14,500 only. So you can forget the \$27,000 and the \$500. It is \$11,500. To this must be added an additional \$200,000 on capital account made up of further amounts of \$100,000 for advances under the Farm Development Loan Fund. That is not necessarily mink at all. And \$100,000 for the construction of a public cold storage plant, making a total of \$211,500.

MR. BROWNE: That \$100,000 for the Farm Development Loan Fund, what is the nature of that? For mink farming?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I dare say. Possibly not. Am I supposed to carry that in my mind. Address the question to the Chair and it will be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. BROWNE: I know he does not have it all in his mind. But the Minister should have that on paper when answering questions on Supplementary Supply. Is he able to tell us? The Minister of Mines and Resources is responsible for the expenditure?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, we would like to have some satisfaction about that from the Minister concerned. I think, Sir, we are entitled to this. I put it —

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is the honourable gentleman entitled to? What does he want?

MR. HOLLETT: I just want to know about the farm loan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not address a question on the Order Paper?

MR. HOLLETT: I asked the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources to answer that question.

DR. ROWE: It would certainly need notice of that question. I have

not the information available right now.

MR. HOLLETT: Why therefore, Mr. Chairman, bring this in if the Honourable Minister from the department is not able to answer and give us these figures? Why should the House be asked to pass this?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is wrong with it? There was a hundred thousand dollars advanced to the Farm Loan Board, passed over to them last year. It was passed over to them last year. Now it either was or it was not. It was. We ask now for ratification of it. Now the honourable gentleman wants to know, what did the Farm Loan Board spend it on. Put a question and we will gladly get the information. We have not got it at the moment.

MR. HOLLETT: We have here the Order in Council calling for \$142,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That may not be connected with this Farm Development Loan Board, and as I said, not necessarily for loans on mink. There are other farming activities and the Farm Loan Board makes loans for other things besides mink.

DR. ROWE: Actually the majority of the loans made by the Farm Loan Board were made to other people, other than mink ranchers.

MR. HOLLETT: An Order in Council, December 8, calls for \$142,000 for Farm Development Loan Board, to make loans for mink ranchers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is another item. This is another here.

MR. BROWNE: The point, I think, is this: \$142,000 was voted December 8 to make loans to mink

ranches. That must be included in this total figure of \$211,500.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer to that has already been tabled in the House, the answer the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is seeking. I remember it was a long answer quite a long one.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, if I mistake not, this morning, the honourable gentleman did not ask a question regarding the loan made by the Farm Loan Board. It was my intention to submit that anyway to the House. I did do so last year, I hope to have it by tomorrow morning, the complete list showing — Perhaps I should say this, Mr. Chairman, and I believe I did state it here before, the Farm Loan Board is a board made up of senior civil servants, the Director of Agriculture, the Assistant Director of Mines and Resources, the Director of Crown Lands and so on. There is absolutely no interference of any kind. In fact they go ahead on their own account of their own activity and investigate any applications without prejudice or interference of any kind and make their own recommendations. I will submit here tomorrow a list showing every loan, and the great majority are ordinary farmers, not milk, but there are some milk too. But tomorrow, or as soon as the department gets the information compiled, and I should think it would not take very long, I can table the answer showing every cent loaned to every milk farmer or otherwise during the past year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The milk has been already tabled.

MR. BROWNE: I suppose that is under capital account anyway?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. But we

have to get the confirmation of it now. That is why we have supplementary supply.

Mines and Resources \$211,500 — Carried.

Public Works — \$1,636,900:

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is divided into two broad amounts, Current Account and Capital Account. Current Account is \$608,900 and Capital Account \$1,028,000. That is accounted for by buildings \$199,000; roads \$394,000; and on Capital Account, mainly \$300,000 improvement of roads and \$1,160,000 new construction or construction of new roads. Both amounts were offset by savings, so that it is not a gross it is a net amount. It is a total of \$1,636,900.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, \$394,000 spent on Current Account for roads and \$300,000 improvement of roads and that is \$694,000 and for new construction \$1,160,000. That is nearly two million dollars, or one and three-quarters anyhow. Can the Minister give us any idea of the chief items in that expenditure in regard to roads, how it was distributed? It is enormous.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would doubt extremely that it would be possible to segregate the road work on which this was spent from the road work on which the amount budgeted last year was spent. In other words, if you budget so much money for the coming year for road work, that is to say, for improvement and maintenance of roads, existing roads, and the construction of new roads, and before the year is out you decide to spend more, how can you differentiate? You just keep on working, and continue to work instead of discontinuing the work on a given road when the money voted is exhausted. You vote more by special

warrant, and you continue to work. But it is pretty difficult, if not impossible, I think to distinguish between the work done with the one and the work done with the other. If the honourable gentleman wants a report of all the road work done in Newfoundland last year we will gladly table it, gladly.

MR. BROWNE: I am only looking for information, Mr. Chairman. I have here before me now 907-roads and bridges. I wonder would that be the one under which \$394,000 was expended.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It falls under five or six headings.

MR. BROWNE: Because, Mr. Chairman, here we are dealing with a large amount of money, and it is quite easy for the Minister to go and make expenditures in districts represented by his colleagues on the other side of the House, and where does the House of Assembly come in? Where is the Opposition? If they want even the smallest expenditure when the House is closed — and these amounts of money would be spread over districts represented by members supporting the Government. It seems to me that is what would count rather than necessity. Is the Minister able to give any explanation of that \$394,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have already said we will gladly give a report on all the road work last year. Is it compiled?

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): In the main it has been done, and will be furnished if we get notice of question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We cannot give it right now. Another thing we could not do, as I have said, is to distinguish between the work done on a

given road by the money that was voted by the House last year and this money which we ask the House to vote now. That is two amounts of money spent on the same road. How can you distinguish between the work and tell what was done with both amounts? We can tell what was done with both amounts together.

MR. BROWNE: I will be glad to get the information promised by the Premier — a report will be put in showing how the money has been spent. It seems to me the House should have some information as to this large amount of money. New construction \$1,160,000. That is a new vote given here. And then for improvement of roads — Surely the House is entitled to that information.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We will table that.

MR. BROWNE: When? On the estimates?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We certainly have to get it this week.

MR. HOLLETT: I notice one million etc. Was there an Order in Council for the one million etc.? But was there no Order in Council for the balance of \$136,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Apparently not.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that quite in order?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes — I am informed that it was all covered by special warrant.

MR. HOLLETT: We have not got a copy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There was a warrant which was subsequently amended, which probably accounts for the difference.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the expenditure of \$199,000 on building?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think that is accounted for, in part at least, by the purchase of a new building by the Board of Liquor Control on Water Street in place of the one at the corner of Springdale Street they are leaving. They bought another just east of that now, to which they are moving.

MR. BROWNE: From whom?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I forget the name. It is about half a block eastward. It is a building with one side on Water Street and with two side streets. They are going to get it fixed up for a new controllers building.

MR. BROWNE: How much did they pay for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think \$60,000 or \$80,000 or somewhere around there.

MR. BROWNE: That is the chief item?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: From whom was this bought?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know the man — I have talked with him. They are selling off there now. I just don't remember the name. If the honourable gentleman would give notice of question I could get the amount. I believe it was actually \$75,000. This building fronts on Water Street and has two streets, one on each side of it.

Carried.

Public Welfare — \$538,400:

MR. SMALLWOOD: A number of under-provisions were made in the account. For example; \$20,000 under Regional Welfare Travelling; \$43,000

under Dependants' Allowances and \$83,000 under Mother' Allowances, Maintenance of Children \$43,000 and Education of Children \$28,000. That is welfare children — deaf mutes and blind.

MR. BROWNE: How can that be undervoted, there must be some mistake.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps more children needed assistance, and the rates were increased in Halifax and Truro and Montreal. We send them to three institutions, one in Halifax, one in Montreal and one in Truro.

MR. HOLLETT: No, two in Halifax and one in Montreal, and the fees have been raised?

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$400,000 for able-bodied relief.

MR. BROWNE: \$400,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: What was the vote for that last year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$350,000. And \$60,000 here for sick-poor relief, and \$40,000 for their board and travel expenses, for sick persons.

These came to \$718,000 but were offset by excess provisions. These were under-estimated but other items were over-estimated, so that the new Supplementary Supply needed is \$538,400. Labrador Trading declined \$100,000.

MR. BROWNE: Was there some reason why this Labrador Trading declined \$100,000? That seems to be a very substantial amount.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The place has been so well stocked it was found to be unnecessary to buy as much additional

supply of goods as had been anticipated.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there is one item there on which I would like to make a few remarks — Sick poor \$60,000, and board and lodgings \$40,000. That is \$100,000. Does that apply to patients going to the mental hospital?

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): As far as I know, it does, Sir.

MR. BROWNE: The reason I want to bring it up is, I think my honourable friend has had some appeal made to him recently about getting patients in, and I understand from the doctor in charge there must be about three hundred patients trying to get admission to mental hospitals. While I know it is not entirely the most suitable place to bring it up, I would like to have some information.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Might we not deal with that when we come to the estimates?

Carried,

Fisheries and Co-operatives \$200:

MR. SMALLWOOD: These are two token amounts of \$100 each, to legalize the opening of new services, new accounts in the estimates.

MR. HOLLETT: Just token?

MR. SMALLWOOD: A little more than token, enabling new accounts to be created. Most of it is covered by countervailing savings, but even if it were all covered there is no vote in the estimates authorized by the House in the last session, and we have to come back now and ask for authority.

MR. BROWNE: What are the two votes?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Co-operative Training \$35,000 and Fishermen's Fairs \$500. Now that began at Trepassay, and worked out so wonderfully we adopted it as a new policy altogether for the Government through this department, to encourage and assist fishermen's fairs. It was the first one ever held that we know of in Newfoundland. And it was a howling success, I would say. I was there myself and saw it. It was a magnificent thing. And we are going to see now in many fairs, agricultural and industrial fairs, that fishermen's fairs are shown — shooting, splitting fish, knitting swine, baiting trawls and all the arts of the fishermen's trade and competitions in these arts, which have the effect of showing people who did not otherwise know it is not the simple thing they might have thought, but calls for skills that other people don't ordinarily have — We want to encourage these fishermen's fairs.

MR. HOLLETT: Would that be, Mr. Chairman, for prizes. There must be some.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, for prizes. We are not going to hold the fairs. The fairs are usually held by the community or parish or agricultural societies or unions or co-operatives. Our contribution is taking the form of offering prizes.

MR. BROWNE: That is the whole amount?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is the whole amount.

MR. BROWNE: I think that is money well spent.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not enough though.

Carried,

Economic Development \$2,499,300:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Chairman, I should explain this: In the estimates of last year, if the honourable gentlemen will turn to the Department of Economic Development for last year, in the current estimates, they will see items: Cement, Gypsum, Tanneries, Electricity, Gloves Shoes, Knitting Mills — in Current Account. And in Capital Account page 79 there is a list: Cement, Gypsum, etc.

MR. BROWNE: Not all of them are here, but some of them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is right. United Cotton, Atlantic Hardwood, Superior Rubber.

MR. BROWNE: That is included in the price? It is not included in the cost?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is an exceptional case.

MR. BROWNE: The country absorbs it all in the end, however. Is all the land bought now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: As far as we know, yes.

MR. BROWNE: That is supposed to be the last item of expenditure in connection with cement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: Now gypsum, what is that for?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The operating loss, and the rest is equipment put in to make a new product.

MR. HOLLETT: It is \$285,000 now. In reply to a question, I was given an amount of \$378,905.06.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For what year?

MR. HOLLETT: February 28, 1954 to the 28th of March, this year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know — That is maybe for another period of time.

MR. HOLLETT: I have these sets of figures and cannot make any one agree, except the United Cotton Mills. For instance, an Order in Council was granted for \$1,563,000 and gave additional working capital for Newfoundland Tanneries \$76,208. There is then additional working capital for Atlantic Harbours \$308,000. We are now given \$398,600. Motor car, yes, \$100 for that. Atlantic Gloves \$279,152, and here it is \$227,500 — So that we don't know exactly what we are to take — It does not matter, nobody robbed it or anything. But we would like to quote these figures correctly. We have to go on the air, after all, and quote these figures, and, as the Premier knows, we don't want to be too much out. We don't mind a million dollars or so. What is a million dollars?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman should be quite sure, if there is a variation in the figures they are not variations of the same figures. A question may be asked for a certain figure and the answer given and be strictly correct. Then an almost identical question may be asked, but not quite identical, and the answer would vary slightly.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, the only variation could take place might be a variation which could take place from February 2 to the end of March last year. Might have gotten some money given at that time. There might be some variation there. There was an Order in Council calling for a million and a half, and then another Order in Council at a later date, February 14, this year, for \$483,000. I still cannot make up the amount asked for now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think we may take it these are correct amounts.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there was an operating loss of \$180,000. I heard that a lot of the product was bad and had to be dumped into the harbour at Corner Brook.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was excessively and extraordinarily small, the amount that has been destroyed. Now there are No. 2 grades, of course, seconds, as you get in any product in the world.

MR. BROWNE: It is working now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, at full swing.

MR. BROWNE: One shift or three shifts?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two, if not three. They started at one shift, and completely sold out. There was not a square yard unsold, and there is stuff sold but not made yet. They are really doing very well.

MR. BROWNE: You don't know whether they are on two or three shifts?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know. They began at one and went to two, and I am not sure if they have yet gone on to three.

MR. HOLLETT: Superior Rubber — That is an extra \$400,000 — According to the account there was one million dollars to this company, and there were certain terms in that agreement, of course, in regard to the paying back of that million dollars. Has anything been handed in with regard to this extra \$400,000 that is given them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the Committee will allow me to say two things (1) I must be very careful; the posi-

tion is under very careful review. That is one thing. I think the less said the better for Newfoundland. It is a case where honourable gentlemen will have to decide whether they can accept my word on that or just ignore it, and make all the hay they can. Be that as it may. The other is this, the estimates in virtually every case, not in every case, but in most cases, in all these industries, the estimate of what they would require in working capital were ludicrously low. In fact, before they were all completed, in construction they were short of money, and we have had to pump additional working capital in to not all but most of them, and we may have to pump some more yet. In fact, I think we will. But remember the first sentence, the sentence with which I opened.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the importance of the Premier's understatement, but are we to understand now that these estimates given this House two or three years ago, prepared by the Director General of the time — I am not concerned now with the man at all but with his ability — Nevertheless are we to understand now that this man did not prepare a proper analysis of the situation, he was not competent or deliberately —

MR. SMALLWOOD: He told me a bare few months before he went to jail, he told me while driving out the road in a car, he put his hand on my arm and said: "Premier, don't get angry, you know yourself, they all must have more working capital." I turned on him like a dog and said: "Now you tell me that." That was about three months before he was arrested.

MR. HOLLETT: These extra payments, are they by any chance ex gratia awards?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, these are absolute loans. As a matter of fact, I may say, virtually all of them, although not all, are in default at this moment.

MR. BROWNE: Are they not all? Is there one that is not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think so, yes. There are two or three. United Cotton and Terra Nova Textiles are both in the black and paying, I am pretty sure.

MR. BROWNE: There is no indication.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am reasonably sure that is the case. I know, if they are not, it is only because we waived it, along with others a couple of years ago. We gave everything for two years free of payment and payment of interest and principal. But they perhaps are able to meet their interest payments because they are doing very well indeed. With the possible exception of these two, they are all in default. And that is the position which we must take into account and we are doing that. I would not want to say anything more than that.

MR. HOLLETT: With regard to the Newfoundland Hardwoods, is there any agreement covering the new operation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The position with regard to the agreement — as the Honourable the Attorney General explained here in the House two or three days ago, the details of the agreement with the new owners are in process of being worked out, but the actual agreement has not been completed in the drafting nor signing, but that is coming pretty shortly.

MR. HOLLETT: With regard to Atlantic Hardboards, up to the 28th of February last year they were given

\$920,000 and since that time they have been given an amount of \$549,000 extra, working capital.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was found the moisture content of our wood was quite high. They found several results of this; one was floating, and they found the wood had to be left much longer in the great dryers to have the great moisture content removed. That in turn slowed down, and reduced the quantity of chips available, and every minute and every hour of the day they had great presses for pressing the board. That had the effect of driving up their cost. It became necessary, therefore, to enable them to buy large quantities of wood to be laid out in the air to become air-dried, which would greatly reduce the moisture content. That was done. That was principally a matter of working capital. Then they found they needed a large new warehouse building down beside the railway track and a shipping platform. Then they found there was an entirely new machine designed in Germany for chipping. They were brand new. In fact they were the first that were sold by the makers. In fact they have the only three on this side of the Atlantic Ocean. They cost quite a bit of money. These additional things were done, but principally it was a case of working capital.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the Premier stated that they had to build a new warehouse. They had a warehouse had they not? What was the point in building a new one? They were disposing of their product.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The one to which I referred, down by the railway track, was a long building nearly three hundred feet long, built of asbestos cement and a steel frame, brought in

from England, by an English firm, with a concrete landing-platform, to bring the cars up to and land straight aboard. The other consisted of a manufacturing building on the west end of it. That was a building required to enable the board coming off the press to go off into unencumbered space for maturing the board. It has to mature, I think, two weeks or so before they trim them and sand them and ship them. The chips are placed together under great heat and pressure. They press a combination of chips and a special type of glue. And they have to lie out there in that warehouse for two weeks, I think, to mature before they can handle them again. So they had to have that large warehouse building out there as an extension to the main building.

MR. BROWNE: Is the Premier in a position to tell us how this particular industry is getting on, as regard to produce?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The product they are making is unquestionably the best in the world, in the world, of its kind. The next best on this side of the Atlantic is "Novaply" made by U.S. Plywood. They are the biggest plywood company in the whole world, bigger than McMillan in British Columbia. Their product of the same type is "Novaply," ours is "Fibrply." It is, I believe, incomparably better than any other product of its kind in the whole world. Even in Europe they cannot make the product, with the same machinery and even the same patent, as they turn out in here. They have an excellent staff of technicians who don't mind working night or day, Sunday or Monday nor holidays — really excellent. And it is a beautifully efficient operation. I would like honourable gentleman to go through it. I would be glad to take them in myself.

It is an excellent factory turning out a most excellent product. Now some of them are going down across the track into the Hardwoods Plant to be veneered with mahogany and with walnut and oak and the like for furniture. And they are getting the most beautiful tables and desk tops and furniture generally surfaced with fibreboard veneer, with these exotic woods. It is as beautiful as the honourable gentleman ever laid eyes on anywhere.

MR. BROWNE: All experimental, is it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not at all.

MR. HOLLETT: How many people are in there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are working around the clock, with 180 people in the plant. That is not counting about two hundred odd people supplying the wood to the plant. And that wood is all coming from nearby here, St. John's and the surroundings in fact not much further away than the Salmonier Line. It is quite a decent source of livelihood and income for about three hundred people. And the veneered fibreply is being shipped away now to the furniture trade in carloads and carloads every week, whole railcar loads.

As for the balance sheet, the honourable gentleman knows my stand on that. It is a private company, and I don't think — I will say this much: There are two very large companies on the Mainland of Canada who have sent spies down to go through the plant to try to discover the secret of its manufacture. They want to make that. One of these companies is very large, and known to the honourable gentleman. They have approached the heads of the company in here, trying to entice them away. They want to

manufacture that same board on the Mainland. And we are not going to give the production costs and that sort of detail. That would help to destroy them. We are not going to give that. What we must give, we will of course. But we are not going to give it if it does them any damage. We regard that as one of the best industries we have. They have had hard sledding financially. It is a new product, not commonplace but new, and it takes time to win for it consumer acceptance, contractor acceptance, supply dealers acceptance. That takes time and it takes money, unfortunately.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I have heard the Premier speak before and have not been impressed by it. I am not impressed now by anything he says because I remember his telling us they had to get two new machines the first ever made.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Three.

MR. BROWNE: The Government, I presume, bought them. What about the agreement? That is supposed to be fifty-fifty investment. Is that one of the companies for whom the formula was varied?

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is the first one in which the formula varied.

MR. BROWNE: Can you tell us how many we have? What is the good of talking of these figures and giving a description of the beautiful wood produced if it is all Newfoundland money? Can the Premier enlighten the country as to how much money these Germans have in this factory?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The amount is basically as shown in the agreement. They have not put any more in since, as they have none. What was put in since was put in by the Government of Newfoundland. This plant is the first

industry of all in which we varied the formula. It is varied in the statutes. We did not vary the agreement, but in making the agreement we varied the formula. That appears in the statutory contract, the amount they are supposed to put in. Anyway they have none to put in. What is being put in we put in.

MR. BROWNE: I would not expect the Premier to explain offhand how much is supposed to be put in, but my opinion is there is very little difference between the amount they have in and the agreement and what they have in the statute. I did come across a difference of one hundred thousand dollars to buy new machinery. What good were they? You took the valuation in the agreement, where the promoters sold the company a certain quantity of machinery, and the House has no information as to the valuation the customs placed on these goods.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman, I am afraid, misunderstood me. He will appreciate the fact that this kind of board is a very new thing, and being a very new thing this machinery that makes it is very new, and is subject, of course, to very rapid improvement. Now when they built the plant about two years ago the wood-chipping machinery in another building altogether, was the latest in the world, in the world, and the best, and better than anything on this side of the Atlantic.

MR. BROWNE: Who told you that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I prefer not to give my authority.

MR. BROWNE: I don't believe that — I am not doubting you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is living in a British country and under the Union Jack and has all the freedom and liberty of a British subject, and that includes the right to believe or not believe. These were the latest and best machines in the world, and furthermore, the only ones on this side of the Atlantic. But, since then, even better machinery has been designed, and these were got, and are in use now. And if still better ones come out they will have to be gotten. I find it a little hard to conceive of better ones than the ones they now have, but I thought that of the ones they had first. It is a very new technique, an extremely new idea, a new product.

Well, to make a long story short, they have now got the latest and the only ones on this side of the Atlantic. But honourable members should go in and see them.

MR. HOLLETT: We would not know if they were the best in the world.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Possibly not, but honourable gentlemen would see what they were. If they have a sort of vague idea in the back of their minds these are just a collection of rusty, old-fashioned machinery, outdated and antiquated, it might open their eyes if they went through it. I had that experience recently. I took a very prominent and very reputable professional man in this city in there, who had not been inside one of the factories, not one. I took him for two days through them, and he came out just full of enthusiasm for them — just full of enthusiasm. He said, he knew they cost a lot of money, but as plants, as machinery, as industrial processes, they are just superb, just magnificent. I think the honourable gentlemen opposite, especially the honourable

member for St. John's West, would have this impression, if they too went in and through them. If they would only do it. But possibly, like H. G. Wells in the First World War, he tells in one of his books, how as head of the great propaganda centre of the British Government in the First World War he had invitations repeatedly made to come to the front in France and see. He refused from beginning to end. He said he could carry on his propaganda beautifully just so long as he did not go, but once he went and saw blood, and bullets actually kill people and once he saw dead bodies he thought he would lose his stomach for propaganda, so he refused to go. Now the honourable gentlemen opposite might be just a little like that. If they went into these plants they might never again be able to criticize the plants. They might criticize the Government but not the plants, if ever they went in and went through them. That is why I keep pleading with them to go through and look at the plants.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on that point — We are not attempting to criticize the plants. We are not criticizing the Government. Almost one would wonder if it was not rusty machinery up to February of last year in that particular plant because Atlantic Hardboards cost already, on the 29th of February last year \$920,000 and since that time they have been paid \$549,600 of Government money. The Honourable the Premier tells us there are one hundred and thirty men employed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the plant, I meant.

MR. HOLLETT: All right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And another couple of hundred besides.

MR. HOLLETT: Where do you keep these?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Cutting and trucking wood to the plant, thousands and thousands of cords.

MR. HOLLETT: I thought most of the wood came from Atlantic Hardboards from that plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: The Government gave enough to pay each of these men, one hundred men, four thousand dollars a year since last year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Divide it now by three hundred and thirty.

MR. HOLLETT: I have yet to see where it comes in. But is this a case where we are continually going to keep on pouring money into this plant for such small numbers as are employed? For instance, talk about Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited. Up to the 28th of February last year there was over two million dollars went to that plant. Since that time they have received \$867,000 and also an additional \$223,000 in guaranteed loans, costing now three million eight hundred and some odd thousand dollars. Surely there has to be a stop to this. Since February last year we have paid into these fourteen industries four million and odd thousand dollars. Now if this Government has to keep pouring in a lubricant to the extent of four million dollars every year we ought to see some returns.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I agree with that.

MR. HOLLETT: We ought not to have to say hush. The Honourable the Premier says, "I would prefer you don't say anything about this company." How long have we got to keep on doing that?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am a little mystified by the Premier's attitude about it being so delicate that he would rather not say things. Does that mean to say the charge which was made here earlier this session is now found to be substantiated?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not referring to that at all.

MR. BROWNE: He mentioned three industries, Superior Rubber, Kock Shoes and Gold Sail. Are those the ones to which he is referring or are there other ones?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was not referring. I did not even have in my mind those so-called charges or accusations at all. It was not on account of these at all that I made my remarks. I said they were in default, most of them, and that the position is now being taken into careful account. Now need I spell it out?

MR. BROWNE: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do you think it would be in the public interest?

MR. BROWNE: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are the best judges of that.

MR. BROWNE: I know there was four million since last year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is one reason why it is under review.

MR. BROWNE: Is it to be another four million this year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. BROWNE: Now in regard to Superior Rubber, is it correct that a boiler burst?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The section of the boiler has to be replaced.

MR. BROWNE: I remember hearing an announcement at 8 o'clock in the morning over CJON that the place had to close down and may be closed for weeks or months.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Until the section was replaced in the boiler.

MR. BROWNE: Where did it come from?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know. I believe it was a German boiler.

MR. BROWNE: I remember last year drawing to the attention of the Premier the statement that the boiler was pre-war, and then the Premier saying that most of the machinery was second hand in there. Now if this is a machine from Germany and pre-war I, it is going to be very hard perhaps to get a section for it. Do I understand from the Premier that Superior Rubber is closed down and may be for weeks and months.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think so. Until they get the section to repair the boiler.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps the Minister of Labour is in a position to say, and whether it is new or old.

MR. BALLAM: They have inspected it, yes. The boiler is quite competent to do the job for which it was bought.

MR. BROWNE: Was it passed?

MR. BALLAM: The section of the boiler burnt out. That is what happened to it now.

MR. BROWNE: It must be incompetent help?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Possibly that is it. But there was no explosion.

MR. BROWNE: Was there no inquiry into that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, there was not an inquiry — That would be an explosion.

MR. BROWNE: Surely if a boiler were in bad condition and began to explode and causing loss of life, the people in charge of the Inspection Service should consider it as their responsibility to investigate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They do, and they are.

MR. BROWNE: Well, they have just told us it burned out. That is all. That is a very rare thing to happen in regard —

MR. SMALLWOOD: No—It happens hundreds of times.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, there are various other things underneath various headings which can be discussed, I agree, at another time. So I think we might not waste any more of the valuable time of the House.

Economic Development \$2,499,300, carried.

Health \$99,300, carried.

On motion Committee rose to report having passed these resolutions.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole on Supply have agreed to certain resolutions and instructed me to report same.

On motion report received.

On motion said Resolutions read a first time, read a second time and concurred in.

On motion the Honourable the Minister of Finance introduced a Bill based on said Resolutions:

On motion Bill read a first, second and third time and passed and title be as read:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now recess until 3:00 of the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Before leaving I want to inform the honourable members that the Librarian is ill today, therefore when sending to the Library for papers they might experience some delay as there is only a stenographer in charge.

MONDAY, April 13, 1955

AFTERNOON SESSION

The House resumed at 3:00 of the clock.

On motion the Honourable Minister of Finance moved the House into a Committee on Ways and Means.

Budget Speech read by Mr. Power.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker:

Our Province has just completed another remarkable year of prosperity, undoubtedly the most prosperous year of our history. Our economy increased its strength, our people were better off. The health of the people continued its improvement of recent years, and generally there was a quite noticeable improvement in the physical and material condition of Newfoundlanders. This happy state of affairs gives ample indication of continuing through the year upon which we have entered, and I expect to see 1955 establish a new highwater-mark of prosperity for this Province. I do not consider that the foundation of our Newfoundland economy has yet become so broad as to repel the onslaught of a depression, should a depression come; but I am satisfied that that foundation has been broadened,

and will be broadened and strengthened still more in this present year. If I were to express a personal word at this point, it would be to say that I am not by temperament or habit a strongly optimistic person. My optimism for Newfoundland is based entirely upon facts that are available to every member of the House. The facts speak for themselves, and they speak with great eloquence. The rising tide of prosperity is the most conspicuous fact in Newfoundland today.

In no way is the fast-rising standard of living of our people better demonstrated than by the insistent and not-to-be-denied public clamor for more and better roads, more and greatly improved schools, and even more and more public health facilities. In my Budget of a year ago I thought that we had provided very handsomely for expansion in those fields, and I still think so. During the year since then, however, my colleagues and I in the Administration were confronted by almost endless demands for extensions and improvements not actually provided for. While in the circumstances we were obliged to resist most of those demands, we did agree to increase expenditures on public services by an amount of something over a million dollars for the year. The surplus on current account for which we budgeted was consequently reduced by this amount, and by some failures of revenue to reach the Treasury during the year, with the result that I am able this year to announce a surplus of only \$1,344,000.

The original estimates of revenue and expenditure stood at totals of \$39,200,300 and \$35,540,200 respectively. Collections will have amounted to \$37,979,400, and expenditure (inclusive of commitments) will have aggregated \$36,635,300.

The amount by which the estimated revenue fell short was \$1,220,900. This is made up of three amounts, namely, \$586,000 in the Department of Health, \$420,000 in the Department of Mines & Resources, and \$214,000 in the Department of Public Affairs. The largest of these figures, that of the Health Department, was made up principally of an under-realization of the estimated receipts from the Cancer Tax. The deficiency in the Mines & Resources Department arose chiefly through failure of the mining royalties to equal the estimate.

The Year 1955-56

And now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the year 1955-56.

I estimate that the revenue and expenditure for the year will be as follows: revenue, \$38,846,300; expenditure, \$38,369,100; surplus \$477,200. I propose to make brief reference to the expenditure figures, selecting those points of noteworthy difference, for the Estimates as a whole must, of course, be reviewed in the House and I doubt that the House would wish me to make a detailed oral explanation of our proposed expenditure programme.

Expenditure Current Account

The first noteworthy increase is under Consolidated Revenue Fund where the estimated outgoings 1955-56 total \$2,231,400, a net increase of \$440,000 over the estimate of one year ago. This increase is due to provision for the first full year in respect of the interest and Sinking Fund on the twelve million 4% loan which was successfully raised in 1954; there has been inserted, also, a provisional amount of \$320,000 for interest on a new \$16 million loan which I shall ask this House to authorize in order that we may proceed with our planned pro-

gramme of capital expenditures. The gross increase is offset by the disappearance of provision for the redemption of Treasury Bills, leaving a net increase, as I have indicated, of some \$400,000 for this service.

The estimates of the Department of Finance reveal an increase of approximately \$200,000 over last year's estimate of \$1,137,000. This net increase is due, in its entirety, to provision for the cost of raising the new loan of \$16 million to which I have already referred. There are two notable, even if much smaller, items under the Vote of the Department of Finance to which I should make reference. The first is that provision has been made in a sum of \$30,000 (compared with \$50,000 in the previous year) to defray the continuing costs, at a somewhat lower level, of the task of preparing our case for submission to the Royal Commission which is to be appointed by Canada under the Terms of Union to review our financial position with a view to determining what additional financial assistance Ottawa will accord to our Treasury; the second is a new provision in an amount of \$75,000 which is designed to meet the costs of observing in a suitable manner the 100th anniversary of the granting of responsible government to our Island. Announcement will be made in due course of our plans in this connection.

There is an increase of \$578,000 in the estimates of the Department of Education. No new services are involved other than a provision of \$20,000 for the vocational training of physically handicapped persons. This work, which is a very necessary one, is being undertaken in co-operation with the Government of Canada, who will bear one-half of the cost. The main cause of the increase is to be

found under Salaries of Teachers, which in accordance with the scales introduced one year ago reveal an increase of \$373,000 when compared with the original estimates of 1954-55. This increase is due, in part, to the application of increments in accordance with the approved scale, plus some provision for an increase in the number of teachers in the year 1955-56.

The estimates of the Department of Mines and Resources aggregate \$1,617,200, an increase of \$268,300 when compared with the original estimates for that Department in the previous year. Provision is made for expenditure on two new services; of \$40,000 for the development of pasture lands, and of \$100,000 for the development of bog lands, two courses of action which have been recommended in the Report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture.

The estimates of the Department of Public Works reveal the heaviest single increase of any Department at \$780,000 in excess of last year's provision of \$4¾ million. Of the total of \$5,504,500 some \$280,000 is attributable to Public Buildings Division (Salaries, Office Expenses, Repairs and Maintenance). The really heavy increase is under the Roads and Bridges Division where it has been necessary, because of the expansion in our road system, to allocate \$3,175,800, or \$470,000 more than the original allocation of 1954-55, for the maintenance of existing roads and bridges.

The Department of Public Welfare exhibits an increase of the order of \$470,000 with total provision at \$7,409,700. This increase is due to augmented provisions of \$1,566,000 under General Assistance and of \$255,000 under Federal-Provincial Allowances, this aggregate increase of \$1,821,000

being offset by an estimated decrease of \$1,421,000 under the Division Mothers' and Dependents' Allowances. This is due, in the main, to the substitution of Social Assistance grants for Dependents' Allowances and Mothers' Allowances, and in this respect the Government of Canada will make contributions estimated at \$168,000 in 1955-56 on account of the Social Assistance Service, a service which hitherto did not attract Dominion aid.

The revenue follows upon the pattern of previous years: the gasoline tax will however be increased by two cents a gallon to seventeen cents. Authorizing legislation will be introduced today.

Capital Account, 1954-55

The original estimates for 1954-55 made provision in a gross total of \$17,492,500 with offsetting receipts (largely from the Dominion Government on Trans Canada Highway account) of \$3,053,900 leaving capital expenditure in a net amount of \$14,438,600.

In actual fact expenditures, again inclusive of outstanding commitments, will amount to \$18,792,000 with offsetting revenue of \$2,559,200 — a net capital expenditure of \$16,233,000 or an increase of \$1,794,400.

The individual vote variations are rather extensive. Under expenditures amounted to \$2,145,400, of which the heaviest was under Fisheries (\$1,846,000). Excess expenditures arose under eight Heads in a total of \$3,445,100 Public Works (entirely roads) \$781,000 of which Consolidated Fund expenditures on liquidation of guaranteed bank loans accounted for \$268,000, and Economic Development \$2,077,000 which was occasioned by the necessity of making further advances to the new industries.

Capital Account, 1955-56

Capital Expenditure during 1955-56 is estimated in a gross sum of \$21,208,200 or in a net amount of \$16,213,400 if we apply recoveries under this division of our Estimates.

The revenue from this Account, estimated at a total of \$4,994,800 is made up principally of recoveries from Canada on jointly shared costs projects, the main item being \$4,000,000 on Trans Canada Highway Construction.

The estimates reveal increased needs for expenditure under five Heads in a total of \$4,995,200 with needs in lesser amounts than provided in the previous year of \$1,279,500 under six Heads.

The net increase in Capital Account provisions over the 1954/55 estimates is thus \$3,715,700 which is entirely due to our determination to press ahead with all possible speed with our road construction programme. The provisions for these services of \$1,500,000, \$2,000,000 and \$8,000,000 reveal increases of \$800,000 for improvement of existing roads, of \$700,000 for construction of new roads not including Trans-Canada Highway construction for which we have provided \$3,000,000 more than in 1954/55.

This Government have never concealed the fact that they consider it to be their principal duty to broaden and strengthen the basis of our Newfoundland economy. Repeatedly we have insisted that this must be the first duty of any Newfoundland Government in these first few years after Confederation. We now have the highest birth-rate, and the lowest death-rate, of all the Provinces of Canada. The pressure of population grows greater every year. Enduring progress for Newfoundland lies, not along the road of producing and edu-

cating young men and women to populate and build other Provinces of Canada, but rather along the road of keeping these young Newfoundlanders here by creating for them adequate opportunities to make a decent living in their own native Province. Our population will have passed the half million mark before two more general elections have been held in Newfoundland. It may well reach the one-million mark while some of us who are members of this House today are still members of it.

We have never been ashamed of our preoccupation with economic affairs. We have never ceased to proclaim the priority which these matters must continue to claim.

This Government, in the past half dozen years, have spent many hundreds of thousands of dollars on geological surveys. The first fruits of these efforts are about to be seen, for not only is a large concentrating mill to be erected this year at Tilt Cove, but other mines and mills are to follow soon thereafter. Newfoundland is about to reap the reward of the expenditures of public money in this field.

In the field of forests we foresee, not only the continued expansion of the great pulp and paper mills at Grand Falls and Corruer Brook, but the construction of a large new pulp and paper mill on the east coast of Newfoundland. The third mill project is a cardinal point in the economic programme of this Government, and I am able to say today that negotiations have been initiated by the Premier for this greatly desired project.

In the field of fishery development things are taking very definite shape, and before the present year expires much progress will have been made.

We all agree that it is mockery to speak of enduring prosperity in Newfoundland without prosperous fisheries.

In the field of agriculture we have been discussing the Report of the Royal Commission too recently in this House to make it desirable for me to say much about it, except to add this much, namely, that we shall follow the Royal Commission's recommendations with vigor and efficiency.

In the field of hydro-electric development great and famous things are likely to be seen in the coming months and years. The British Newfoundland Corporation, that great aggregation of British, Canadian and other corporations whose formation was a direct outcome of this Government's programme of economic development, are conducting a very thorough survey of the potential of the Hamilton River watershed in Labrador. On the Grand Falls of that river at least 4,000,000 horsepower of electricity can be developed. This is the largest single hydro-electric development that is possible anywhere in the world, and it is but one of several sites on that great watershed.

And so, on all fronts, Mr. Speaker, economic development is proceeding in this Province: fisheries, forests, minerals, water-powers, agriculture, industrial. This Government have aided and encouraged this development at a cost of many millions of dollars of public money, and many millions more will have to be expended on such purposes. I am encouraged to believe that more and more of these millions will be private capital in the coming years, and that fewer millions of it will have to be drawn from public funds. As this becomes increasingly so it will become feasible for

the Government to devote more and more of the capital sums at its disposal to bringing about badly-needed improvements in the public services of the Province.

And so, in this my fourth Budget Speech, I am happy and I can report to the people that their Province is marching steadily ahead and that the prospects are truly excellent.

On motion debate adjourned.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

The Honourable Minister of Finance:

I, the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending 31st March, 1956, and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, as amended, I recommend the estimates to the House of Assembly.

(Sgd.) LEONARD OUTERBRIDGE,
Lieutenant Governor,
April 16th, 1955.

On motion the Honourable Minister of Finance moved the House into a Committee on Supply:

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage, Chairman of Committee on Supply.

On motion the Committee rose to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole on Supply have considered the matter to them

referred, have made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received, and leave given to sit again tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Your Honour would be willing to see 6:00 o'clock so that traditional events may take place, and the House may resume again at 8:00 of the clock tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: At the request of the House that it be now 6:00 o'clock I do leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock tonight.

MONDAY, April 18, 1955.

NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement between the Government and Union Electric Light and Power Company Limited, Relating to a Franchise."

MR. SPEAKER: The second reading of this Bill was moved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply and the debate adjourned by the honourable member for St. John's West.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, we have nothing to say to this in reply.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Minister wish to comment?

MR. HEFFERTON: No, Mr. Speaker.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and Mr. James Boylen."

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that in the Speech from the Throne reference was made to the fact that Mr. James Boylen had started mining interests here in Newfoundland. I shall very gratefully give the background of that.

It might be recalled, several years ago the Government entered into an agreement with Falconbridge Mining Corporation which provided they were given a concession area, quite a sizable concession area in the general area of what we call Green Bay, lying roughly between the western part of the Notre Dame Bay and a portion of White Bay. They fulfilled the terms of their agreement there and subsequently decided to withdraw, apparently because they developed some interest in some private mining claim in the Tilt Cove and Pilley's Island area, private claims. Subsequently, it appears, Mr. Boylen joined forces with Falconbridge and the result was the announcement which the Premier made here a few weeks ago.

Now this agreement which we have before us, or Bill, makes it possible for Mr. Boylen to do further exploration work on what was part, roughly the northern part, of the old Falconbridge concession area. The idea being, as already intimated, to try and prove up enough there to warrant several mining developments in this area. The area in this agreement is contiguous to the area held by Mr. Boylen, an associate in the private areas around Tilt Cove and around Beck's Cove and Pilley's Island, etc.

This agreement gives Boylen the right to carry on exploration work

for four years from the current date, on areas, one of them being, as I indicated, the old northern part of the ex-Falconbridge concession, and the other being what is referred to as the Pilley's Island concession area, a smaller area, but one considered to be fairly rich in possibilities.

The sub-clause of the agreement, No. 1 and No. 4, are sub-clauses whereby Boylen agrees to spend not less than \$240,000 on exploration work during the four year period, of which not less than \$60,000 shall be spent in one year. At the expiration of this agreement, Boylen has the right to take out development and mining licenses, in accordance with the general provisions of the Crown Land (Mines and Quarries) Act.

The agreement follows a standard pattern, which is now fairly familiar to this House, according to the pattern started here in 1950. I believe, and carries a number of formal clauses, to which I don't think there is any necessity for me to refer on second reading. Perhaps during the Committee stage there may be some questions.

It will be noticed that under section eleven, Boylen has the right, subject always to the general agreement the Government has with Rothschild & Sons, to develop any water power he might need for his mining development in the area.

All other clauses, Mr. Speaker, are formal clauses in the sense that they are standard in all agreements.

I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HOLLITT: Mr. Speaker, I think generally, we are in accord with the principle of this Bill. There are

two or three things that need some discussion in Committee of the Whole, I believe. We don't know anything about Mr. Boylen, neither do we know anything about Mr. Doyle, who, I believe, came down here last year. I do hope our connection with this Mr. Boylen will be more happy than the ones which we have had so far at any rate established with Mr. Doyle.

The principle of the Bill, of course, is that we are giving this man the right to go and see if he can find economic copper down there. Certainly we could not be contrary to the principle of this Bill.

There are one or two other things though: It says in Section 19: "Boylen shall not at any time be liable to pay any taxes other than taxes of general application." That is a policy, I think, which the Honourable the Premier himself generally opposed in connection with some of the great corporations carrying on business here for a number of years. Some discussion was had about that some time ago in connection with Bowaters, where great disgust was expressed on account of the fact this Provincial Government was not allowed to collect any taxes. On the face of this agreement we are not going to charge Mr. Boylen except on taxes of general application. I don't think there are any taxes of general application we can put on very much, over and above the Federal Government. The Federal Government, of course, can tax for profits and customs duties and all that sort of thing.

There is another thing there in connection with the area — Mr. Boylen may encroach on someone's private land. With that, of course, we have always expressed our disagreement as too arbitrary — giving the right to award John Jones so much damage for

compensation for land Mr. Boylen may take. And the man has to accept that without any right to appeal to the Supreme Court. We have never been in favour of that particular principle, and I see that is embodied in this Bill here.

Apart from these two points, Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why we should not support the general principle of this Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has misapprehended the meaning of the term "taxes of general application." To say that he shall not be subject to taxes except taxes of general application is only another way of saying that no special taxes aimed at him shall be levied upon him. It is only to say that any taxes that are generally applied to mines or to any other enterprise shall be levied against him. But there shall not be levied against him taxes aimed only at him. To give the House some example of what I mean: At the moment we have a tax rental agreement with the Government of Canada. Under that agreement we do not levy income nor corporation taxes in Newfoundland. We have reuted to the Government of Canada our right to do that. But suppose we, in our wisdom, at some time in the future declined to have a tax rental agreement with the Government of Canada and we in this House imposed or reimposed a corporation tax or an income tax in Newfoundland. That corporation and income tax would be of general application. It would fall where it fell. No one would be exempted from it except Bowaters. That tax would be one of general application except to Bowaters. And it would apply to Boylen's enterprises in Newfoundland. Similarly if they have municipal taxes in various parts of the

Island, Boylen enterprises would be subject to that tax, provided it were of general application. So that, to say that he shall be subject only to taxes of general application is only to say that he shall not be singled out for special taxes to apply to him, of a special character aimed at him and at no one else, or perhaps aimed at him and perhaps one or two others, but at all events not of general application, applicable to everyone under the same terms and conditions, and not a special tax aimed at him and a number of people and not at others who may be in precisely the same circumstances, engaged in precisely the same type of enterprise. Now I feel sure that my honourable friend misapprehended the meaning of the term completely, and now that he knows from what I have told him, I am sure he must agree with this particular clause in this particular Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Honourable the Premier would allow me to ask a question on that, without debating. Would the Honourable the Premier consider a tax which could not be levied on Bowaters to be a tax of general application or otherwise?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, of course. There is only one exemption, and if it applies to everyone else it would certainly be a tax of general application, with only one exception.

MR. HOLLETT: Exceptions prove the rule.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the meaning of this agreement and other agreements before the House, seeing that both are similarly expressed, is because many of the Island's possible mining areas are reserved or are leased to other corporations, and it is necessary to bring in a special Act to withdraw from the reser-

vation that I refer to, under the Crown Lands Act, certain areas in order to enable Boylen to do any work there at all. I have mentioned before that mining men have said to me — "What is the use coming down here — You go and prospect and find it belongs to certain corporations who have already gotten a reserve for themselves." That is the reason we don't have any people coming here now. To get them you have to make deals with them.

Now I notice this is a "red box" Bill. It was signed, the agreement in it was signed April 15, just a day or so, if it was not the very date, after the Premier read a statement here from Mr. Boylen which announced that he was going to have work done at Tilt Cove, and going to put in a concentrator there. I hope that the work at Tilt Cove is successful, and I also hope this work will be successful. But I do feel that, if the territory, all the minerals listed here in this country was opened to prospectors, there would be more work done than we are having done at the present time.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, there are just two points. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition said he did not know Mr. Boylen, I am surprised to hear that. He is generally recognized as perhaps the most outstanding mining promoter, important enough for "Life" to carry an article on him and his activities last year. He is the man generally regarded as being responsible for the great mining development in New Brunswick in the last three or four years. I have heard myself some of the outstanding public commentators make reference to Mr. Boylen and his activities here.

The tax clause my honourable friend referred to has already been dealt with by the Honourable the Premier.

The matter of expropriation: That stands in all our Acts. But there is one phrase there, which I am afraid has not been given the importance it deserved. That is that expropriation can only be with the prior assent of the Government. No Government, I am sure, would agree to assent to any expropriation proceedings which were not in the public interest.

I don't think there are any other points, Sir, except those of which my honourable friend has just spoken. He seems not to be aware of the fact that Mr. Boylen has acquired a number of private interest lands, mining leases and what not, for the most part in fee simple. They have acquired them on their own, bought them out in some way — I don't know — it is not relevant anyway. We are very happy the Government is able to give exploration rights on contiguous areas there, which we believe, and Mr. Boylen believes, will prove very promising, the idea being we might be able to develop even greater mining activity there than foreseen at the present time.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Establish the City of Corner Brook and for other Purposes in Connection Therewith."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, the members of the House are very well aware that only recently, by means of a plebiscite, the towns of Corner Brook West, Corner Brook East and Curling and the Townsite of Corner Brook decided to amalgamate and form themselves into a city.

This Bill is an attempt to give them an abridged charter under which they may be able to make certain prepara-

tions during the coming months. Our hope is that by the next session of the House of Assembly we may have the complete charter and give to it the consideration it deserves. For the purpose of this particular Act we have drawn largely on the provisions of the Local Government Act, under which the incoming council which will be elected some time during the coming summer, probably, will be able to make certain preparations in anticipation of the time when they will be able actually to take over. Provision is made that they should take over January 1, 1956. Until that time, of course, the regulations and taxes now imposed by the five councils in the area remain in force and cannot be changed except in the normal way. That is, the incoming council has no power to change it, but the incoming council will have certain powers in anticipation of what they hope to do. For instance they are given the power to engage certain clerical help which they think may be desirable. And they will have power to select a site for a town hall. Certain other powers will be given to them, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Provision is made here whereby the election can be carried out. Provision is made for the election of a mayor apart from the councillors. Provision is also made whereby, after inception of the office of council, it may possibly take over the control and management of the water and sewerage corporation of Greater Corner Brook. At the present time the water and sewerage corporation of Greater Corner Brook is managed by appointed representatives from the four different councils. After the inception of the new council, provision is made whereby it can appoint members to take the place of those who

will automatically vacate their office at the end of the year. Subject to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, they may also assume control of the water and sewerage rates because it becomes, as it were, an integral part of the municipal council of the new City.

Schedule "A" and "B" and "C"; Schedule "A" deals with the boundaries of the new city. Schedule "B" deals with qualifications of voters and Schedule "C" gives the boundaries of areas outside the limits of the City over which the new council would have control but where they will not have taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, as we only received this Bill this morning, although it is only very short, we have not had an opportunity to look at it scarcely at all. But I should like to take this opportunity to say how glad we are on this side of the House that the people in this area have decided to amalgamate and so will become the second city, I take it. I don't know what the people in Harbour Grace would say to that, but I mean the second City at any rate to have a charter. I am rather sorry to see the Government should bring in such a skimpy Bill as this on such a huge event, in a sense. You get four municipalities agreeing to co-operate to the extent they become one City, and I think it should be marked in this House with something a little better than that three or four pages. I feel, Sir, the people of Corner Brook are not going to appreciate that. We are told there is not time, and we are told there is going to be brought in, in the Fall after the elections are over, I take it, another Bill. But I don't think things should be rushed like

that, and a proper Bill should be brought in with the necessary charter, etc. I take it, however, the thing will work out in the end. And I would congratulate the people of Corner Brook for deciding that there is safety in numbers. The four of them are now united, and that is definitely a tendency to strengthen that particular area. We are all proud of that because it is a very great industrial area, and the earnings of the people there certainly justify a big effort being made to really make it the second City of this tenth Province of Canada.

MR. CURTIS Mr. Speaker, in replying to the last speaker, I would like just to point out that in 1921 we passed a charter for the City of St. John's. It was a charter taking Mayor Gosling, then, or the Commission of which he was the head, years to prepare. Every year since 1921 we have amended that charter, and we are amending it again this year. Now it is absolutely impossible to draft a charter for a city to satisfy them for any length of time. We did have a charter prepared and could have put it through. There were three hundred Sections in it, all ready to bring in. But we felt that the Council when elected might like themselves to consider that charter section by section. And they could not possibly do that in the time that has elapsed between the time they had the election and now. So that they have a whole year now in which to do it. At the same time I have high hopes, Mr. Speaker, and I am speaking now after consultation with the people of Corner Brook, that the present charter, short and concise as it is, will fill the Bill admirably. And it is our feeling that this Bill may not be just a tem-

porary Bill, but that it may stand for many years as an authority.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the point raised by the Attorney General, that there should be a great deal of consideration given to the devising of a suitable charter for the new City of Corner Brook, yet, I feel quite sure that is not really what it is. I think this is really only a temporary measure, and when they get working together they will find they will need to have it all set out for the benefit of the citizens as well. Because it is not only necessary for some persons elected town managers to know what the law is, but "John Citizen" is entitled to know. And how can he be entitled to know if he is to look at any particular section and then refer to the Local Government Act as amended in 1953 and 1954. He cannot possibly do it.

I have already drawn attention several times to the question of regulations. I notice regulations are referred to here. But there is still no section saying there must be regulations published in the Newfoundland Gazette not anywhere else. I feel it would be a good thing for all regulations to be published not only in the Newfoundland Gazette but in the "Western Star" or whatever paper they have in Corner Brook, so that the public there, if so minded, will be able to cut out the regulations from time to time and have them to guide them.

This is certainly a great step in the history of the town and in the minds of the people who reside in that great area over there. There is no doubt about it, that is a very progressive section of our community. Many, many years ago I remember reading Archbishop Howley's book, when sta-

tioned there as bishop, he looked forward, as soon as relieved from the injustices of the French occupation along the coast, to its going ahead very fast. Then of course with the coming of the great industrial development in 1923, Corner Brook has been going ahead ever since. So that we are all very happy to witness this very auspicious occasion when a Bill is being introduced to give them the powers of a City Council.

I really do look forward to seeing another Bill brought in before very long, which will set out more fully, and in greater detail the sections which should apply to such an important place as the city of Corner Brook.

MR. BALLAM: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say anything about this Bill, because, as mentioned before by other honourable speakers, this is more or less a temporary measure. I may say for the benefit of all concerned, that it has been taken up with the committee over there, and it was understood that they will be given such time as the actual Bill itself will be brought into the House either at a later date or in a later session. This is being gone into at great length, and we feel this Bill bridges the gap until such time as they can bring the Bill before the House for proper consideration. But it has been gone into and accepted by the amalgamation committee in Corner Brook.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Confirm to Bowaters Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Mills Limited Certain Rights and Powers."

MR. SPEAKER: The second reading was moved by the Honourable the

Attorney General, and adjourned at the request of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, over the weekend I looked into this Bill and, as well as I could, considered it, considering we had a great many of them to try and study. There were certain points about it that occurred to me which I would like to express now.

This is a Bill to confirm to Bowaters Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Mills, Limited certain rights and powers. Now the Bowaters Corporation of Corner Brook are the successors of the International Power and Paper Company who took over from Newfoundland Power and Pulp and Paper Company in 1927. And they were the successors of a company or rather they were formerly the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, which I believe were formed to, or took over from, the Newfoundland Products Corporation formed in 1915. The history of the development of the natural resources of Corner Brook goes back a long way, but the chief step was taken in 1915. Then in 1923, and after that the contract was made with the Armstrong Withworth Corporation to build a paper mill and develop power at Deer Lake. And generators were put in at Deer Lake to develop something in the neighbourhood of one hundred thousand horse power.

Now this Bill, I thought, was to transfer to a new company, called, the Bowater Power Company, the assets in Newfoundland involved in the production of electric energy. But I think it contains more than that. The first recital I see here says: "Whereas it is desirable further to promote the development of the water powers in the Humber District and facilitate the development when practical so to do of

undeveloped water powers the rights to which are now vested in Bowater Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Mills Limited."

Now the company and its predecessors have been operating since 1923, or rather since 1925, when they started operations. That is thirty years ago — and apparently without any difficulty. Now they have the idea of forming a separate company, which was recently incorporated. We don't know very much about it nor when it was incorporated, but apparently there is such an organization now as the Bowaters Power and Water Limited, incorporated under the Companies Act for the purpose of taking over the hydro-electric asset from the paper company. And their recital is based on — "It is desirable to remove any doubts as to the powers of the paper company to assign the rights, power, privileges, lands, leases, timer limits, water rights, franchises, concessions, immunities, exemptions, development rights, licences, right-of-ways and easements vested in, or owned, enjoyed, or acquired by the paper company, by, under or in pursuance of the statutes or agreements recited in the Schedule to this Act." I take it "Paper Company" is the Bowaters Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Mills, Limited. — "Whereas it is desirable to remove any doubts as to the power of that company— " (That is the company which took over from the International Power and Paper Company) " — to assign the rights" etc. "vested in the paper company." Now they want to have it declared by this House that they are perfectly free to do that. If there has been any doubt up to the present time, this Bill is to clear it all away. There is supposed to be no longer any doubt about the power of Bowaters to pass over to another company any of the rights

which they possess. What about their duties and obligations? Can they get rid of any duties or obligations imposed upon them? The Bill is not entirely silent upon the subject, but makes very little reference to it.

One would think that a Bill as extensive and far-reaching as this is and as important as this is, would have brought forth from the Attorney General a greater explanation than we have received, and that we would have been supplied with copies of the numerous Acts which have already been passed in connection with these properties. There are nineteen different documents referred to in the Schedule. And I am quite sure that, outside the Attorney General, perhaps nobody in the House has had the time nor the opportunity to examine them, or to examine them all anyway. There have been twelve documents since 1923 including the principal Act of 1927, when the International Power and Paper Company took over. But since then there have been several Acts passed by the Commission of Government from 1934 until 1947, of which I don't know. But I notice that they have to deal with concessions of land, the Newfoundland Government being guarantor for "B" Debentures which were issued at a certain rate, I believe five and a half per cent, actually when money was a lot cheaper. The Bowaters people took advantage to convert their loan, and these loans have been converted accordingly. Now of course it is desirable for the promotion of development of water powers, which I don't see how this Bill is going to help in that respect — If there is any doubt about the powers of the company should they be resolved in favour of the company at this juncture? And should it be assumed they should be resolved in this way? It is only a few

days ago that we had the Royal Commission on Forestry expressing their amazement at the concessions which previous governments had given to the companies which established themselves at Corner Brook and suggesting that the Government should re-negotiate the contract with a view to being able to get a revenue from the timber limits and from the water powers which they possess.

Well, is not this the opportunity for re-negotiating the contract — And why should — if it means anything, if the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Forestry mean anything — why now are we taking this in our stride, so to speak, so casually, without giving it very much consideration? I believe I heard the Honourable the Attorney General say that the value of the assets to be transferred to this new company is something in the nature or neighbourhood of thirty-five million dollars. What about the Premier's own statement recently, when he was speaking in relation —

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman cannot refer to a former debate in the same session.

MR. BROWNE: I believe, Mr. Speaker, it was not strictly a debate — I can make reference to a casual statement, without going into it in any detail. What about the Premier's reference to the attitude he was going to take towards this company. He seemed to be in a very fighting mood at the time. At any rate it involves the question of the attitude towards the company as far as re-negotiating the agreements are concerned. Is there to be another time to come as opportune as this one when this matter may be considered? The Government has a distinct advantage over the Opposition as far as the consideration of this Bill or any other is concerned. In regard to

this Bill the Government can be advised by the Attorney General who is a director.

MR. CURTIS: A Newfoundland Government director.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, a Newfoundland Government director of Bowaters Company. And he knows exactly the inside working of that corporation. He should be familiar with all their decisions and all their deliberations. But he has told us very little. I don't know whether he is bound by any oath of office. But, if he is a Government director, I take it, he is not there personally, for personal benefit of the Government, but for the benefit of the people. And if there is to be a re-organization of Bowaters' holdings in Newfoundland, I think the people should be informed as to why it is being done and what the effect of it will be — separating their power assets from their timber limits or their mill. Everybody in this House, it seems to me, should be in a position to explain it to someone outside the House. If our constituents wants to know; what is going on about that Bill you brought in the other day, giving Bowaters certain rights and powers or conferring on them certain rights and powers — What are you doing there? — I could not tell them. It is beyond me to tell them what the purpose of this Bill is. From anything that I have heard from the lips of the Attorney General I would not be able to do it.

Reading it through, it seems to be passed exclusively for the benefit of Bowaters, and the public interests, as far as the benefits of this country are concerned, seem to be forgotten. In Section 2, for instance, or sub-section 2 of Section 3 — "While the power company is a subsidiary of the paper company or of the parent company of the

paper company, it is also entitled to the immunities and exemptions vested in the paper company by, under or in pursuance of the statutes or agreements recited in the Schedule to this Act." But, there is nothing about the duties nor obligations. Now should we assume that they stand or should they be inserted? Why put it in they should be entitled to all immunities and exemptions and not say they are liable to all duties and obligations?

Then in Section 4 there is a similar exemption: "Nothing in this Act shall limit, restrict or affect any rights or powers existing or arising otherwise than by virtue of this Act which the paper company or the power company or the trustees referred to in Section 3 may have or acquire in respect of any of the assets mentioned in sub-section (1) and (3) of that section, and in particular, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing the right to dispose of any such assets." There is nothing again about duties nor obligations. Does then this Act affect the duties and obligations, and if it does, why do you have to say "nothing limiting or restricting the rights and powers and omit to say nothing affecting the obligations and duties of this particular company?"

There is one other section, the last section, which deals with the Act, Section 11 of the Act 14, George V, Cap. 1. I must say I am at a loss to understand the meaning of this provision — "If the power company acquires from the paper company any of the assets mentioned in sub-sections (1) and (3) of Section 3 and undertakes to supply electric power to the paper company Section 11 of the Act 14, George V, Cap. 1 shall not apply to any power to be supplied to the paper company or users of power now served by that company or the succes-

sors and assigns of any of them." That is the new company which is going to take over the assets and sell electric power to the paper company. There was a provision that if the Government should ever electrify the railway, the company would be required to sell electric power to the railway for that purpose.

MR. CURTIS: It is a little more limited than that.

MR. BROWNE: I was just going to read it — Sale of Electric Power: In view of the possibility of hydro-electric power being required in future for operations by electricity of the Newfoundland Railway the company shall, prior to offering for sale to any persons any electric power developed by the company and not required by the company —

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no necessity to worry too much about that.

MR. BROWNE: No but I was wondering why it is put in. I cannot make any head nor tail to it. I would like to understand it before we are finished with the Bill because the sense of this particular section does not apply.

Well, Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate that there has been big development taking place in Corner Brook, and that there are other companies there willing and anxious to buy electricity, and there are great waterpowers and that sort of thing, I would like to understand exactly why this arrangement is being made at the present time, and why the Government does not take advantage of this opportunity to carry out the recommendation the other day of the Forestry Commission, that it should re-negotiate.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say one word on that too. That is the point worrying me. We all read that report of the Royal Commission in which they suggested re-negotiation of the agreement with this paper company if we are going to get anywhere in the future, and we all remember the accusations by certain members on the other side of the House, who almost hinted crimes had been committed by the legislature of the past when they gave this company such huge concessions, and gave them, as the word here very well describes it, immunities and exemptions from taxation. And the view was expressed on both sides of the House here just recently that we all regret very much that this company had been granted immunities and exemptions from taxation. I think everybody was more or less agreed, and I am quite sure that the Honourable the Premier was sure that the agreement should be re-negotiated so that this Legislature could get its tax clause in. Now here we come, and we are presented with an Act which confirms that, and also confirms the immunities and exemptions to the subsidiary of this company. In other words, if the paper company passes over its waterpowers to this power company they also pass over all immunities and exemptions from taxation. In other words it is almost compounding a felony, doing something we don't believe in. I am just wondering how the Honourable the Premier can square his ideas on the Report of the Royal Commission which we had a few days ago and this particular section. We are definitely saying here — "Yes, we know you are exempt from taxes and we are quite happy to pass that over to another private company. We are confirming it. We are not going to upset it." I would like to know if there is any reaction from

the opposite side on that. That is the only objection I have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, of course, had been presented to the Government before we got the Report of the Forestry Commission, and the Government had agreed to accept it, and had made the necessary arrangements to that effect. The same may apply to what my honourable friend has just said. Of course, it is the Government's intention to implement as far as possible any recommendation of the Royal Commission, which should prove to be fair, reasonable and workable. But the amending of a contract is a thing to be done by long negotiations. And in this case negotiations will have to be doubled. We are not going to negotiate one party but both parties, and the matter has to be approached very carefully and after a lot of consideration. I don't suppose many of us here have fully digested the Report of the Royal Commission of Forestry, and it is far too early to embark on a policy of adopting any recommendation they make, no matter how much they appeal at first sight. It must be remembered, when we came into office, Bowaters were paying no income taxes. Since Confederation they are paying very substantially, with money coming to us indirectly under the Tax Rental Agreement. And I feel quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that the country can be assured that this Government will do everything possible to protect the interests of the country, having regard to our obligations, obligations which we inherited, and which were given many, many years ago, and obligations which we must not and cannot view too lightly even though we may find them irksome. Mr. Speaker, there has been something said about this Bill. I quite appreciate the fact I might have

gone into a long dissertation and traced the development of this company from 1915 when it first started in as Newfoundland Products Company, not with the idea of manufacturing paper but with the idea of manufacturing calcium carbide or something like that. Anyway it was a far call from the programme of 1915 to the programme of 1923. But the whole effect of this Bill is simply to enable the Bowaters people to transfer one of their assets to a daughter company or a brother company, in other words, what is now owned by the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Limited will be owned in the future jointly by two of them. There is nothing really serious about the Act at all, Mr. Speaker. It is a normal business transaction which you hear of every day. It is just a distribution of assets.

MR. BROWNE: Not every day.

MR. CURTIS: Not quite as frequently as that, but every second day.

Now then my honourable friend, the learned and legal member for St. John's West suggested that there is no obligation being assumed by the power company. My honourable friend must know that one cannot sell what one has not got, and if there is any obligation attaching to any property these obligations pass on to the purchaser. And this clause does not say that any assets passed by the paper company to the power company shall be freed of any obligations. There is no such sentence here. All this Act does is to declare what I really think was not necessary to put in a formal Act at all. I think they had the right to assign these things, but this Act just confirms it, and it is necessary to have this Act to confirm it because of the magnitude of the value of the item involved. And because, I might say, I can tell the

House I have already intimated, it is the intention of the company to pay off all its debts, pay off Debenture "A" and Debenture "B" and general, and everything else. And it is the intention of the company, I believe, that these amounts shall be paid off by the power company. The power company can raise money very easily, can raise money without Government guarantee when there is a sale for their product. And in this case the power company will be able to borrow all the money necessary (1) to pay off all the obligations of the paper company and (2) have enough money left to develop the areas there and not now available.

Now my honourable friend is greatly worried about Section 4 of the Act. Section 4 is merely a provision, which my honourable friend would put in there if he were drafting the Bill, a proviso saying, nothing in this Act shall question the right of the company to transfer property to individual purchasers. What is the effect? The company is still accorded its right to sell pieces of land to employees who build houses, to sell pieces of land to commercial people who want to go in there. It is simply maintaining the present right of the company to alienate its land to purchasers for value.

As for Section 5, my honourable friend referred to that too.—It is a simple matter; under the company's charter, if any new power is developed, any excess has got to be offered for sale to the Newfoundland Railway. But now that these assets are owned by the power company, if it develops any assets it might be obliged to offer them first to the railway. This section simply states, if the power company develops power it should offer it first to the paper company and the manufacturer of paper and thereafter, be-

fore anybody else, they must offer it to the railway. It just simply puts the paper company in the position it now is, having first claim upon this water power. Now this Section 5, which my honourable friend states he has not had time to study, is a very simple one. The company does not have to offer the power to the railway until the paper company has said that it is not needed by them.

I might say that the power shortage there, Mr. Speaker, is very great, and they are anxious to get more power. I understand they recently planned to install a steam system to give them additional power temporarily. And obviously, if the power company develops more power it will look after its own baby first, baptize its own child first. And Section 5, which worried my honourable friend so much, is merely a clause saying the power company shall first offer its power to the paper company. With that, I am sure, my honourable friend will agree. We don't think there will be any possible objection to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I move the second reading.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Election Act."

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, this is purely a routine piece of legislation. There are two things which it proposes to carry out. First of all, because of the passage of the Redistribution Bill the other day, certain changes in the Election Act became necessary. When any Redistribution Act is brought in any of the following things may occur: The name of a district may be changed. A polling division may be completely assigned to a new

district, or a polling division may be split into two and part assigned to one district and part to another.

The substance of part of this Bill is contained, Mr. Speaker, in Section 5, which amends Section 25 of the principal Act, and Clause 5 sets out to take care of any of the events I have just mentioned, change of name in a district, assignment of a polling division entirely to a new district or being split into two by redistribution.

All the other clauses in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, are, what I would call, tidying up legislation. When the Act was being put in practice certain anomalies and discrepancies, clerical errors and the like came to light, and all the remaining sections set out to rectify these.

Section 2 of the Bill sets out to define the qualifications of electors. I might say, Mr. Speaker, this section stands in the parent Act. It was taken in its entirety from the Dominion Election Act. Now the Dominion Election Act and our Election Act set up two different systems entirely. In the Dominion Act the writ of election is issued and after the writ is issued the list of electors is taken. In our Act, as we know, a list of electors can be taken and is valid for a year after. Now, if you note here, the qualification of electors, is the full age of 21 on or before polling day. Now under the Federal system the writ is taken out and the list is set up. Under our system the date is an unrevealed mystery, and one has to have a crystal ball, and we have to amend the Act, so we merely delete "on or before polling day." An elector to be qualified, must be at the full age of 21 when the list is being taken out.

Sub-section (c) is similar—(c) has

been ordinarily resident in the province for twelve months immediately preceding the day of election. Delete "The date of issue of the writ." Sub-section 9 is the same.

MR. BROWNE: Making it now, twelve months preceding the election?

MR. MURRAY: Yes. Preceding the date of the election, an ordinary resident of the electoral district. Under the Federal system a man must be resident of an electoral district at the date of issue of the writ. As it stands now a man ordinarily resident in the electoral district on the day before polling day may vote in that district, as long as he is an ordinary resident. Of course the rule of residence applies later on.

Section 9 is the next one. This follows along the same principle. Every elector is entitled to have his name placed on the list of electors for the polling division in which he resides. Now this new section is to take care of our new system. Actually it means that a person may be put on the list of electors if eligible to vote at the time the list is taken up. In the parent Act it says: every elector must be a person 21 years of age, a British subject, twelve months in the Province and resident in the district. Now this is, any person if he would be qualified to vote, if polling day were to take place on that day, if he had all these qualifications and is 21, he may then be registered. I don't know if I make myself quite clear or not.

MR. BROWNE: If he is 21 at the time of the election, he does not go on when taking the list?

MR. MURRAY: If the enumerator is going around taking the list now and the man is twenty years of age and will be twenty-one in eleven

months he does not go on the list. If he is twenty-one now and fulfils, of course, all the other qualifications he does.

MR. HOLLETT: If he is twenty-one the day of the election, what about that?

MR. MURRAY: He goes on a supplementary list. That is taken care of later in the Act.

MR. MURRAY: Now 5 has already been dealt with. It has merely to do with redistribution. It empowers the compiling officer to make use of the material available. As we all know, at a great amount of expense, a list of electors has already been taken and is in the process of being printed. This is just to empower the compiling officer to use up the material he has and not to go to all the rigmarole of taking up a list again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Suppose we don't have an election this year?

MR. BROWNE: It is good for a year.

MR. MURRAY: And may be extended by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For more than a year? The election might not even be next year?

MR. MURRAY: It is laughable.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not funny—don't worry.

MR. MURRAY: Section 7—In the principal Act—In the principal Act the provision was that in order for persons to be officials at polling booths they had to be electors and on recommendation of the electoral officer. That has been changed. There are people like school teachers, non-resi-

dents of the districts, who would be under twenty-one or would not fulfil the other qualifications but yet might be very suitable for poll clerks. A school teacher might be 19 or 20, and on recommendation of the electoral officer the law is changed to make such a person eligible to act as an official poll clerk.

MR. HOLMERT: To act as a poll clerk, but can't vote?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, if otherwise qualified as an elector.

Clause 8: Except as otherwise provided etc. a person qualified to vote at an election whose name appears on the official list of electors for a polling station shall on polling day be permitted to vote at such polling station, if he is then resident in the polling division for which that polling station has been established. This amendment is to take care of classes of people who stay in their own electoral district but move from one polling division to another. Suppose a man, from the time the list is taken, moves from Bay Bulls to Fermuse, if resident in Fermuse at that time he votes in Fermuse rather than in Bay Bulls. That is the purpose of that. I have been informed by the draftsmen, that has been inserted principally for the purpose of clarification.

MR. BROWNE: What is being changed?

MR. MURRAY: Section 56 — a person whose name appears on the official list of electors be permitted to vote in that polling station except as otherwise provided. If he is then resident at the polling division. The difference is that residence becomes the qualification.

MR. BROWNE: What happens if his name is not on the voters list?

MR. MURRAY: He is sworn in and goes on the supplementary list.

MR. BROWNE: You said there, persons qualified to vote appear on the official list.

MR. HOLMERT: The man in Fermuse must swear he is a resident?

MR. MURRAY: If he is not on the official list of Fermuse, he takes an oath, yes. This section has also been amended by striking out in the main Act, sub-clause 4 and sub-clause 6 and then substituting the Roman V — That is sub-clause 4, sub-clause (IV) the Roman IV is stricken out. V becomes IV and 6 is stricken out.

Clause 9, Section 74 — In sub-clause 6 and 7 of Clause 8, Clause 7 creates an offense under the Act. These are indictable offenses and can be prosecuted under Section 118 of the Act. There are various penalties assigned for different degrees of offenses. So that subclause 7 here creates an offense for anybody to vote in more than one district and classifies the particular sort of offense it is. In Clause 9, by deleting the words "three" in paragraph 2 and substituting therefor the word "two" it means at least two witnesses instead of three witnesses. It was changed to two witnesses on recommendation of the compiling officer. In Clause 10, Section 78 is the next one. There are some deletions made. In Clause 11 there is the same thing again, the Act is changed, not from the date of the issue of the writ but immediately pending the election. Clause 12 is just a ratification of the Act.

I think, Mr. Speaker, actually these things could be more properly dealt with in Committee. I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Well, I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, if all these

amendments are necessary one year after the principal Act was passed, when we gave the matter very considerable consideration, how many amendments will be needed next year when we are rushing this through like we are rushing it through as we are every other piece of legislation, we cannot possibly give it proper attention.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education) : Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act." It is in three parts and is including for the first time the words "Secondary Education." At the present time all Boards of Education have power only to deal with elementary education, now they are including secondary education, in line with the Government's policy of Regional High Schools. That takes up the better part of the Bill.

The next part, Mr. Speaker, deals with requests that the Department of Education received from the Church of England asking them to have this Act changed. The present set-up of the Church of England is that they have two boards, one for colleges and one for schools. They want a complete board in the city of St. John's to deal with both types of education.

The other part, Mr. Speaker, is in connection with privately owned schools here in the city. At the present time there are three or four especially well-run private schools, and what the Department and Council of Education are more or less scared of is that too many of these private schools

would start in and around St. John's or in the province without any authority whatsoever. They can keep their eye on the few going now, because they know the persons in charge of those, but they have heard a number of rumours of new private schools starting in a short while, and want to make sure the persons in charge are proper people to take care of them. So they are asking that all these schools be registered with the Department and so prevent any ones the Department of Education would prefer not to have. We have good ones now.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that when the Minister replies he might be able to give us some idea what steps are being taken in regard to the annual worry over teachers. As the Honourable Minister knows, every year there is a shortage of teachers running up into many hundreds. A lot of money is being spent by the Government at the present time in many ways, but apparently there is not enough being spent on education to induce teachers in sufficient numbers to take care of the needs of the province. I believe the Minister of Finance today said something about the education of the province, and how people are inclined more towards education, and that that in itself was a sign of prosperity. Now I would suggest that more of the money that is being collected from the people might ordinarily be spent by way of education. I know that the Government is spending considerable sums now, but apparently they are not spending enough. I take this opportunity to make these remarks simply with the hope that the Honourable Minister might be able to give us some encouragement when he replies.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, what I would like to say about this Bill is what I would like to say about all these Bills; they are not being properly considered. This House of Assembly is a farce. Bills are brought in here and just rushed through here. I find a Bill last year, "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act," and one of the first things changed was Section 15A in its entirety, and here we got it again repealed and another 15A put in. Next year the same thing will be happening. How can you get any other state of affairs when you don't give proper consideration to the legislation? We ought to be able to sit down here for a day anyhow and discuss education, instead of rushing through in five or ten minutes. That is not giving proper consideration to such important issues, such as education. There is nobody in this House, including the Minister, knows what this is all about. We are expected to go through with it, all because the Premier is in such a hurry to get away to Ottawa so he may shine up there. Let him shine here, if he wants to shine. It is not good enough for him. But it is only a farce to expect to deal with a Bill like this, pushed on us today, and we are asked to give it second reading.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, may I take exception to certain remarks of the honourable gentleman. There is nothing particularly contentious about this Bill. For instance, the enlarged definition in Clauses A and B giving provision whereby Boards of Education can take care of secondary as well as elementary education. It is merely an enlargement of the Act on the original idea.

Section 21, for instance, allows for the setting up of Boards of Governors for the Church of England Colleges.

That is being deleted in order that the Board of Governors of the Church of England for colleges and elementary schools in the city may come together and form a joint board.

Most of the amendments in this amending legislation are tied up with this particular clause. Now the honourable and learned member referred to 15A. We put in, he says, an amendment last year. As a matter of fact this clause incorporated here in this amending Act is practically the same as that of last year, except for a redundancy in the drafting last year. Moneys voted by the Legislature, in the Act last year, or raised under any statute — personally I can't see the difference between voting by legislature and under the statute. So that is being applied to this particular clause.

The other provisions which my honourable colleague referred to become increasingly important. And I think the Education Department should take cognizance of private schools coming up, and be able to say whether they are properly run or not.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, it is my intention at the time of the estimates to go into details regarding teachers' salaries and other things pertaining to education.

As regards the honourable and learned member for St. John's West, personally I think his remarks were very rude. Besides that, Sir, there are a lot of people in this House very well acquainted with all parts of education, some of them much better than I, which I must admit. Nevertheless we are quite capable, and I am quite capable, with the people that I have working for me, Dr. Frecker and other officials of my department, of running that department. And I think the

honourable gentleman is just out of order.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion the House then recessed for ten minutes, after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting the Processing of Pothead and Minke Whales."

MR. SPEAKER: I wish the Honourable Minister would tell me how to pronounce the word "M-i-n-k-e."

DR. ROWE: Your Honour is in the same state as I find myself. I have always called it "Mink." It is a happy coincidence that it is called "Mink."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in introducing this Bill for second reading, I need only say that the mink industry, the development of this industry as the Government envisages it at the present time, is not dependent on the pothead whales, but at least it is closely interrelated with the pothead whale fishery. But pothead whales, I am referring particularly to Trinity Bay and Bonavista Bay, in fact, the east coast, because it is commonly known that many thousands of these mammals come around our coast every year. We propose to exert some control over these animals, once they are brought ashore. While they are in the water we do not propose to do so but when they come ashore, because of their intimate relationship with the mink industry, an industry in which this Government is investing very large sums of public money - This is an enabling Act.

Clause 5 states "The Lieutenant Governor in Council may issue or renew a licence to any person to establish or operate a plant for, or to engage

in, the processing of pothead or minke whales in Newfoundland and may attach conditions to the licence, and sub-clause 3: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may cancel or revoke or refuse to issue or renew a licence without assigning any reason for the cancellation, revocation or refusal. The licence is in three categories: (1) the operation of the plant (2) the processing of the whales and (3) the sale of products of the plant.

I feel certain that everybody in the House will appreciate the need for such legislation at the present time, and accordingly, I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, I have no wish to delay the House, but I might offer a suggestion which I think might be acceptable to the Honourable Minister in charge of the Bill. I was going to suggest that in Clause 5 the word "slaughter" might be inserted, and a licence be issued governing the slaughtering and processing of the whales. I am doing this, Sir, because during the past week or so I have been receiving a lot of correspondence from the SPCA. There has been a film brought out recently, I understand, dealing with the seal fishery. I don't think it gives us very favourable publicity, and the release made by Dr. Cunningham on his return from the seal fishery brought the whole matter to light. I was in attendance at a squadron dinner and there saw the picture, and it did receive a lot of adverse comment, not in the interest of Newfoundland. I know the seal fishery is carried on outside territorial waters. As I say, the whole subject is giving adverse publicity at the present time, and is causing some people, apparently, real distress. And it is my suggestion we

do something to bring ourselves in line with civilized institutions.

MR. SPEAKER: That matter might be more properly taken up in Committee of the Whole.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister who introduced this Bill thought that everybody in this House ought to see this is a perfect Bill. I must say I am very much against certain principles in the Bill—in Clause 4 where no person shall establish nor operate a plant for or engage in the processing of pothead or minke whales, etc. Now in my opinion, Sir, that is just an attempt on the part of some person or persons to secure a monopoly with regard to these pothead whales.

The position now is that the Government have brought in a dozen or more, Western Canadians, I call them, I suppose some of them were born in Canada, or maybe elsewhere, but Canadians, brought in by the Government and some minke came in with them. And some way or another they have been informed they are likely to get meat at very cheap rates. I have heard the figure of 2c. a pound. They have already been loaned some two hundred and some odd thousand dollars, I believe, and as I think, this is an attempt, particularly this section here is an attempt to create a monopoly whereby some person or persons may be able to, well not monopolize the whole business of pothead and minke whales, but it is going to make a man who catches a minke whale or a pothead, have a licence before he can do that. Why don't you make every fellow who catches a codfish or a caplin get a licence before he catches these fish? They are in the sea. Any person can get them outside the three mile limit, I am sure.

Certainly there is no point in getting them if you can't process them, you have to have a plant. And I think any Newfoundlander who is satisfied to put up a plant and catch minke or pothead whales ought to be allowed to process them without having to be turned down by some official of the Department of Mines and Resources. Definitely, Sir, it is an attempt there, I believe, to set up a monopoly with regard to these whales. Certainly I am not in favour of that particular section which would allow that. "And the Lieutenant Governor in Council may issue a renewal licence to any person to establish or operate a plant or engage in the processing of minke whales, etc." In other words, going to sell products to people who have minke, and can't sell anywhere else. That is what is going to happen. And I certainly don't think this House should tolerate setting up monopolies with regard to minke whales nor pothead whales nor any other kind of fishes in the sea. If the Honourable Minister can show me why a monopoly should be set up like this, then, of course, I might see some reason in it. But it certainly does not seem correct to do this thing now. Why cannot every man in this House, if he wants to, set up a plant to process minke whales? What is to prevent any Newfoundlander setting up a plant around the coast?

MR. SMALLWOOD: This Bill, when it becomes law.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't get the point. Any official, under this Act, of the Department of Mines and Resources, can stop me or you or anybody in this House or anywhere in this country—I have to be granted a licence by the Department of Mines and Resources or by the Lieutenant

Governor in Council, as the case may be, and certain conditions will be set up, and I have to conform to these conditions. And the conditions which will be set up will be so impossible that I would not be able to operate a plant economically anyway. The whole idea of this, Sir, in my opinion, is to grant a monopoly to the directors of Trinity Mink Limited, and possibly Mr. Russell, down somewhere in Bonavista Bay. I make that statement now, and time will tell whether I am right or not. I am against that particular part of the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in expressing my own personal dislike for the provisions in this Bill which gives power to the Governor in Council to issue a licence. That means to say, that every person or any person who wishes to operate a plant or manufacture whales, minke or podhead whales, must get a licence from the Government.

Then later on in the Bill there is provision for regulations being made. But these regulations are apart altogether from the issuing of licences. And it seems to me, unless the Government intends to issue a monopoly they should, in cases like this, give the Lieutenant Governor in Council, power to make regulations concerning the issuing of licences for the various matters to which they refer. Then you would have general regulations covering the whole thing. But, under this Bill they can issue a licence to John Jones and refuse one to John Smith who comes along with just as good a case as John Jones, if you don't like the colour of his hair or his politics, you can refuse him a licence, and not only that, can cancel the licence and don't have to give any

reason for doing so. It seems to me that is bad legislation. The Bill must contain a provision so that everyone who wants to look for a licence will know what to do in order to apply, and what he will have to do in order to qualify for a licence to be issued him. That is not so under this provision here. And I think it ought to be so. Unless that is changed we got to vote against it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has discovered another mare's nest, a monopoly. Where the Bill provides for any monopoly is more than I have been able to see, I have looked over the Bill, considered it, thought about it, discussed it over a period of weeks, and I see nothing in it about a monopoly. It is merely—No one shall process whales without a licence. Now you can't sell ice cream without a licence, can't run a restaurant without a licence, can't sell insurance without a licence, can't practice law without a licence, can't practice medicine without a licence, can't be a plumber without a licence.

MR. HOLLETT: And can't catch trout without a licence.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, can't catch trout without a licence. But it is extraordinary, a most astounding scandal, sinister, it is a deep dark plot because we say you must not process whales without a licence. That is exactly what we say.

MR. BROWNE: No, you don't say that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is exactly the purpose of the Bill, to provide for licensing. That is the purpose of the Bill, to provide for a system of licensing or withholding of licensing.

MR. BROWNE: No it is not a system. There is nothing systematic.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It provides for a system of licencing or withholding licences for the operation of a plant in which pothead whales will be processed. Now at the moment we cannot prevent it if Americans came in tomorrow and wished to open up plants and take pothead whales and process them and ship every pound to the United States. The Newfoundland Government can't say no. But after this Bill is legislation it gives us complete control over it, and we intend to exercise this control. That is why we ask this House to pass this sinister Bill, this dark plot against the liberties of the people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

On motion Bill read a second time — (Mr. Hollett voted "Nay") — ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, there are just two small amendments to this particular measure. One enables the Water and Sewerage Corporation to pay a gratuity to their chairman, if they wish to do so. The other one merely gives power to levy a tax on vacant land, provided the vacant land is within two hundred feet of their main. I move the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: I believe I did see something there I wanted to refer to, Mr. Speaker. Every owner of vacant land the nearest boundary of which is situated within two hundred feet of the pipes of the water system or the pipes of the sewerage system, shall,

whether or not such land is used for any purpose or is connected with either of those systems, be liable for water rates and assessments and sewerage rates and assessments. Now I do not know why that need be so. If a person comes within two hundred feet of the water pipes and is vacant land, not occupied by any person, he should have to pay rates. And how are you going to assess the rates? These are questions I would like the Honourable Minister to say something about when he replies. It seems to me rather strange that because a person has a piece of land two hundred feet away from a water pipe, which has no connection with it in any way, but which may possibly go into somebody else's land, but why that other person whose land is two hundred feet away has got to pay water rates — Unless the Minister can show me some reason why, then of course, I am certainly against that, and I think we are all on this side of the House. We may be wrong, but at first flush I feel that principle is wrong. How can you take a man two hundred feet away from you, with no connection whatsoever with you — It is true the council has to look after the water and see the water is pure and all that sort of thing, but surely, if my land is two hundred feet away from the water pipes or from the water reservoir I don't see where they have the right to tax me. Of course you are going to make the right here. Is it an attempt to make him sell his land to somebody or to get him into the town council area or what? I hope the Minister will be able to satisfy my mind on that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me there is something in what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said, in fact a good deal. Suppose there is a piece of land 75 ft. in depth and immediately behind that

piece of land there is another piece of land 85 ft. in depth, and the third piece of land is not very wide, say less than 50 ft. wide. Then the third piece of land would be two hundred feet from the water pipes and liable for assessment, according to this, although it is easily seen one would have to go through two other parties, land in order to reach it with water pipes and would make it very difficult to bring water and sewerage there, make it practically impossible to do it. It would seem to me that land that is fronting on a street where water and sewerage go through certainly would be liable. But I can hardly see that land that is to the rear of land that is adjoining water and sewerage should be liable to assessment. I think that needs a little careful study before it gets to Committee.

MR. HEFFERTON: I am not able to answer the question. It was put up by the Board of Assessment, Water and Sewerage, in Corner Brook for us. And I believe similar provisions are contained in the St. John's Act now, or one very similar to it.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think.

MR. HEFFERTON: We can bring that up in Committee.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, this particular measure is merely an addition to the Local Authority Guarantee Act. Under the provision as made, the town of Fortuna may raise further bond issues of \$60,000 in order to extend the sewerage and water system of that town. And provision is

made for the town of Placentia, \$60,000 bond issue and Jerseyside \$85,000 bond issue in order to carry out replacement of existing water systems and extension of water particularly in the Jerseyside, and for a chlorination plant to take care of all water feeding the two towns.

I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Is this the Bill to which the Premier referred, to make provision for compensation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't need a Bill for that.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to Agreement Dated the Twenty-First Day of May 1953, and the Third Day of July 1954 respectively."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, when the BRINCO Bill was passed in this House a couple of years ago it established in connection with the concessions given to BRINCO a principle of which we were quite proud and of which we are still quite proud, that is, what we came, after some discussion, to call the "Shedding Principle." That is to say, we gave to BRINCO certain areas of land in Labrador and other areas in Newfoundland, and we said: at the end of every period (these periods laid down in the agreement) you shall shed so many miles of your land in Labrador and so many miles of your area in Newfoundland, and eventually, at the expiration of the agreement, you will be left with only

those portions of land in Labrador and in Newfoundland that you are actually working. — At the end of it — I think that is twenty years. — Now, we were proud of that for this reason: It seems to us to create for them a very powerful incentive to search for minerals. That before shedding at the end of each period as provided, thousands of miles of territory, they would scour that territory in search for minerals so that they would not find after shedding a piece of land that somebody else went in and made a big strike or discovery. Therefore, we were creating a very powerful incentive for them to search and spend money.

But when we did we overdid it. We created too strong an incentive in BRINCO to examine the areas which they proposed to shed. Indeed we imposed on them so powerful an incentive to examine the areas they were about to shed as to create the position in which they were rather neglecting the areas which they were not proposing to shed. In other words, Mr. Speaker, insofar as mineral exploration is concerned from the passing of the BRINCO Act to the present time all of the emphasis has been not on the areas where they confidently expected or expected with great confidence to find minerals but rather on the areas which they had earmarked for rejection.

Now last year they spent one million eight hundred thousand dollars in Newfoundland. Of that, one and a quarter million was spent in the survey of the Hamilton River Watershed, which left half a million dollars which they spent on the mineral survey. And I regret tonight to say that most, not all, but most of what they spent, most of that half million on mineral surveys was spent surveying and making reconnaissance investigations of the areas

that they had earmarked for shedding. Now there is a limit to the amount of money they can get annually from their shareholders. For instance in this current calendar year the expenditure is to be (I speak from memory) \$1,500,000 — in this current year. Of that sum a very considerable amount will of course be spent in the further and perhaps final phase of their survey of the Hamilton River Watershed — let us say it is three-quarters of a million, which I think perhaps it will be. That would leave approximately half a million dollars that they would spend in this year again on mineral surveys. But if again this year they spend that money to make surveys of the areas they intend to reject — it may be sound from their standpoint — in fact I am convinced that it is the sound thing for them to do — but, is it sound from the standpoint of Newfoundland and the advancement of Newfoundland in the field of geology, in the field of minerals? We think not. Therefore we ask the House to give us the authority to change the agreement advancing from the end, I think of this year, to the end of 1958 the time within which they must shed so many thousand square miles, I think it is to be found in the preamble "A" on page 2 "Pursuant to the terms of the Agreement the Corporation has exercised its option under Clause 3 of the said Principal Agreement as amended by the First Supplemental Agreement and

B. Pursuant to Clause 5 (1) and (2) of the Principal Agreement, the Corporation has to surrender certain areas of the 31st day of December 1955 and the 31st of December 1958.

C. It has been agreed between the parties hereto that it would be to the benefit of all parties if the Corporation were relieved of its obligation to surrender any of the said areas on or

before the 31st day of December 1955 and that the first surrender date be the 31st day of December 1958, and that the Principal Agreement be amended in manner hereinafter appearing.'

Now that is the principle, that BRINCO be relieved of the necessity of shedding areas, which they are now obliged to shed, before the end of 1958. We say that is in the interest of Newfoundland. We would rather see them spend money this year and the next year and the year after on the areas which are likely to contain minerals and not on the areas which are less likely to contain them. Yet, while they are under the obligation to shed this land by the end of this year they will inevitably spend the money examining these areas which they intend to reject.

Now I had a very good example of that cited to me: Jules Timmins said, when they were building the railway down through from Seven Islands to Knob Lake, he pointed out, as the railway was a common carrier any prospector or surveyor might use the railway, they were building at the cost of a quarter of a billion dollars, as a means of getting down to survey both sides of the railway. He said, how silly they would feel and look, if after going to that enormous expense, somebody used it as soon as it was built, going down and prospecting on both sides of the railway, and here would be this mighty company having gone to this great expense and right under their very nose somebody else had stepped in and found minerals. So that that would not happen they themselves, knowing they were going to give up that land from the mineral standpoint for so many miles each side of the railway, knowing they were going to shed that land, that they were in-

der obligation to shed that land, they put on a special survey to see if it could find minerals running along both sides of the right-of-way of the railway. Well similarly with BRINCO, they did last year and will again this year devote most of their time and will again next year, 1956, and again in 1957 and again in 1958 and to the end of 1958 they will have devoted most of their energies, under the heading of minerals, to searching in the areas where they don't expect to find minerals and which they do expect to shed, and yet which they don't feel like shedding without having a look. Now we think on this side of the House that it is in Newfoundland's interest to have BRINCO revise their policy, which they cannot do unless we relieve them of the necessity presently existing under the agreement as it is to shed a large area by the end of this present calendar year.

I move the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I think by now the Government must have seen their mistake in granting to BRINCO such huge areas as they did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, we don't.

MR. HOLLETT: And I should think the Government ought to take warning and have somebody examine the heads of directors of BRINCO, since they decided to spend money, a million and a half last year, on examining these parts where they were sure there was no minerals, neglecting these areas where they felt pretty certain there was. It looks to me as we are up against a pretty sad proposition in BRINCO, who want minerals that is what they are here for. They are looking for minerals, but they have about fifty or sixty thousand square

miles to go over. They know there is mineral in this area up there, but they decide, we will spend money here now. That is the most ridiculous statement I ever heard from anyone much less the Premier of this Province. I think it is ridiculous, silly. And if that is the attitude of BRINCO, as expressed by the Premier a moment ago, then I have not much faith in BRINCO. Can you imagine a corporation of that size spending their money somewhere where they don't expect to get anything and leaving the mineralized area where they know there is some mineral, leaving it alone, not touching it, and going in where they don't expect to find mineral so they can keep someone else from doing it? I say the Government made a mess of things when they gave BRINCO fifty or sixty thousand square miles and gave them a certain amount of time. On the face of it, BRINCO must be mad, and to take that and decide to shed each year so much. What they can do in one year God only knows. I think they scarcely got down there the first year. Then I think last year we passed an Act whereby the time was extended. I believe we did, and it was extended last year. Now we are asked to extend the time again. And the Honourable the Premier hopes it is going to reverse their policy, and they will go in and get something or another. I hope they do. I don't think there is anything to stop this, but we are against large concessions to corporations even though they have great big names behind them and all sorts of people. Why are they doing it? They know where all the mineralized areas are. They are keeping everybody else out. By the way what happened to NALCO, Mr. Speaker, it is not mentioned in this Bill at all is it? That is funny.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Bank of England is not either nor the United Nations.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: I wish I would not be interrupted.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has strayed from the subject.

MR. HOLLETT: Both companies, Mr. Speaker, are interested in the same sort of thing. I realize I am off the track a little on NALCO. I really had some hopes of BRINCO when I saw the list of firms or corporations which made up BRINCO, big names like N. M. Rothschild and so on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hopes are all gone now though.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes. My hopes are absolutely gone at the moment. When I think of firms like that forgetting altogether the areas of which they feel pretty certain, and not bothering about examining them at all, but going into areas where they don't expect to find anything and spending half a million dollars. I say they are cracked, and the Honourable the Premier can pass that on for me if he wants to. If his statement is correct, they have neglected the areas where they expected to find minerals and have gone over the areas where they did not expect to find any. Then I say, there is something wrong with Rothschild or something wrong with us. I am not against it at all. I think they are the proper people to have it. They will hold on to these mineral areas until they see a chance to make a few dollars. I dare say that is what they want to do. I am not blaming them for that, but I am very doubtful if it is in the best interest of Newfoundland. In these agreements the

welfare of Newfoundland was not taken to heart as much as it should have been when some of these agreements were made up. I am not blaming the Premier nor the Government, I have not gotten around to blaming anybody yet. But I think a little more care should be attached to the alienation of resources of this country and the territory of this country. It is all gone now—in the hands of two firms—all that was left.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot go into the details of this Bill because I cannot understand it. The original agreement which I have here, 1953, gave to this corporation an option exercisable any time before the 31st of March, 1954, to take exploration leases from the Government on terms hereinafter set out, on any land or water not exceeding fifty thousand square miles, in those parts of Labrador which were coloured red, and ten thousand square miles in those parts of Newfoundland which were coloured blue. In other words, that was an option to take an exploration lease of fifty thousand in Labrador and ten thousand square miles in Newfoundland before the 31st of March 1954. Last year we extended that until the 31st of December by this agreement in 1954. And here in this Bill it is assumed that the option had been exercised, yet we are going to give them a further extension to 1958.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have turned back a lot already. Last year they turned back a lot.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps the Minister can explain it.

DR. ROWE: I can say this, the honourable gentleman is talking about two different things. Mr. Speaker, one

the exercising of the option and the other the shedding principle.

MR. BROWNE: Well the agreement said they have the right—the Government grants the Corporation an option exercisable on or before the 31 March 1954 to take exploration rights from the Government on terms hereinafter set out, of any land or water not exceeding fifty thousand square miles.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before that happened they were given more than that from which to make their selection. There is fifty and ten, then the selection having been made the shedding principle would begin. The shedding principle is shedding from the fifty and ten.

MR. BROWNE: This is the first agreement made in 1953, and the only thing I can see here is fifty thousand square miles of Labrador and ten thousand square miles of Newfoundland. Well, if the Premier says they were given a greater area.—

MR. SMALLWOOD: They were given all the unalienated areas of land from which to select their fifty and their ten. In any case the statute provided for that.

MR. BROWNE: I cannot see it here. Anyway they got the right not to surrender any land before the 31st of December 1954, according to the Act passed last year. They had to exercise their right by the 31st of December 1954.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was extended to 1955.

MR. BROWNE: By what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: By statute.

MR. BROWNE: The Governor in Council must have passed a statute

themselves without bringing it to the House of Assembly. Here is the 1954 Act we passed last year, which extended it to the end of 1954.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: I have the statute here. I don't know whether the purpose of this is to extend it to 1955. I could understand that. But this seems to assume—It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, this big corporation—I don't know why it is the Premier has such faith in big corporations, perhaps because he likes to see big corporations. But they are like a dog in the manger, with fifty thousand square miles tied up in Labrador and ten thousand square miles tied up in Newfoundland and nobody else can go in. Personally I think it is a very bad policy, and I am opposed to it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, has not the Premier already spoken on this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: He moved the second reading, yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The company, Mr. Speaker, had an area of about eighty thousand square miles out of which they were given the right to make a selection—or they had an area of more than that, a hundred thousand square miles out of which they were given the right in the statute to select sixty thousand, fifty in Labrador and ten in Newfoundland. And that was to have been done by a certain date, which date was amended last year, by the way, to become the end of 1954. That was done by statute in the last session of the House. But in the original agreement it was provided that out of that area which they would finally select, of fifty and

ten thousand square miles, they would by the end of 1955, that is this year, shed so many. That is the law as it stands at the moment.

The purpose of this is to say, while you are under obligation to shed those miles by the end of 1955 and again by the end of 1958 shed still some more, the purpose of this legislation is to say: you need not shed it until 1958. That is all there is to it.

I took due note of what my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition said about BRINCO. On first thought I was going to assure him that I was going to pass his message on to BRINCO that he take a very dim view of them and does not think much of their intelligence in view of their policy—My statement was that they had concentrated their efforts to do, under the heading of minerals, to survey the areas that they think they would have to shed. On my statement of the description of their policy the honourable gentleman tells how little he thinks of their sense, their intelligence and their policy. And I was going to pass that on to them. But on second thought I shall not pass that on to them, because I don't want to discourage them. I would not want Rolltschild and the English Electric Company and all of the other twenty-four great British Corporations to become discouraged. I don't want to take any chances on that. Because the honourable gentleman is a Newfoundlander, his opinion on their policy is bound to be sounder than their own opinion.

MR. HOLLET: Any Newfoundlander's opinion of Newfoundland is bound to be better than anyone else's opinion of Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I won't pass the information on. I don't want to discourage them. I am afraid where

they spent one million eight hundred thousand dollars last year and will spend probably one and a half million this year and the next year, if they hear the Leader of the Opposition in Newfoundland takes a dim view of it, they may change their minds, they may get discouraged, they may lose interest in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. So I shall not. I shall not only not send the word on to them, but I shall hope that they will not tune in over there in London to our local stations.

MR. MURRAY: It might put Rothschild out of business.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh yes, they might fold up. So I shall not pass the word along to them, but I do repeat my motion for second reading of this Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend Stamp Act:"

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, this is a very minor Bill, which needs no explanation. The object of the Bill is to provide all fees payable under the District Courts Act, the Bill of Sale Act and the Conditional Sales Act be paid by stamps. Obviously the Registry of Deeds does not want to handle any money. And it provides that these items are paid in stamps. I move the second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Judicature Act:"

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the second reading of this Bill, which is an amendment to

Amend the Judicature Act. The amendment is a very simple one. The present Act provides, Mr. Speaker in Section 56 that there shall be a sub-sheriff who shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The object of the present Bill is to enable the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to appoint a second sub-sheriff or perhaps more, to appoint additional sub-sheriffs, one definitely in Corner Brook and one possibly in Grand Falls or in any other section where one of the district courts may operate.

There is no provision at the moment. We have a deputy-sheriff at Corner Brook, but he is so far away from St. John's we deem it advisable to have a sub-sheriff there instead.

The other item of the Bill deals purely with distribution of the fees paid for the taking of jury lists. At the present time the amount voted is, I think, ten cents a name, and the amount is equally divided between the police who take the list and the magistrate who checks the list. We feel that the amount that the magistrate is receiving is out of all proportion to what is fair. Therefore we are proposing that we pay to the police, who take the list, eight cents of the ten cents and have the magistrate receive two cents for checking the list. Magistrates now are well paid, and we find that the small payment of four or five cents now being paid the police is not enough incentive, particularly now since this work is not done by the R.O.M.P., but we must engage special enumerators to take the lists.

I move the second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is the best judge of how many officials are necessary to carry out the duties formerly done by

the sheriff and his assistant bailiff. He knows that at the present time there are two bailiffs in St. John's. There is a sheriff and two bailiffs who perform their duties admirably. Some people may not like them — but I think the legal profession is satisfied, especially with one of them. Now the intention is to appoint a person outside of St. John's to perform similar duties. This means that there are going to be two new officials appointed as sub-sheriffs, a sub-sheriff in St. John's and a sub-sheriff in Corner Brook.

MR. CURTIS: I think there is a sub-sheriff in St. John's, a most worthy sub-sheriff.

MR. BROWNE: I was not aware of that. I take it there is to be another one appointed in St. John's.

MR. CURTIS: No, only one more.

MR. BROWNE: On the other section, dealing with the payment of magistrates for taking the jury lists. Well, surely the Attorney General must realize that if he is going to take away some of his remuneration that he is entitled to, he is entitled to consideration for that. It has been held so in the Supreme Court in a decision many years ago when the judge of the Central District Court brought action against the Government. Of course, the Government may settle it by legislation, but two cents may not be sufficient to compensate the magistrate for the time he has to spend and the trouble that he has to take in regard to these names. Even the Attorney General, I think, ought to give some little attention to the inducement he may be given to perform these duties.

MR. CURTIS: In reply to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, I may say, we did give the magistrates last year very, very substantial increases. And

I think the increases which we have given them and the way in which we have treated them would much more than compensate them for any small loss they might sustain by reason of this legislation.

I move the second reading, Mr. Speaker.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Public Works Act."

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill was presented recently, and it has been passed around, distributed, so that practically everybody is familiar with it.

There are just three or four small items of amendments in connection with this Public Works Act. The first three or four of any consequence whatsoever are actually existing to-day, but they are put into that amendment 22 "A", "B" and "C", "D", "E" and "F" of the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Public Works Act, Chapter 15" and are identical with existing legislation contained in the Industries Act, Chapter 246 of the Revised Statutes, 1952.

Section 50 (1), (2) and (3)—these too are identical, but Section 2 of that particular clause is new. As the law stands at the present time the magistrate may impose a penalty for breach of regulations made under the section but there is no power to order removal of the offending structure. Without that power the law is ineffective. The addition of sub-section (2) is in accord with similar provisions contained in Section 32 of the Act.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that honourable members will observe that there is very little of a contentious nature in this Bill. In fact I don't think there is anything contentious in this Bill.

I move the second reading, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the Honourable Minister that there is nothing contentious in this Bill. I think there is. He says that the provisions to which he refers are already in the Industries Act, but I do not know what the Industries Act has to do with Public Works. The Industries Acts are very, very minor affairs compared with the Public Works Act. The Public Works Act enables the Minister to go all along the highroad throughout the length and breadth of Newfoundland and Labrador and enables the Public Works to say put back your fence. I want you to put it back now so and so a hundred feet or fifty feet or sixty feet, any distance he likes. And the Minister tells me that is similar to the Industries Acts. Well we have fifteen industries which apply to fifteen localities for a distance of perhaps fifty feet around the various plants, and to compare that to this one that gives many thousands of miles upon which the Minister has the power to do these things, I don't think there is any comparison at all. These are very wide powers which have been given to the Minister.

Now the first provision to which he referred deals with the question of expropriation of land. The Minister goes along to some settlement, Torbay, Flat Rock, Trepassey, Seldom-Come-By, Joc Batts Arm, any district represented by members on the other side, comes to Humber where a man

has carved a little estate for himself out of the forest, chopped down the trees, drained the place, ditched it, practically built up the place and made a garden and put up a fence, and the Minister comes along and says, put back your fence. Now I know of a very serious thing that happened down in Salmonier a couple of years ago. The RCMP came along to a blind man, Mr. Hurley, down near the bridge, Hurley's Bridge, and said, "You got to move back your fence." He said: "I got my potatoes set there now." "Well," he was told, "what time you dig your potatoes or not, you have that back by the 16th of October. So the poor old man, he could not do it himself, but he got his nephew to move back the fence on the 16 of October. So that, when the RCMP came back, the fence was moved back. Now, Sir, you can go along there and see the fences as you go along, all in a straight line. The Minister of Finance knows what I am talking about. They are all in a straight line until you come to blind man Hurley's, and that goes back. That is the only one moved. This poor old blind man about 90 years of age, on his last legs, I think he is in the hospital now somewhere, dying with cancer. That was the only place moved in that particular area. In any case, the Minister has the authority to move people's fences back. Now, then, when it comes to the question of compensation, there is nothing in this original Act which requires him to pay compensation, until the man comes along and proves his title to the satisfaction of the Minister. Now I can assure honourable members of this House, they have had no experience with Ministers, they are very hard men to convince you own any land. It has to be proved to the satisfaction of the Minister that their title is good.

Now there are such things as possession titles. I don't know what the view of the Minister is on it himself. But people who have land for a certain length of time, after twenty years, have good title against anybody else, as far as the Crown is concerned after 60 years, it is a good title. I don't think the Minister would recognize that. So that we are in a very difficult position. The Minister goes in and takes a piece of land, puts pegs along through the land, and says, I am going to take this now. Now there is a piece of controversy at the present time, where mining officials have served notice of expropriation and the procedure is held up under the Act until this thing passes. It is not going ahead, nothing is being done until notice of appropriation has been received. The law naturally cannot be carried out until this Bill is passed and becomes law, then this governs it. Then the man in possession of the land, and who to all intents and purposes is the owner, must come along to the Minister and produce his title. If the Minister is not satisfied he won't pay for any compensation.

Then there is a further provision in this Bill: that, the Minister, if he is not satisfied with the title may pay, or if the owner is absent from the country he may take the land of the valid owner and place it in the hands of the registrar of the Supreme Court, what he considered, or what the Board of Assessors think is the value of the land. Then if that is not claimed within three years—within three years, Mr. Speaker—the money reverts to the Crown. Well now, the ordinary statute of limitations in regard to land is twenty years, and here you are going to alter the statutory law which gives a person twenty years in which to bring an action. That per-

son, if he happens to be absent three years is out of luck. He cannot bring any action against the Crown, and his rights in regard to his land will have vanished, and ordinary law will have been abrogated in that particular.

MR. SPENCER: The honourable member is aware, that is only where a person cannot be found.

MR. BROWNE: Of course sometimes it is very difficult to find people. Only a couple of years ago, down in Torbay the Minister's officials went around and took a big slice of the land, paid no attention to anybody. The owner, the person directly concerned, could not be found. I won't say he could not be found, several people were entitled to it. The man whose rights were probably the strongest had just died in Boston, so the next-of-kin became entitled to it. The solicitor for his estate had to write to the Minister. No attention was paid to any representation he made. The land was taken. Just the same nobody paid any attention. It must be recognized that land is a very important thing. I have met in this country men who died for their land. I had a gentleman come to me the other day and charged that the Department of Public Works was going right through his land, and he said to me: I will shove them off. I have put them off and told them they can't come here. When the railway went through they were given compensation of eighteenth hundred dollars, forty years ago. When building the Bonavista branch the railway went through his land and he was paid eighteen hundred dollars. Now I am quite sure the Minister has no idea of paying eighteen hundred dollars to-day, but expects to get away with very much less.

MR. SPENCER: Every piece of land taken is compensated for, according to a standard rate.

MR. BROWNE: I don't know if there can be a standard rate. There is supposed to be a Board of Assessors appointed by the Government, two members appointed by the Government and one by the person owning the land. Well now it is weighed against the owner. Perhaps the Minister is right when he says there is a rate already set before the Board of Assessors begin to consider the situation.

MR. SPENCER: No assessor has the first right to settle the value.

MR. BROWNE: I think I have said enough to show the Bill is not quite so simple as the Minister would have us believe.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Opposition voted against the Bill).

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow Tuesday at 11:00 a.m. of the clock.

On motion the House then adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday at 11:00 a.m. of the clock.

MORNING SESSION

TUESDAY, April 19, 1955.

The House met at eleven of the clock in the morning, pursuant to adjournment.

Presenting Petitions

MR. S. DROVER: Mr. Speaker, I

beg to present a petition from the people of Williamsport, Bear Cove and Coney Arm in White Bay. This is a follow up to the many petitions which have been presented to this House for better medical facilities in the southern part of the district, i.e., that the St. Anthony Hospital and the Grenfell Mission be placed under the cottage hospital scheme.

I have much pleasure in presenting this petition, Sir, and give it my support. I ask that it be tabled in the House and forwarded to the department concerned for consideration.

On motion petition tabled for reference to the Department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Giving Notice of Motion

HON. G. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in respect to an increase in tax on gasoline.

I also give notice I will on tomorrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in regard to raising a loan on the credit of the Province.

Notice of Questions

(46) MR. W. J. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Attorney General to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the amounts, if any, paid to lawyers by the various Departments of the Government, including Boards appointed by the Government, giving the amounts and dates of payment and names of matters for which payment has been made, and

names of lawyers or firm of lawyers to whom payment has been made since Jan. 1, 1954.

Answers to Questions

Question No. 41: In course of preparation.

Question No. 42:

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the first part of that question asks for the names and positions and present salaries of all persons employed in that Department with the date of appointment and titles or other qualifications of persons so employed in the case of all those receiving \$3000.00 or more annual salary.

There are only two, the Deputy Minister, Mr. Short, and the Director General, Mr. Pushie. Mr. Short was appointed just after Confederation in 1949. Mr. Pushie was appointed following the resignation of Dr. Valdimanis. The salaries are as seen in the estimates.

Part (2). That has already been done years ago.

Part (3) and (4). As these are questions bearing on private companies they are not proper to answer here in the House.

Question No. 43: In course of preparation.

Question No. 44: In course of preparation.

Question No. 45: In course of preparation.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): That question is in the process of preparation, but I am afraid it is going to be difficult to answer as asked there. The honour-

able gentleman asks for the lists broken down. The loans are in three categories, and very seldom have any loans that have been paid, I understand, been broken down. I have asked the Department to prepare a list of all the loans given out, showing the name of the person, the amount and date; and that answer will be available to me and therefore to the House later today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Any answers to any other questions?

MR. SMALLWOOD: On the Order Paper of March 31, Question No. 25, as asked by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West:

- (a) has already been answered.
- (b) officials of the Department of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa, orally.
- (c) all of the industries except the birch plant and Eckhardt Mills in Briggs; Terra Nova Textiles — they were erected by him. The Rubber Company was also by him — all except the three I mentioned.
- (d) there was no correspondence. The answer is none. Any correspondence would be between him and the officials of NALCO. He might have dropped me a personal note, as he frequently did, but there is nothing official about that.

MR. BROWNE: There is one part of the question the Honourable Minister did not answer — When did Dr. Valdimanis cease to take an active interest in the work of the Department?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are two answers to that — Officially on his resignation as Director General.

MR. BROWNE: Actually when he went into NALCO.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. No. He was in both at one time, Chairman or President, I forget which, without salary, and Director General of Economic Development under salary. He was both at one time. Then he resigned his position as Director General and continued his office but under salary in NALCO. That, I think went into effect the 1st. of January or February — it was the beginning of the year, and I think it would be the year before last. I can get the actual date. I am speaking now from memory. But the fact of the matter is, after he had ceased to be Director General of Economic Development he continued for a while to show some interest, because he was here, visiting here, from time to time, and these German nationalists would seek him out for advice. They looked to him as their particular friend in Newfoundland. When they had problems they came to him, and they would come to me.

MR. BROWNE: The explanation I understood from previous statements of the Premier, Dr. Valdimis had been absent for long periods from Newfoundland, and therefore, I understood, could not be active in the Department of Economic Development.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think it was January 1, last year, although it might be the year before. I think he went out January 1, last year. I don't think he was President of NALCO, under pay, a whole year, prior to January 1, last year. He was part of both for one year, one with salary and one without salary. He resigned one job and the salary was reversed, that was upon his resignation as Director General of Economic Development.

MR. J. R. COURAGE: Mr. Speak-

er, yesterday I brought in a report from a Committee on Standing Orders, on the Architects Bill. I thought, at the time, that would constitute notice of motion, but apparently it did not. I wonder if the House could consider that as a notice of motion so that the Bill might be read a first time today?

MR. SPEAKER: The fault is mine. I ought to have proposed the motion. If the House would permit me to do it now.

On motion Bill, "An Act to Incorporate the Newfoundland Association of Architects" read a first time.

On motion ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries & Co-operatives): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to Question No. 39.

The following information is supplied by the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives in reply to questions asked by Mr. Malcolm Hollett:

1. Q. A statement showing quantities and qualities of fish bought in 1954 by the Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.

A. This is the private business of Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.

2. Q. A statement showing what prices were paid to fishermen of the Province by said Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd. during 1954 for the following grades:

- (a) Labrador Salt Bulk
- (b) Labrador Ordinary Cure
- (c) Labrador Hard Dried
- (d) Merchantable (extra large, large and medium, small)
- (e) Maderia (extra large, large and medium and small)

(f) Thirds (extra large, large and medium and small)

(g) West India.

A. This is the private business of Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.

3. Q. Who are the present Directors of said Company, and does the Government still control 51% of the shares? If not, then to what extent financially is the Government interested?

A. The present Directors of Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd., are: Donald Andrews, Rupert Bartlett, Irving Mercer and the Honourable W. J. Keough. The Government does not control 51% of the shares in the Company. The extent to which Government is financially interested is a balance of \$120,000.00 on a guaranteed loan of \$160,000.00 at the Canadian Bank of Commerce.

4. Q. What is the limit of Revolving Credit presently afforded this Company by the Treasury?

A. The loan or revolving credit at the Canadian Bank of Commerce is \$125,000.00 and is made available under Section 88 of the Bank Act with the Company hypothecating its fish, fish receivables and the like to the Bank. This revolving credit is guaranteed by Government.

5. Q. What amount of money is presently owed the Government by the Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.?

A. \$120,000.00

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, there was a question on the Order Paper addressed to me as Minister of Economic Development by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asking for the balance sheet of NALCO. I have the balance sheet but I cannot find the question. Yet, it was asked by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West, on the Order Paper of April 4, No. 32: This is the latest available balance sheet.

QUESTION No. (82):

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR CORPORATION LIMITED

Balance Sheet as at March 31, 1955.

ASSETS

Current Assets—

Cash on hand and in banks.....	\$ 216,181.27
\$200,000.00 Government of Canada 3¼% bonds, 1974/76	200,250.00
Accounts receivable	6,012.87
Deposits	425.00
Inventory of expendable equipment and supplies—at cost	12,365.16
Prepaid expenses	2,696.12

Total Current Assets

\$ 437,879.92

Fixed Assets—at cost less depreciation

29,521.20

Mineral and timber concessions and rights acquired from the Province of Newfoundland by virtue of the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act

1.00

Deferred Assets—

Exploration and development of concessions and rights (Schedule "1")

928,876.43

\$1,396,277.55

LIABILITIES

Current liabilities—

Accounts payable and accrued liabilities.....

\$ 618.54

Total Current Liabilities

618.54

Capital and Surplus—

Share Capital

Authorized: 5,000,000 common shares of no par value

Issued and fully paid: 1,078,572 shares

\$696,680.00

Issued and partly paid 1,500 shares \$6,350.00

Less: Unpaid subscriptions

5,199.99 1,150.01

697,830.01

Surplus—

Paid-in surplus arising from the sale of no par value shares (in accordance with the provisions of Section (7) of the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act

697,830.00 1,395,660.01

\$1,396,278.55

The above Balance Sheet and accompanying statements of Income and Expenditure and Statement of Paid-in Surplus are drawn up in accordance with the books of account and records of the Corporation and exhibit a true and correct view of the state of affairs of the Corporation at March 31, 1955.

(Sgd.) RONALD TURTA.

Vice President and Secretary-Treasurer.

Dated in St. John's, Newfoundland,
this 12th day of April, 1955.

Orders of The Day

MR. SPEAKER: Item 1, Committee of Supply — Leave was given yesterday that this Committee sit again — I do now leave the Chair.

Mr. Courage Chairman of the Committee.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I think I may ask this question — Yesterday in the budget speech the Minister of Finance gave the revenue as \$37,979,400. I take it that is the estimate up until the end of March, and not including receipts coming in during April, is that correct?

MR. POWER: And expenditures the same thing.

MR. BROWNE: Capital revenue and expenditure is the same thing?

MR. POWER: Yes.

Consolidated Fund Services: Page 24:

10, Public Debt Interest:

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think, Mr. Chairman, a correction needs to be made to that answer, I don't think the answer is fully explained. The Statutes, the law, provides that all revenue up to the end of April, i.e. up to the end of one month following the year in question is credited to the year in question. But, with regard to expenditure, all expenditure whether a week or a month or a year, after the year in question, is debited to the year in question if it is committed, spent or not, but committed, it is debited to the year in question, not to the year in which it happens but to the year in which it is committed. In other words, the expenditure shown in the budget speech for the last financial year included everything, whether spent or not, if it is committed. It

may be spent a month or two or three from now, still it is charged up against last year. On the revenue side it is only what comes in one month following the year is credited to the year. That is the law.

MR. BROWNE: It is to be an estimate, it includes what is estimated to come in this month?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, always was and is invariably. I think it requires still further modification: That refers only to amounts from the Government of Canada, not only revenue, but revenue from the Government of Canada that comes in for any period up to one month following the close of the financial year is credited to the financial year just closed. That is the law.

10) Public Debt Interest:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, these are loans which would come due during the next couple of years.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, what is the bank overdraft at the end of March? In answer to a question I had the overdraft as at 24 February 1955 amounted to \$1,953,161.89. I wonder if the Honourable Minister would tell us what was the overdraft at the end of March?

MR. POWER: There was not any.

MR. HOLLETT: Just one point, Mr. Chairman, before you go on: I was wrong on that point of the overdraft. I think the explanation is quite easy. I asked a question relative to the overdraft on the 1st of April, 1954, at the Bank of Montreal, or at least the amount of money that was there on hand. I was given the figure of \$3,772,212.55. But I see in the Public Accounts that, the day before that,

March 31, there was only \$76,000 there. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could explain how, between midnight on March 31 and the 1st of April over three million dollars came in? It is probably quite easily answered. It is rather a large amount of money to come in overnight.

MR. POWER: The public accounts are book debts. Not the amount at the Bank of Montreal.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to be quite clear on that before we go on. In the Public Accounts, I understand, it is given as the amount at the Bank of Montreal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know whether it is proper to debate questions at this time.

MR. HOLLETT: Oh well, we will probably take it up later. I just asked for the information. I am not mistrusting anybody or accusing them of stealing three million dollars nor anything like that, you know.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has given no indication of the purpose of this \$16,000,000 loan should we not have that information.

MR. POWER: I think that will be given consideration later in the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a Bill that has come in.

MR. POWER: I don't see how it could be given on this page here.

On motion, carried.

102 Sinking Funds:

MR. HOLLETT: I notice for Fishery and Road loans last year there was \$180,000 towards the sinking fund on that. I take it that was for the half year?

MR. POWER: That is right.

MR. HOLLETT: Why is there now nothing in for the up and coming loan of \$16,000,000 this year?

MR. POWER: Because it won't fall due. Won't have to be paid.

MR. HOLLETT: The other falls due at the end of the fiscal year?

MR. POWER: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The sinking fund does not begin to take effect until a certain time after the loan is raised, but interest does.

MR. HOLLETT: On loans raised last year therefore it should be put in this year. These are estimates and it has to be taken care of in the estimates.

MR. POWER: We don't know the exact date the loan will be made. The Deputy Minister tells me it was not clear last year whether payments would fall due or not, but this year it is clear that it won't.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you.

On motion, carried.

103 — No Item.

104 Statutory Salaries:

On motion, carried.

Legislative:

201 — Scasional:

MR. BROWNE: Should not that be increased now for thirty-six members for this year?

MR. CURTIS: Not for this year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That depends, of course on whether we hold the election in the spring, summer or fall, and whether the next session is held in the winter, and when the election is held. So, in view of the uncertainty about the matter, we just don't know now. The honourable gentleman must

not assume from that anything with regard to an election.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not clear in the mind of the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Very clear.

MR. HOLLETT: He has not passed the information along to the Minister of Finance, otherwise we would have it in here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is correct. The Premier knew the honourable gentleman would be watching carefully, so he did not.

MR. BROWNE: While we are on this here — There should be a vote for the next session for the Opposition to have some kind of a secretary or assistant in performance of their duties. I brought that matter up last year, but no consideration appears to have been given to it. We are terribly handicapped with no assistant whatsoever. Everyone knows how pressed we are with work, trying to get it done, yet they think we must do it ourselves. It seems to me reasonable Mr. Chairman that there should be a vote placed in here for a special assistant for the Opposition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable and learned member for St. John's West has already made something between fifty and one hundred speeches without a secretary. Now what would he do if he had a secretary?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the Premier sits there with all his Ministers behind him and all with staffs to assist him, and here we are over here with no assistance whatsoever.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The difference between us is that we are governing the Province and the honourable gentleman is not.

MR. BROWNE: Excuse me, the Opposition has a part to play in the Government of the country as well. I understand we are referred to as "Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition," and we are supposed to contribute in the House of Assembly, and not as much in the matter of administration outside but in the actual work in the House of Assembly we need an assistant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We thought of that. We provided a salary for the Leader of the Opposition. The House of Assembly pays the Leader of the Opposition as much as it used to pay the Premier of Newfoundland; Sir Richard Squires, Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Monroe did not draw as much from the House of Assembly as the Leader of the Opposition does now from the House of Assembly. This Government did that. I would say that we would not need to be pressed very hard to provide the Leader of the Opposition with a private secretary or at least with the salary of a private secretary. But I don't know what about providing the Opposition with one. I think it might be a good idea if we did provide the Leader of the Opposition with one, because some day I may be that. There is a possibility, and one must not be selfish in these things.

MR. HOLLETT: I was going to ask what the Ministers are going to do when we take over the Government. They will have no secretaries, and they will be lost completely. We have been used to it for some years. But this is the first time it has been pointed out to me that I should provide a secretary for the Opposition. This is the first hint. I did not know why the salary was paid, but if it is, why I would not tax the Government for a private secretary for the world. They need them all, and they will need more in the future.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am serious in what I said about the private secretary.

MR. HOLLETT: Keep serious.

MR. BROWNE: I want to point out there was a substantial vote for this item, printing Hansard.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Last year.

MR. BROWNE: Fifteen thousand will be sufficient to cover it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think so.

On motion, Item 201 carried.

Executive Council:

301 Lieutenant-Governor's Establishment: On motion, carried.

302 Premier's Office:

MR. BROWNE: What were the actual travelling expenses?

MR. SMALLWOOD: 1949-50, 1953-54 inclusive \$819, \$1,404, \$527 and \$2,300 a year.

MR. BROWNE: For officials in the Department.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not necessarily. The only travelling done in the Premier's office is done by me. In the Department of Economic Development that is another matter. 1953-54 is \$2,300, the latest year for which I have it.

302 — On motion, carried.

303 — Executive Office:

MR. BROWNE: I see an increase here of \$700, page 89, also to the Clerk of the Council.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The salary of the Deputy Minister of Provincial Affairs, also in addition he is Clerk of the Executive Council — \$11,500.

MR. BROWNE: What is the reason for the increase?

MR. HOLLETT: Is there any particular reason for that amount there? Not objecting to it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Carew is going out soon. Mr. Carew has been with every Premier beginning with Sir Edward Morris, and he was in the same position with the Commission of Government. He is equivalent to a Clerk of the Council with the Commission of Government, and was with every Premier from Lord Morris's time. He will be pensioned soon.

On motion, 303 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Surely, Mr. Chairman, \$10,000 under 304 is not sufficient for this year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course we can always get a special warrant if we decide to have this election before the House meets again. We can always have his Honour issue a special warrant on the Treasury for the additional amount over and about this figure to cover the cost of the election. My honourable friends must not allow this figure to influence their thinking at all.

MR. HOLLETT: It does not, Mr. Chairman. It influences the surplus which the Finance Minister has in the year if there is \$10,000 on elections.

MR. HOLLETT: I have no doubt about that.

304 — The Newfoundland Election Act — On motion, carried.

Department of Finance:

401 — Minister's Office: On motion, carried.

402 — General Office: On motion, carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Just one moment, is there somebody fired in the office. There is quite a difference. What makes the difference.

MR. POWER: The post of Administrative Assistant has been dropped.

MR. BROWNE: You say it has been dropped, Mr. Chairman, does that mean somebody is out of a job or has been transferred? Was there anybody in that job last year?

MR. POWER: No.

MR. BROWNE: Who is the director — Grade IV?

MR. POWER: Gordon Bearn.

On motion, 402 carried.

403 Auditor General's Department:
On motion, carried.

404 Pensions and Gratuities:

MR. BROWNE: Here is an item that was short last year. I notice that it is increased correspondingly \$15,000 Civil Service Pensions and \$25,000 for Railway Pensions, which is the amount under-supplied. Is there any change to be made in that — Do you think that will satisfy — Does the amount increase from year to year?

MR. POWER: The amount is very hard to determine exactly.

MR. BROWNE: I don't see why.

On motion, 404 carried.

405 Social Security Assessment:

MR. BROWNE: Who is the director, Grade III?

MR. POWER: That would be Mr. Frank Hugh.

MR. HIGGINS: Is that amount for travelling, Mr. Chairman, for going around the country collecting social security and that sort of thing?

MR. POWER: That is salaries of inspectors going around checking.

MR. HIGGINS: Is there any provision made in this vote for Social Security Assessment prosecutions instituted in various sections of the country?

MR. POWER: That would be under the Attorney General.

MR. HOLLETT: What is 405 — 05 equipment?

MR. POWER: That is a cash register.

On motion, 405 carried.

406 — Miscellaneous:

MR. HOLLETT: 03 — Management Expenses, Public Debt, what is the explanation for the increase from \$101,500 up to \$245,000?

MR. POWER: That has to do with the Commission fund; one and a half per cent on the new loan.

MR. HOLLETT: What is involved in management expenses?

MR. POWER: It is bank interest and cash.

MR. HOLLETT: On account of the new loan coming up?

MR. POWER: No.

MR. HOLLETT: Why has it increased?

MR. POWER: It is the same thing. We have no idea what the rate of commission would be.

MR. HOLLETT: What was the rate of commission?

MR. POWER: One and a half per cent.

MR. HOLLETT: What did you allow last year?

MR. POWER: I think it was a hundred thousand.

MR. HOLLETT: Why not put a dollar in.

MR. POWER: It would be unrealistic, when dealing with a hundred thousand.

MR. BROWNE: Financial Consultant — How much if any was paid last year?

MR. POWER: Nothing.

MR. BROWNE: Who is the Consultant?

MR. POWER: Mr. Thompson.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Thompson is still Consultant to the Government on matters of Finance.

MR. HOLLETT: He is not a Civil Servant, is he? Is he paid by the day or by the job or what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Usually by the day.

MR. HOLLETT: He just comes in on certain occasions?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: It is still thought necessary, after all the experience since 1949, I remember some estimates made that did not work out — What I am getting at is that I don't think we should spend such huge amounts of money as we are spending in this connection. I fail to see how the Government can justify it. What is the Government elected for? Everything has to be handed over to a specialist or a special commission or handed over to a Royal Commission, the Government does nothing at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, just loafs around, that is all.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes that gentleman, I don't mean the gentleman himself but that job — I am quite sure that our own finance department is competent to decide any issues that may arise in connection with the financing of this country. Now I am not referring to the hiring of Mr. Thompson with reference to the Terms of Union, which is coming up — it is all — important, of course — but our own finance department can handle matters. It is proven, it did not cost the country here, the finance department last year, by having Mr. Thompson come in. But Mr. Thompson got a lot of money from the Government in other departments.

On that Workmen's Compensation, Mr. Chairman, is that contributions.

MR. POWER: That is designed to cover payments in respect of all departments except Public Works.

MR. HIGGINS: Is that contributions paid by the Government from the Workmen's Compensation Board?

MR. POWER: It is to meet claims from all departments.

MR. BROWNE: In reference to the Financial Commission of Inquiry: We voted \$30,000 to add to the \$50,000 making \$80,000. Does that mean that they can get along with \$30,000 this year? Seems to me these amounts are all undervoted. Loan Boards, what is that for?

MR. POWER: That is to provide for overhead on raising loan boards. It was not out of funds of the various boards.

MR. HOLLETT: Why not now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have changed our policy. We are voting it here in the House.

MR. BROWNE: Should there not be details for this. I know, whatever you call it, there are men of the Loan Boards getting ten thousand dollars. What are the details for the other eight or nine thousand?

MR. POWER: For a secretary, I think, and a shorthand typist.

MR. BROWNE: What is the secretary's salary?

MR. POWER: Five thousand five hundred. Shorthand typist \$2,170.

406 — Miscellaneous — On motion, carried.

407 — General Contingencies :

MR. BROWNE: Were there any expenses under 02 — Other — last year?

MR. POWER: That was largely for helicopter services.

MR. HOLLETT: I came across somewhere in the estimates, I believe under this heading, maybe last year, \$450 painting.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A painting of Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: To whom?

MR. BROWNE: To Mr. Pickersgill. Why was that presented to him?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In recognition of very special favours done for Newfoundland over and above the call of duty, responsibility.

MR. BROWNE: That is very unusual.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was a very unusual favour.

MR. BROWNE: What was the favour?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I prefer not to say.

MR. BROWNE: It is a very strange thing to give the man a painting, \$450 for a favour and not talk about it.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words this Government paid Mr. Pickersgill for favours done the country.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Paid him a painting.

MR. HOLLETT: And paid someone else to paint it for Pickersgill, for a special favour for Newfoundland. I am sure the people of the country would love to know what it was for?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think they would.

MR. HOLLETT: I think the Premier should explain.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would ask the people to excuse me from doing that.

MR. HOLLETT: I think the temper of the people is somewhat different.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We will see when the next election comes around. The biggest special favour he gave Newfoundland was getting elected and becoming our Minister, but that is not the favour for which we gave him the painting.

MR. HOLLETT: We will find it out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, in the course of time. Mr. Chairman, on 407-05, \$75,000 to cover the cost of the observance of historic events. That is a reference, of course, to the 100th Anniversary of Responsible Government. The Government have cast about in their minds very carefully as to the form the Governmental or official observance of the Centenary should take. There are, if the Committee stops to

consider, many, many ways in which this important anniversary might be commemorated. We have decided on two forms, one is to create one hundred new scholarships, one obviously for each year of that century, new scholarships over and above those that presently exist. That is to say, the provincial scholarships we instituted in this province a few years ago, when this Government created a number of new scholarships known as the Provincial Scholarships, one, I think, in each of the constituencies. These are awarded annually. Then, I believe, we created still another series of new scholarships, three in memory of the founders of our university. Now as part of centenary celebrations of Responsible Government, we propose to institute one hundred new scholarships. And our thought in that connection — a special sub-committee of the Cabinet are working on it. They, of course, are seeking advice from education authorities generally. But our special thought is that these hundred scholarships be tied in somehow in a practical form with the basic industries and the basic resources of the province, i.e., fisheries, forests, minerals, waterpowers, agriculture, but not entirely so. We will say 75% will be devoted specially to these basic industries and resources of Newfoundland. Then the remaining scholarships would be a gesture in the direction of culture and things of a non-economic nature, non-materialistic nature. We might include a scholarship or two for art and one or two for music.

I was so very glad, and I say this with all sincerity, so very glad to hear on the radio the other day, that the son of the honourable and learned member for St. John's West is distinguishing himself in France as a musician. I am sure all Newfoundlanders

are proud of Mr. Browne, Jr., if they are not of his father. But they are all very happy to know that a young Newfoundland can go even to Paris, a great cultural centre, and show his talent acceptably in that great centre. So that we think, perhaps one or two of the scholarships might be in music and in art and perhaps in medicine or history or other branches of learning and culture, apart from the straight economic ones. The details have not been worked out in the final form. The sub-committee in Cabinet is working on it. When it comes to Cabinet the Cabinet will give its final approval, and then an announcement will be made, perhaps by me.

Secondly, the commemoration might take the form of an attempt at some beautification. One cannot help but being struck, as one travels around the world, and one has travelled around the world a lot in recent years.

MR. BROWNE: Join the Government and see the world.

MR. HOLLETT: One refers to oneself when one said that, I hope, that is understood.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One cannot help being struck by the statuary and fountains that grace so many cities and towns of the world. But not so the city and towns of Newfoundland. We have, of course, our beautiful War Memorial on the King's Beach. We have the Sergeant's Memorial over near the Anglican Cathedral; we have some statuary in the grounds of the Roman Catholic Cathedral. I noticed recently a beautiful one in the grounds in front of the Episcopal Palace; and out here in Baumann Park we have one statuette. One bust mounted on a pedestal, and in Bowring Park, of course, we have some very beautiful monuments,

the more beautiful the reproduction of Peter Pan. But actually we are lamentably deficient in them. Now we do not propose to begin establishing statuary. But we do propose to establish some fountains here in front of the building, between the door and the gate we propose to establish a very beautiful fountain which would be flood-lighted and would have multi-coloured lights. We propose also a fountain in Corner Brook and a fountain in Grand Falls and a fountain in some Conception Bay town to be typical, to represent the outposts of Newfoundland. That is to say, at least four new fountains, and possibly one in Bowring Park, if the Bowring Park Committee and the city Government agree.

Then we thought that we might invite here the Royal Jamaica Band, a brass band, a military band, the Royal Jamaica Military Band, a magnificent band, the members of which are all coloured with the exception only of the bandmaster who is an Englishman, a white Englishman, a major. The Royal Jamaica Band is quite famous in the Caribbean. Our thought was that we might invite the band to Newfoundland to be present at the little ceremonies there would be at the unveiling of these fountains, in front of the Colonial Building here in St. John's, in Corner Brook, in Grand Falls and somewhere in Conception Bay. We thought also that we would send that band on a bit of a tour, say, up the Southern Shore and down to Bay de Verde and possibly down to the town of Bonavista, so that they, as salt codfish eaters, would get acquainted with some of our fishermen in the actual fishing settlements. Thus they could carry back with them to Jamaica, stories of our Newfoundland fishermen and the production of salt codfish,

which, with certain fruit, is the staple diet of everybody who lives in Jamaica. We thought that would be a good-will towards our neighbour Island of Jamaica, which is perhaps the oldest customer we have in the world, certainly in the new world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that generally is what we have in mind by way of commemorating the one hundredth anniversary. We thought also of having placed, one on each side of the steps out front here, a statue. We thought about four statues, two representing Representative Government and two representing Responsible Government. Representative Government would be represented by statues of Dr. William Carson and Patrick Morris, and Responsible Government would be represented by Philip Francis Little, the first Premier of Newfoundland and John B. Garland, the first Speaker of Newfoundland, whose portrait is the first at the left top row on the wall. In other words, the two leaders of the movement for Representative Government, which of course lead to Responsible Government in Newfoundland. These four statues, or busts of them, mounted on pedestals, on either side of the steps out here.

Now if it should finally be decided to adopt a plan which I passed around here privately amongst some members, or most members of the House, including the honourable gentlemen opposite, if that were adopted, then it would become absolutely imperative that some programme of beautification of these grounds be carried out, and that this building, which must forever have a great appeal to the hearts of Newfoundlanders, be preserved and its beauty perhaps not only preserved but enhanced — So that perhaps some statuary outside as well as the fountain might be a very good way to do it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, truth to tell I was almost getting ready to be opposed to that \$75,000; but since the Honourable the Premier has spoken I feel that he has sold me on most of his programme, certainly on the programme of scholarships. Even if the Government does nothing else, if they do that, they will have substantially recognized the one hundredth anniversary of Responsible Government in this country. It is the proper form for it to take, and I am delighted the Government is planning on that. I hope they carry out the plan. I don't know what the amount of the scholarships will be, but I do hope they will be substantial. And if they could set up a hundred scholarships in this country in this hundredth year of Responsible Government I would almost be prepared to forgive the Government for some of the sins of omission to say nothing about commission.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thank you very much.

MR. HOLLETT: I do think that is a splendid idea, and is a credit to whoever thought about it. I don't care who he is. I hope that when the Honourable the Premier decides just what monuments he will erect he will forget some of the monuments it was his intention for a time to put here in Newfoundland. I am quite sure he will forget some of these, at least I hope so.

The hundredth year, Sir, of Responsible Government — We have, Sir, after a hundred years, probably, not given much thought to it at all. It must have meant a lot to our ancestors a hundred years ago to think that the control of the country, and even further back in 1832, had been more or less passed over to them, because the Government of 1832, more or less, had control, but

in 1855 the people of that day — Every time I pass the Belvedere Cemetery I take a glance at the monument of John Kent, the first Premier.

MR. MURRAY: No, Little.

MR. HOLLETT: What was John Kent?

MR. MURRAY: He was Premier later on.

MR. HOLLETT: Was he not the first Premier?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, Philip Francis Little was.

MR. BROWNE: He was Premier until 1855.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No — The honourable gentleman is going to argue with me of all persons. Responsible Government did not come until 1855. He could not have been Premier until then — It was Philip Francis Little. I don't only say it, but history says it, the facts, the records say it, everything says it besides me. His son says it too.

MR. HOLLETT: It must be right then. We will check on it in any case.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't take my word.

MR. HOLLETT: Certainly not. At any rate John Kent, as I remember, is very largely in my mind as being first Premier — Yes, I say, Responsible Government today perhaps does not mean very much to us, but it meant a lot to our ancestors, and they must have been sturdy men, much more sturdy than we are today, I think. And I make no wonder the Honourable the Premier decided to go on, and I congratulate the Premier even for going so far as that. I congratulate the Premier on the honour of being Pre-

mier on this one hundredth anniversary of Responsible Government. I do hope that the plan envisaged in the statement just made by the Premier will be carried out, and that everybody in this country will feel very pleased over the action of the Government.

John Kent, I am informed, was the first native-born Premier, and the second Premier. I knew there was something about Kent. He was the first native-born Premier. I thank whoever brought the information along. It has helped me out a lot.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think John Kent was not the first native-born Premier. I think it was Sir Hugh Hoyles. I think John Kent was a native-born Irishman. He was a brother-in-law of Bishop Fleming. He married the Bishop's sister. I forget the details. The first native-born Newfoundlander to become Premier was Sir Hugh Hoyles. So my honourable friend's informant is wrong like himself. My honourable friend must be careful from whom he takes advice, otherwise he will be misled.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I understand from the Honourable the Premier there are various ideas a Committee of Cabinet is thinking over but have not decided.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have decided on the hundred scholarships but not on the precise nature of them, and we have decided on the fountain.

MR. BROWNE: I think in regard to the scholarships they ought to be set up under some sort of board, non-partisan, a non-political organization.

I want to thank the honourable the Premier for the kind words of reference which he used in connection with my son in France. I do feel the arts

are neglected, especially by great corporations like Imperial Oil who gave scholarships to everyone in engineering and forgot the cultural side altogether. If we are too materialistic it will be to the detriment of the country in the long run. I am glad to know the Honourable the Premier has in mind cultural activities as well as on the industrial side. These are likely to be substantial scholarships, I take it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There can't be much spent this financial year on scholarships. Most of this amount will be for materials. Then year by year, later, the amount for scholarships will appear in the estimates.

MR. BROWNE: There is always a question in relation to scholarships, whether you should spread them over a great area or whether you should distribute them to the brightest pupils. If distributed to the brightest pupils you give the advantage to city students where the schools are bigger and the pupils have more advantages. If the scholarships the Government is giving are spread out over the Province, I think, that way they do a great deal of good. No doubt that would be in the mind of the Government when giving out scholarships again. I feel that those who live in the city have advantages — And while I would like to see a large number of scholarships given to city schools, because they have very bright students here who on a proportionate basis are more numerous than they are in other places, that is from the point of view of the advantages they are getting — and I think that should be kept in mind as well.

There is one item, Mr. Chairman, in connection with this vote, 407 about which I would like to ask a question.

I notice here in the Auditor General's Report, page 47 — Allowance to

Private Secretary of Minister without Portfolio \$1,200. Is that being continued?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: That is Mr. Lewis?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Why is that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because he is the only member of the Cabinet without portfolio and his duties as a Cabinet Minister are very onerous, and we thought he should have a secretary, so we gave him one. That has been so now for many years. It is a part-time secretary.

On motion 407 — General Contingencies carried.

409 — Central Accounting and Pay Division:

MR. BROWNE: That is an increase of \$6,000 there in salaries.

MR. POWER: We brought in two extra people.

On motion 409 — General Accounting and Pay Division carried.

410 Civil Service Commission:

MR. HOLLETT: 410-02-03. Candidates. What is meant by that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Travelling of candidates.

MR. HOLLETT: Do you pay many?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not too many.

On motion 410, Civil Service Commission carried.

Department of Provincial Affairs: V:

501 — Minister's Office: On motion carried.

502 — General Office: On motion carried.

503 — Public Relations: On motion carried.

MR. BROWNE: I take it Mr. Carew's salary does not create a precedent for his successor?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. It is purely personal.

504 — Museum:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that brings us to the question of the museum. We are voting money for a museum and we don't know when it is going to open. For six years now the Government have been trying to organize the new museum, and it does not seem to be much further ahead than it was four years ago, and certainly does not seem to be any further ahead than it was last year. What is the matter with the museum? What is the reason for this slowness in opening the museum? It does not seem to be reasonable. I understand there is a big collection of exhibits there, and nobody is allowed to see it. I do not know what the exhibits are. Perhaps the Minister when speaking, if he is going to speak, might tell us something of what is there and what is the trouble. I understand he has engaged the services of a member of the British Museum who is coming out in June, I believe.

MR. MURRAY: In a matter of weeks, in May.

MR. BROWNE: Let us hope that after he comes he will open it. Because I believe, even though it may not meet the ideas of perfectionists as far as museums are concerned — some people travel so much and see so many museums perhaps they become very, very critical and are not satisfied with

the home-grown variety. It is better to have it open and going even though it may not live up to the standards elsewhere.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a word to that: When the museum was about ready to open to the public, it occurred to me that before opening it we should have the opinions and the advice of a number of prominent citizens, who might be expected because of their past activity to have some special interest in the museum. I therefore talked with a number of persons asking them if they would go personally and visit the museum to have a look at it and to let me know what they thought. I asked Mr. Albert Perlin. I asked Mr. Don Jamieson. I asked Mr. C. E. A. Jeffrey (editor of the Evening Telegram). I asked Mr. R. S. Furlong. I asked Mr. John J. Higgins. I asked several others. I asked Mr. Nimahi Crewe. I asked a number of men who had one thing in common, i.e., an intense interest in Newfoundland history and an intense desire that our museum should truly and faithfully represent Newfoundland. These were not men with particular museum experience nor background, but with a particular knowledge of and an interest in Newfoundland history and Newfoundland affairs. And the consensus of their opinion confirmed my own, that the museum ought not to be opened to the public in its present condition.

I therefore asked my colleague, the Solicitor General and Minister of Provincial Affairs, to take a personal interest in the matter, and especially a personal interest in the matter of securing someone with very definite experience in museums, to look at it and appraise and perhaps reorganize it for us. He made strong efforts to obtain someone. He tried right across

Canada. He tried first to get a Newfoundlander. He thought there might be somewhere a Newfoundlander with experience in museums. He failed. Then he tried to get any Canadian, not being a Newfoundlander, and again he failed. And it was I who suggested to him, when he reported that he had made every effort and failed to obtain someone, that he might try the United Kingdom, and indeed that he might go over personally and see if he could find someone. Now it is a little unusual for a Cabinet Minister to go rushing across the Atlantic personally to find someone. But we in the Government were very much impressed with the thought and the feeling of my honourable and learned friend the member for St. John's West, who has just spoken. It is a long time since the museum was begun to be restored, it is now more than a year since it was physically restored and the exhibits arranged in it. So that I thought the matter was sufficiently important to the general culture of Newfoundland that even a Minister of the Crown should go personally across the Atlantic to consult with the British Museum, and to personally interview persons selected by the British Museum as possible persons for the management of our museum, or at least for a person to give us some expert advice. Now the Minister is well able to tell what happened. I give only the background. I have no doubt he would like to tell the Committee what happened as a result of his visit.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I think I have already announced to the House here what I did when I went to London. I got in touch with Sir Thomas Kendrick, Director of the British Museum. He suggested a couple of names to me. The one who struck me most was Mr. Digby of the

British Museum, a man with something like 7,800 exhibits under his own particular care, apart from being a specialist himself, in aborigines. That was the thing appealed to me. During the year, as you know, all specimens were removed and the work of restoration and reclassification has been going on every year since the war. I asked Sir Thomas Kendrick if he could make available the services of this man, and he agreed, and he will be on his way the first of May. He suggested I should go to Dublin and look at the Irish Museum. There are a lot of things in the Irish Museum of great interest, which we could not possibly compete with, but there is a section there we think we might very well follow along, the native culture section; the way people actually lived, the utensils they used, their arts and crafts. We could adapt it to our fishermen's lives, our farmers, the implements they actually use, and the implements they use on farms and in the fields and all that. There is a section of the Irish Museum developed along that line. And I suggested to Mr. Digby this would be the line along which we should develop. Mr. Digby then told me he is not an expert in that particular field, but he does know a great deal about museums generally. And I think with his arrival here we will definitely be put on the right track. The Premier has mentioned the difficulties we experienced. I thought myself, and the Premier strongly agreed with me, it would be better to have no museum than one which might expose us to ridicule. Some of the specimens down there are not properly classified, I believe, and not labeled properly, and some of very questionable ascendancy. And if we open our museum with that sort of thing, I feel, we will only be exposing ourselves to ridicule. I think that finally we are on the right path.

I have great confidence in this man coming out. He is a man certainly of tremendous knowledge of everything to do with museums, and at least will be able to set a pattern for us.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering when the Honourable Minister was speaking; if we are to have the exhibits he speaks of, showing the native crafts and equipment and household functions and so on, is that part of the building presently set aside for a museum sufficiently large?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No it is not.

MR. HIGGINS: Does the Government envisage a new building or an extension of the Gosling Memorial Library?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I cannot give a categorical answer to that. I can only give my personal view. The matter has not been discussed by the Government nor a decision on it taken. But I personally am strongly of the opinion that the present building might be big enough for the public library, if it were all of it available for that purpose. It is doubtful that it would be big enough for a museum, if all of it were available for the purpose of a museum; but that both should be housed in the one building is to me ridiculous. In that way we have neither a good library nor a good museum. And it seems imperative to me — imperative — that another building be found either for the museum or the library. Now I don't like the idea of taking the museum out of it. It was built by the Government of Sir Robert Bond, I believe, as a museum, and I think it ought never to have been used for any other purpose. I think it was criminal on the part of the Commission of Government, nothing short of criminal — Not tech-

nically. I don't think it was an offence against the Criminal Code of Canada nor against the laws of Newfoundland at the time — not criminal in that legal, technical sense, but morally criminal for them to have laid vandal hands on part of the historical and cultural accumulations of our Newfoundland people. They should have been blasted to Hell for it. If they had been an invading enemy they could not have done anything much worse than that, than to take our museum and scatter it and move the exhibits — It is a scandalous thing they did.

MR. HIGGINS: Did they move some stuff to Bay Bulls?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They moved it everywhere, and most of it was destroyed by weather, by climate and by fire. It was scandalous. Every now and then something turns up and is brought to me. Not long ago the original petition of the Water Street merchants against Confederation, not this last campaign, not this last time but back in the last century the original. Somebody had grabbed it, and after a while it found its way back to me.

MR. HOLLETT: You would not want to see that preserved?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes I do. There is nothing I would rather see preserved than the petition of Water Street against Confederation in the last century. I love the thought of it. However, the way the exhibits in the museum were scattered was scandalous and criminal. Although I will admit that a lot of them were junk. But, they had no business ever to touch our junk. They should have left our junk alone, such as it was, and junk a lot of it was. Oh I think I would like to see a new building for one.

MR. HOLLETT: You have sixteen million dollars, why not provide it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have a lot of roads and schools to build. And we hope to get a new building either for a library or a museum, but in the meanwhile we have a lot of schools, hospitals and roads to build, and these are awfully important.

MR. HOLLETT: Could the Minister tell us, Mr. Chairman, what efforts were made in order to obtain a curator on this side of the water or even here in Newfoundland? I understand from the Premier there was quite an effort.

MR. MURRAY: Specifically, we got the names of every museum in Canada and I wrote the directors of every museum across Canada. At first, as the Premier said, we tried to get a Newfoundlander, preferably somebody with knowledge of Newfoundland. No such person came up.

MR. HOLLETT: How did you try?

MR. MURRAY: We wrote to the director of every museum across Canada. They did not know of anybody available. Personally I don't know of anyone living now actually in Newfoundland who would have the qualifications for which we were looking. As I said, we wrote right across Canada but got no satisfactory answer. We did get back a few recommendations. I put it before the Cabinet but there was nobody who filled the bill.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if I could ask the Honourable Minister what sort of things are in the museum now that are preserved?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why does not the honourable gentleman go down and look at it and see for himself what is there?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, we would be very glad.

MR. MURRAY: Better museum practise is that geological specimens should not be placed in a museum but in the university where there is a geological faculty or people giving advice. And advice was given us to move out the geological specimens to the university.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course the honourable gentleman should stay away from the fossils.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, we can dig up all sorts of fossils even in six years, and skeletons. I am beginning to wonder what kind of country we did join, when I think the Minister of Provincial Affairs could not find a man to take care of a little, small, 8 x 10 museum. That is all our museum has been. That is all it can be. We have not the history of some of these countries. Yet we cannot find a man all across the great Dominion of Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All hands got jobs.

MR. HOLLETT: He had to go to England. Now we got the best ever curator.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The best ever is not too good for Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: The Premier had to send the Minister of Provincial Affairs across the ocean, at the risk of his life probably, in an airplane, in order to dig up an antiquarian or a curator. I think it was an antiquarian he got. After consulting all the antiquarians the Premier could get in touch with here in St. John's and converse with them — that is a very good name for them — he had to go across there and get a man. It is silly to

think, rather silly. All these things we had this morning were not so silly, but the finishing touch, the whole thing is rather silly.

On motion, 504 carried.

506 — Miscellaneous:

MR. HIGGINS: We don't have any censorship do we?

MR. MURRAY: No, only just a token vote.

MR. BROWNE: 506-04 — Official Entertainment — Was there anything spent under this heading?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nothing under this heading.

MR. BROWNE: It is really not necessary there, when you have the other one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Probably not, it does not do much harm though.

506 — On motion carried.

507 — Civil Defence:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, we have been told the salaries of the director and the assistant director, but there are two other gentlemen.

MR. MURRAY: Oh yes, there are instructors. They get paid an honorary \$500 a year.

MR. BROWNE: What does the man in Corner Brook do?

MR. MURRAY: He has no staff. He is supposed to organize Civil Defence on the west coast. It is a full time job, \$4,000 a year. The idea was that he contact service clubs and get the thing under way. If the staff becomes necessary we would provide for one.

MR. HOLLETT: Does the Premier think the question of Civil Defence is a serious one here in this country?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Deadly serious.

MR. HOLLETT: I know an effort should be made to preserve us, but sometimes I doubt the wisdom of \$66,000.

MR. MURRAY: Half that returns on the revenue side. I might say, \$30,000 is for two new fire pumps, fifteen thousand dollars each.

MR. HOLLETT: And salaries?

MR. MURRAY: I could give the details; Director \$6,000. Assistant Director \$4,000; Stenographer \$1,800; three wardens \$500 each. Inspector \$1,500 and two I have already spoken about, two inspectors one in Lewisporte and one in Corner Brook \$4,000 each.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We get back half of all that.

MR. MURRAY: The two fire pumps are not on order, and radio equipment for the fire trucks.

MR. HIGGINS: Who controls the pumps and so on?

MR. MURRAY: The Director of Civil Defence, of course.

MR. HIGGINS: Then if we have a disaster and fires around, the fire department has nothing to do.

MR. MURRAY: Actually the Civil Defence Organization is supposed to be auxiliary.

MR. HOLLETT: In accordance with figures just given possibly half of the whole grant goes in salaries. I am wondering what efficiency can be had from a director who has no more money than that at his disposal. I

think that estimate is very low, and I think the Government ought to consider giving the director and his aides all, which is all I can call them — I don't mean aides like in hospitals you know — but they should have more money. For instance the whole town is to be evacuated, I believe, some time in May. I don't know how the thousands of us who won't be able to get out — has the Government sanctioned that, could it ask the Minister?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Government has nothing to do with it.

MR. HOLLETT: The Honourable Minister has just nodded his head to say the Government has sanctioned it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is only kidding the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, knowing of his experience with the director. The Government does not control him. He runs Civil Defence as he ran the Tory Party. He runs it — really runs it.

MR. HOLLETT: Now I do know why the long, anxious faces of the Honourable Ministers in that photograph. It is historic. I suggest to the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs that that photograph be taken immediately and put in the museum — Three Ministers of the Crown in a dugout.

MR. BROWNE: \$47,000 was voted last year, is the amount in supplementary supply to be added to get the correct expenditure for the department last year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The total last year was \$86,000.

MR. MURRAY: That was for the taking of the election list.

MR. BROWNE: I am just wondering if the total vote would be affected?

MR. MURRAY: Oh yes.

507 — On motion carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to it referred, has made progress and asks leave to sit again.

On motion report received, and Committee ordered to sit again presently.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the House now recess until 3:00 of the clock.

On motion the House recessed until 3:00 of the clock this afternoon.

TUESDAY, April 19, 1955

The House resumed at 3:00 of the clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the House do not rise at 11:00 o'clock tonight. I may say for the benefit of my honourable friends opposite, it is not necessarily so that we meet after 11:00, but that we may meet after 11:00 in case we need to go on for half an hour or even an hour.

Motion carried, that the House do not adjourn at 11:00 o'clock tonight.

Committee of Supply: Mr. Courage, Chairman of Committee:

Department of Education VI:

601 — Minister's Office:

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, before starting the estimates of the Department of Education, I think it only proper I should give a summary of some of the improvements in education in the Province of Newfoundland since the Smallwood Government in 1949.

We had in 1948-49, 73,086 students registered in our various schools. In 1953-54 we had 92,361 an increase of 17,278, and this year we will have a greater number.

Percentage of attendance in 1949 was 79.3 per cent. In 1953-54 it had risen to 89.4 per cent, an increase of 10.1 per cent. The average salary paid a teacher in 1948 was \$1,085; in 1949 and in 1953-54 it had risen to \$1,500. We had in 1948-49, 1,187 schools and in 1953-54, 1,173, which was part of our policy of the Government and the Department of Education in trying to eliminate a lot of one-room schools. Class rooms in 1948-49, 2,286 and in 1953-54 it had risen to 2,749; an increase of 463, which bears out my remark of a few moments ago, that we are now getting the smaller schools together. In 1948-49 we had 2,424 teachers and in 1953-54 we had 2,865, an increase of 441 teachers. The vote for teacher's salaries in 1948-49, \$2,325,211; and in 1953-54, \$4,185,161. The number of candidates taking Grade IX, X, IX examinations in 1948-49 was 5,867. In 1953-54 it had risen to 9,000. The number of teachers in training in 1948-49, 329; and in 1953-54 it had risen to 584; an increase of 255 teachers.

Our other departments, Mr. Chairman, which are doing exceedingly good work, i.e. audio-visual education. The director of this division informs me that in 1948-49 film audience was 246,145 at a total cost of \$47,678. This has risen in the last year to over a million

with an increase of less than \$10,000. That was due in part to the National Film Board assisting our Provincial Board here. Our Adult Education Centre catered to more than eight hundred people last year and extended their work to St. John's and Corner Brook Sanatorium and to the Orthopaedic Hospital here in St. John's. The organization of 4-H Clubs in Newfoundland is growing rapidly. Last year we had 19 4-H Clubs organized in this province. I may say also Mr. Chairman, one of the members of the 4-H Clubs brought us honour by winning an essay contest on some form of their club activities.

Our Vocational Education, under the guidance of the director, is now firmly established. I think the honourable members will remember this school was started originally to retrain war veterans. It has now fitted in so well catering to thousands who need vocational education that we have increased our present staff and have also partially completed a new addition to the university which is to become our new vocational school.

Of the major accomplishments of this Government in Newfoundland, in education may be mentioned, I think, possibly as the greatest, the granting of the charter to the university, the introduction of much better rates of remuneration for our teachers, the introduction of new pension schemes for teachers, the granting of membership privileges to Newfoundland Teacher's Association, the introduction of vocational education to supplement actual academic education; the provision of a curriculum, the expansion of audio-visual education the introduction of a comprehensive Regional High School policy, backed by a special grant of \$2,500,000 to be divided among the various educational authorities on a

per capita basis in annual instalments of half a million dollars. As a consequence the regional school movement is catching on in Newfoundland. Two are now in operation and several of the larger boards of education have plans for the erection of such schools in the near future.

The problem that the Department of Education has to face in the future is a severe one, Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that the increase in our school population is mounting on the average of five to six thousand pupils each year, necessitating a considerable outlay in capital expenditure. It is very difficult for this Government or any other Government to keep up with it. As a matter of fact in my office at the present time there are requests from various amalgamated school boards amounting to well over two million dollars. All are needed. It is very difficult to give them all, but we are doing our best to help out the most urgent cases, specifically in the larger centres where most of the people have moved today.

I thought, Mr. Chairman, these few remarks would help the members of this Committee in consideration of the Department of Education estimates.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I think we would be remiss in our duty if we did not say just a word of congratulation to the Honourable Minister that he should be able to give such a glowing report of the progress made by the schools and by this department generally in connection with education. It is encouraging indeed to hear something good coming out of Israel occasionally, and I do agree —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twice today.

MR. HOLLETT: I do agree, the Minister is very fortunate to be at-

tached to a department which can give us such an excellent report. We have to remember, of course, Mr. Chairman, we must not let these Ministers on the opposite side get puffed up too much. We have to remember, in the dirty old days of Responsible Government, whose Centenary we celebrate this year, our people did not have the money to do the things that should have been done. We also must not forget that this Government — and I note the Minister talks about the "Smallwood Government." I thought it was the "Liberal Government." At any rate I am very glad it is not the "Liberal" but the "Smallwood Government." He talks about the progress being made by the "Smallwood Government." We have to remember and remind them they had fifty million dollars hard cash, and they came in, in the midst of an era of prosperity, the like of which this country has never seen before, never witnessed. I do not say that to detract from the efforts made by the Minister and his department, because I think they have done an excellent job, and I think they would have done a very good job indeed even if they did not have the money necessary. But they have not enough now. They know that. We know that. They cannot supply all the teachers and cannot build all the schools without money. I hope and pray things will continue that way and we will always have a job to find teachers. That will show we are progressing and our population is increasing and will keep the Minister and his department on their toes to try and keep up with it.

I would like to express our appreciation for the Minister's remarks.

601 — Minister's Office — On motion carried.

602 — General Office — On motion carried.

603 — Accounting Office — on motion carried.

604 — School Supplies :

MR. BROWNE: This is a big increase. Have you got the actual expenditure for last year?

MR. CHALKER: That is \$428,800. The salaries are to be deducted from that total, Mr. Chairman, I think the actual expenditure is exactly what is there, Sir. I have not that with me at the present time. Approximately \$350,000 was the approximate expenditure on that item.

MR. BROWNE: That seems to be a big jump from \$350,000 to \$489,700. Is there some special reason?

MR. CHALKER: Just the additional increase in the number of pupils. Last year we ran out of two or three issues of books. We usually carry some over. This year we have to purchase more than the annual requirement.

604 — School Supplies, on motion carried.

605 — Supervisory Service :

MR. HOLLETT: I note there are twenty-two supervisors, is that correct?

MR. CHALKER: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: They travel the country all the time? I remember when I was a boy we had three supervisors altogether.

MR. CHALKER: How many people did you have?

MR. HOLLETT: Well, I think we had an average number of pupils. I think probably they went fishing earlier than we — They don't go fishing today, except troutng — they are being educated all the same to catch

fish. But it is just as well to remember our people did get an education, some of them, and most of them turned out to be most excellent citizens. I think we ought to remember these things as we go along. You have twenty-two supervisors going back and forth the country all the time. I should think the school services should be up to that many by reason of the fact you have that many people. I am not sure that conditions in the schools are really as good as they should be, judging by the failures in the CHE Examinations. I wonder whether the children are at fault or the system or whether it is the examiners or examinations are too stiff or what? I think if the Honourable Minister would look back he would find there was not nearly such a great percentage of failures in the CHE Examinations twenty-five and thirty years ago as there is today.

MR. CHALKER: I have been informed, Mr. Chairman, that the entire education authorities of the world are meeting up with the same trouble as we are here in Newfoundland. But for the honourable member's information: In 1948-49 in Grade XI Commercial we had 90% passes and in 1953-54 we had 90% passes in 1951-52 we had 90% passes.

MR. HOLLETT: I have mentioned back twenty-five years.

MR. CHALKER: I have not these figures.

MR. BROWNE: I think I could say something about longer ago than twenty-five years ago. The number of pupils, of course, increase enormously every year. I was looking at these figures here in this report, and I am very sorry Mr. Chairman, we have not sufficient time to be able to look into it in order to discuss the subject more fully. For instance in Grade XI — I re-

member distinctly forty years ago seeing the results of the CHE Examinations for an associate graduate at that time, and I think about fifteen passed or twenty at the most for the whole country. Now I notice that in 1953 there were two thousand enrolled. So you see that the increase in population and the increase in educational facilities has multiplied the number very considerably. Yet I am sure even the Minister and his officials must feel they are not doing enough, still there are many, many places in the country that are lacking in educational facilities. But I do believe that it is probably the best thing that the Government has done since it has been in office, the improvement in the Department of Education.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Three compliments in one day.

MR. BROWNE: Well, we are very fair and generous in our compliments.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is amazing. There is something going to happen.

MR. BROWNE: We don't mind passing out praise when it is deserved. We think in the Department of Education good work has been done, and I hope that it will continue to be done. When we come to another vote there, I think I shall have something to say about 4-H Clubs.

605 — On motion carried.

606 — Library Services:

MR. BROWNE: I would like to ask Mr. Chairman, if there are any expansion plans in connection with the library? As a member of the Library Board I am familiar with the organization and set up of that branch of the service. Have we done creating regional libraries, or are there more?

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, last year the Government passed over the control of libraries to the Library Board, and there is only one paid Civil Servant on the Board at the present time. I think that is the secretary, Mr. Newell. We still have regional libraries and still hope to expand them.

606 — carried.

607 — Correspondence Courses:

MR. BROWNE: Is that doing very much work? I do remember some years ago asking Dr. Frecker about people living in light-houses down by Cape Pine who found it very difficult to get to school. They were fifteen miles, I think, from a school, and I was wondering if anything could be done. Is the Minister in a position to say whether there is any improvement there?

MR. CHALKER: While still catering to the needs of children in various light-houses throughout the province, we have not enlarged this to any great extent, and don't visualize doing so in the near future.

607 — On motion carried.

608 — Training of Teachers: On motion carried.

609 — Teachers Pensions, etc.:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, is there any reason why the cost of living bonus should not be added.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, we are considering doing that now. We are working on that.

609 — On motion carried.

610 — Scholarships:

MR. BROWNE: I notice in the report of the Department of Education, Government scholarships are accorded

to second year university students of \$1,500 each, called after Dr. Paton, Dr. Burke, Dr. Curtis Dr. Blackall. Where do they show here?

MR. HEFFERTON: Under 610-05. On motion 610 scholarships carried.

611 — Vocational Training:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister, I believe, told us that during the past year some money was spent on the training of physically handicapped, according to an agreement which was made with Ottawa. I take it this \$20,000 is a vote for the present year?

MR. CHALKER: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Could the Minister tell us how that is being set up?

MR. CHALKER: There is a Committee, Mr. Chairman, made up of Welfare Educational and Health officials and, I think, Mr. Walter Davis is the secretary to that.

MR. BROWNE: Would there be some revenue on this coming from Ottawa to help in that?

MR. CHALKER: Fifty per cent of it.

611 — On motion carried.

612 — Handicrafts — On motion carried.

613 — Adult Education:

MR. BROWNE: In regard to (13), I don't know if this is the right time to bring up the question of Co-operative Education. I would like to know if anything is being done in that respect. It has been noted that it was going to be placed under the Memorial University College, and I believe somebody was brought in there to visit the Government in that respect, in regard to setting up an extension department.

I believe that the setting up of an extension department in the Memorial University and the giving of training on similar lines as that pursued in Government in the University of St. Francis Xavier University in Antigonish would be a great thing for this country. I would like to see that done. Is the Minister in a position to tell us what is being done?

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, we are now trying to set up this extension department of the university, and Dr. Gushue at the present time is looking for a man capable enough to do that job. It is a terrific job. They will take over such things as Jubilee Guild. We have some cases of a lot of duplication in our Government Departments and we hope with this extension department we can bind them into one group.

MR. BROWNE: The only reply I would like to make to that is, I think it is the same information as was given us last year. There does not seem to be much progress made.

MR. CHALKER: We still can't find a man.

MR. BROWNE: Is that the only thing holding it up?

MR. CHALKER: That is the only thing holding it up, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: What efforts have been made to find a man? Did you go to England? Over there they conduct similar work for workmen, and they are pretty well versed in co-operative unions too.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, I have every confidence in Dr. Gushue. He has done an excellent job at the university. He has some of the most capable professors you can find anywhere. He himself told me only a

short time ago; unless this department of extension has the right kind of man it would be absolutely useless to start it. He has been visited by Dr. Miller, who is consultant here with him, and he agrees a hundred per cent with Dr. Gushue. He has tried all over the world, from what I can understand, and by the look of his professors there, he has taken them from all over the world. I don't think he is sitting down on the job. It is a most particular job and has to have the foundation laid for it in the university, and he is waiting for that specialist to come along.

613 — On motion carried.

614 — Grants.

MR. BROWNE: In regard to 4-H Clubs, are there many of these? I saw a reference to their presence in the city on a convention. It is certainly a thing which ought to be encouraged.

MR. CHALKER: I may say they are active in nineteen communities, with five hundred members.

614 — On motion carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Have we passed 613: I wonder if I might go back to that for a second. Page 93 — \$57,400 — And again, \$15,000 on account of savings owing to late recruiting last year. I was under the impression the \$72,400 last year was at the end of the year, and would go back into the Consolidated Revenue, which means the vote should be the same as last year, if you want to get the money?

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, we have had great difficulty in getting help for that department of adult education. We have tried for a great number of years. We get one or two and they leave within a matter of a year and a half. This year we decided to

cut back to those we had working for us and bring the matter to the attention of the Cabinet in a month or so, to see if we can arrange a better system or a better scale of salaries to attract these people.

MR. HOLLETT: It is rather unfortunate to cut down on this grant for Adult Education. I am quite sure a good job was done, and I hate to see any cut in the grant for education.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, since I have been Minister of Education this thing has been brought forward from year to year. I thought it rather silly to show it again this year. We just won't get the help. It is not available.

MR. HOLLETT: The need is not there?

MR. CHALKER: The need is there, if we get the right help. We could fill it with inexperienced people, but that is a waste of money. We want to get good, well-educated people, trained for the specific job. As far as I am concerned, I would not want to have any person here not capable of working with the director and pushing the plans of the department. We feel it is better to leave it alone and do an appreciable job than to cover a big area.

MR. HOLLETT: You ought to be able to get teachers for Adult Education from other provinces or even might send the Minister of Provincial Affairs to England and Ireland to collect a couple over there.

MR. CHALKER: A case in point — We had a lady here from Washington, getting around five thousand dollars a year, and she left and went to Bagdad.

613 carried.

614 Grants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: These are large amounts and, I think, should be taken separately.

614-01 614-03 carried.

614 — 04 Maintenance, Repairs and Supplies.

MR. BROWNE: What does that apply to?

MR. CHALKER: That is given out \$100 per classroom, approximately to the Board of Education through their superintendents.

614-04 carried. 614-06 carried. 614-07 carried.

614 — 08 Colleges:

MR. HOLLETT: What is the cause of the increase there?

MR. CHALKER: That is the new salary scale the Government brought in last year.

614-08 carried. 614-10 Transportation:

MR. BROWNE: This vote was in for the first time last year — Could the Minister tell us how many buses they have in operation, and how much was spent on it last year, and how it is working?

MR. CHALKER: It is really brought in, Mr. Chairman for regional high schools. I think two or three are availing of it now the one at Foxtrap and the one in Placentia and other schools coming together for lack of teachers find it cheaper to transport the pupils to larger schools and close that small school. One at Quidi Vidi and one at Petty Harbour.

MR. BROWNE: Just hire the bus.

MR. CHALKER: Oh yes, we don't buy them.

MR. BROWNE: How much was spent on it last year?

MR. CHALKER: About fifty-six hundred dollars. We don't hire the buses but let the school board hire them. I believe it is 75% of the cost of transportation.

MR. HOLLETT: Could I refer back to 614-01 — salaries of teachers? There again Mr. Chairman, I notice that the cost of living bonus last year and this year has been added in, which will bring the appropriation up to five million dollars, approximately, which means only an increase of \$250,000 and with some 250 more teachers to take care of these and also to take care of the increases to all the teachers. Now these 250 teachers got only a thousand each, so I fail to see how you are going to get enough money out of that. How do you account for that, adding the cost of living bonus in?

MR. CHALKER: We can't, Mr. Chairman, tell exactly, due to the fact a number of teachers drop out and new ones are added. We always have a drop balance in that. We actually don't spend that amount. But that is the amount, which we have cut it down to this year. It is based on last year, it is based on certain months throughout the year. It is practically impossible to get the exact figures on it.

MR. HOLLETT: I think the Minister said there were 3,700 teachers with an average salary of \$1500.

MR. CHALKER: We cannot go by that average. There are so many getting a lot over and so many getting a lot less.

MR. HOLLETT: Surely the actual average salary divided into the number of teachers.

MR. CHALKER: It is rather dif-

ficult to explain. There is no discrepancy.

Carried.

614-02 Miscellaneous Grants:

02-13, 02-15 carried, 02-16 carried, 02-17 carried.

02-18 Assistance to Youth Organizations:

MR. HOLLETT: Are these local?

MR. CHALKER: The C.L.B., the Kinsmen's Club, etc., various youth organizations. They are, I think, given about fifty per cent or what they collect, roughly.

MR. HIGGINS: What is the basis for assistance?

MR. CHALKER: The number of children attending the various service clubs.

MR. HIGGINS: Physical education?

MR. CHALKER: That is right and recreational.

MR. HIGGINS: There is no provision for the athletic clubs under that.

MR. CHALKER: No.

614, on motion carried.

615 Audio-Visual Education:

MR. BROWNE: I notice you have a new officer, Grade VI, salary \$3,900. Do you find that necessary? Who is that.

MR. CHALKER: Well with the radio broadcast going ahead we find it necessary to get assistance to the present director, Mr. Kennedy. We only have a provision at the present time. That position will be advertised.

MR. BROWNE: I want to refer, Mr. Chairman, to 08-Documetary Films \$51,000. I wonder if the minister could explain that.

MR. CHALKER: It is the Government's policy, Mr. Chairman, to have movie pictures taken of the various activities in the institutions. We have one in education, one on natural resources, one on new industries, and this year we hope to have a new one made covering other information.

MR. BROWNE: Is this the "Five Years"?

MR. CHALKER: No it may be part of it. That could be for a number of films.

MR. HIGGINS: On 615-03-03 and 615-03-06, I think it rather seems they tie one with the other. Is that CBC radio scripts? Who writes these?

MR. CHALKER: We pay certain individuals to write these scripts for us.

MR. HIGGINS: Is it done by contract or what?

MR. CHALKER: Not necessarily, no.

MR. HIGGINS: Who appoints the script writers?

MR. CHALKER: They are selected by the director and the deputy minister.

MR. HIGGINS: Is the minister, Mr. Chairman, able to tell us whether they are satisfied they are getting the best return for that?

MR. CHALKER: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: In connection with the film, who passes it as proper to be sent out to the different schools?

MR. CHALKER: The various superintendents inspect all the films and they decide.

MR. BROWNE: Who prepares these films?

MR. CHALKER: They are brought in from various organizations, mostly, I think, the Canadian National Film Board.

MR. BROWNE: These are brought in are they—not prepared here?

MR. CHALKER: No.

MR. BROWNE: You do get a lot of films from the Film Board, don't you, on lend lease?

MR. CHALKER: On loan, yes.

MR. BROWNE: But it is still necessary to purchase these large amounts?

MR. CHALKER: Yes. I think we have twenty-seven hundred films. We have a library here.

MR. BROWNE: This is your first vote here, \$51,000.

MR. CHALKER: No. That is documentary films. The documentary films are entirely different, the other films are for various classrooms and clubs throughout the province, but the documentary films are to be made here.

MR. BROWNE: By Atlantic Films?

MR. CHALKER: I could not say.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Do the various superintendents pass on that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do—If you want to know. I am the one that passes on it?

MR. HOLLETT: I would not say the Premier is any judge.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is not the one who has to say so. It does not really matter what he thinks—it does not really matter.

MR. HOLLETT: I have grandchildren, and I think I do have something to say about it. I think the people in this country got something to say about it, and the Premier of the country can go ahead and make a film which is nothing only propaganda for himself and his party and send it to the school children. I will have something to say.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Say it now.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not forced to say whatever the premier wants me to say.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is one way to stop you.

MR. HOLLETT: His lovely laugh should be put on microfilm, I think.

MR. BROWNE: At any rate this documentary film is the one we were talking about yesterday? It is only one film?

MR. SMALLWOOD: A good picture. The honourable gentleman may not like it but it is a good picture.

MR. BROWNE: I would not mind seeing it if it gave the true story.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There again, truth is simply a matter of opinion.

MR. HIGGINS: That is what Pontius Pilate wanted to know.

MR. BROWNE: A modern Pontius Pilate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would be ashamed to say what the honourable

gentleman is a modern edition of—it begins with "J."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order—No personalities.

MR. BROWNE: I think the Honourable leader of the Opposition asked a question of the minister about the examinations results. There has been from time to time criticisms of the number of failures. I notice from a report in 1953-54 that the number of failures do seem to be very large. Has that been analysed so that an explanation can be given of the large number of failures?

DR. ROWE: 1920 was the largest number of failures.

MR. CHALKER: We are passing too many, obviously due to the scale methods we have incorporated in the department, and due to public criticism—

MR. BROWNE: Did I understand the minister to say we are passing too many? I might say here that all the provinces have similar difficulties because of the pressure on the lower school rooms, you see, they have to push pupils ahead. I know that in the City of Ottawa the inspectors from the Government came and told the teachers they had to pass more pupils so they could move ahead. Now are you having any difficulty like that?

MR. CHALKER: No.

616, on motion carried.

617. Encouragement of Cultural Activities: On motion carried.

618. Physical Fitness and Recreation:

MR. BROWNE: I believe they dropped that at Ottawa.

MR. CHALKER: That is dropped.

619. Curriculum Services:

MR. HOLLETT: Who is director of curriculum?

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Gough.

MR. HOLLETT: What I was about to say, Mr. Chairman, that for director of curriculum services, of the country I take it, you are not over-paying him. In my opinion, it is one of the most important jobs there would be in education or any other branches of the service. Certainly he is not paid on a par with some directors we have in this country, doing very little work. This is a very important job. A man who assumes that job should get more than he is getting there in this day and age. I don't know whether the government would consider that or not. I only mention it. I don't know the gentleman at all. I do know it ought to be an important service, and I think therefore the salary being paid there is not sufficient, if he is an efficient man he is not paid sufficient money.

619. On motion carried.

620. Temperance Education:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, does that come under the Minister of Education, and is he in a position to advocate the cause of temperance and further it by stricter regulations in regard to the redistribution of alcoholic beverages. I have received complaints recently that in some places there is no supervision and no police and even young boys, under the age of 21, and well under that age, can easily obtain large supplies of beer, and too much of it.

MR. CHALKER: That is the idea of this, Mr. Chairman, to educate the young fellows not to drink beer.

MR. BROWNE: How is it being carried out? Is there any supervision?

MR. CHALKER: We have a man here who is looking after this part of the Department of Education, and he has a committee which is now visiting all the various schools and showing various films of the evils of liquor. I am sure he is doing an excellent job, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HIGGINS: Is he showing anything of the evils of drinking essences?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I don't see anything so very funny about this myself. I speak as one who has some experience in alcoholic liquors. I don't see anything funny about it at all. I know that the government are big vendors of alcoholic beverages. I know they are the only sponsors in this country. They put in a vote of ten thousand dollars for the cause of temperance. I take it their interest is governed by a small grant of ten thousand dollars. I am not sure, if I were in the government I would approve of sending a man around to various schools teaching the merits of temperance. I don't believe that is the way. When I was a boy it did not do any good. I don't think that is the way at all. It has to be taught in a different way. If this is just a sinecure for somebody getting ten thousand dollars for nothing, then, of course, it should be cut out. I would like to stress the point that it is no laughing matter. I question the value of the vote anyway.

620. On motion carried.

Department of the Attorney General:
VII:

701. Minister's Office—On motion carried.

702. General Office: On motion carried.

703. Supreme Court: On motion carried.

704: St. John's Magistrate's Court:

MR. HIGGINS: I notice a director, Grave V, is that the magistrate? \$6,500. Is that the maximum?

MR. CURTIS: Just at the moment it is.

MR. HIGGINS: It seems to me, pardon my saying so, Mr. Chairman, that it is rather odd that a district magistrate of a district court which is not going to have any more work, if as much, as this particular court, is going to have a much larger salary. I don't think there is anybody in the civil service who performs as much work, and I don't expect the judges in the Supreme Court, as the St. John's magistrate in the District Court, or the St. John's District Court. I think the Attorney General has as much knowledge of that as I have. That man passes through something like eight or ten thousand cases in the run of a year, and on top of that he has everything from inquiries to releasing husbands from the lockup on Saturday night after they had been charged. I would suggest, when there is any revision he be borne in mind.

MR. BROWNE: Are there not some vacancies, which, I understand, the Attorney General is going to announce. Are these being filled?

MR. CURTIS: Not yet. They will be filled very shortly.

MR. BROWNE: You have not them budgeted for here. There does not seem to be any change in the number of magistrates?

MR. CURTIS: There are two vacancies and one died.

MR. BROWNE: Where are they located?

MR. HIGGINS: Magistrate Jones is one. And magistrate Hawco has been more or less retired for some time.

MR. CURTIS: We plan to appoint four.

705. Carried.

706. Deeds and Companies.

MR. HIGGINS: In connection with this new process for registration of documents, Mr. Chairman, will that necessitate additional help?

MR. CURTIS: I hope not. I expect the present staff will be able to look after it. They may need help in the beginning.

706. On motion carried.

707. Constabulary:

MR. HIGGINS: In that connection again, Mr. Chairman, there is provision for four district inspectors. As we all know, there are only three at the moment. Is it contemplated there will be another district inspector appointed?

MR. CURTIS: Yes.

MR. HIGGINS: Shortly?

MR. CURTIS: Yes.

MR. HIGGINS: There is another matter, Mr. Chairman, the police surgeon, \$1,500. I gather that fee is just for attendance on the police constables?

MR. CURTIS: That covers the fire department, police department, and I believe, the families.

MR. HIGGINS: Yes, I believe so. What I am trying to come to, Mr. Chairman, as you possibly know, some great difficulty in our courts lately with this business of drunken driving. People are brought in and they cannot get a doctor up. Up to a very short time ago the police had their own surgeon to attend to that work. I realize that it is today rather difficult to get a doctor who will go down to the police station when somebody is brought in like that. None the less it is becoming quite a problem. I think that the Attorney General will find, in reference to his own department, every day there are complaints from magistrates asking to pass on people who have not had any examination by a doctor. I don't know whether it is possible or practical to have the police surgeon now adopt the practice he had adopted hitherto. He used to do that work, and be paid in addition to his fees.

MR. CURTIS: We have had that matter under careful consideration. It seems to be very difficult now to get anyone. They are making too much money. We got to get down on our hands and knees now to get them to come over after ten o'clock in the night. Of course there are a lot of drunken parties after ten o'clock. I made arrangements where a doctor would come but he said he would come until 11:00.

MR. HIGGINS: Most of them are hooked on their way home after the night.

MR. CURTIS: Then we recommended another young doctor, but this fellow wanted to be paid so much, it is almost impossible to finance them. But the matter is one under consideration.

MR. HIGGINS: It is a matter of very real concern.

707 on motion carried.

708 Royal Canadian Mounted Police:

MR. BROWNE: There is an increase there of \$42,000.

MR. CURTIS: Yes. We had to increase the amount last year, Mr. Chairman. It was actually \$1,400 per head, and now it is \$2,000. Actually it must cost the Federal Government more than that.

708 — On motion carried.

709 Fire Department:

MR. HIGGINS: The fire marshal is not covered in this?

MR. CURTIS: No.

On motion 709 carried.

710 H. M. Penitentiary and Gaols:

MR. BROWNE: I am sure the Attorney General saw the article written on the Commissioner for Prisons, in which he praised the institution on the Salmonier Line. I have no doubt he must have been very much impressed with it, and I believe it has been doing great work. Is the Minister in a position to tell us how many prisoners are there, and if they produce food for themselves to any great extent compared with the costs?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, I would be glad, Mr. Chairman, to make a statement on that in the House during the present session. Now, I know is the proper time, but I actually have not the figures before me. This is a wonderful Institution, producing all its own food, practically, both vegetable and meats, milk and eggs and such food for other departments is also being produced there. The men who

go there are really getting an excellent training. Recently the Government added to the equipment there, a bulldozer. Now the people who are there are learning to operate a bulldozer, so that when they leave the institution they will be able to take a regular job as a bulldozer operator. I am very happy about that camp, and naturally very pleased with the report on it.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to know the Salmonier Prison Camp is so satisfactory. But can the Honourable the Attorney General tell me, what is the present state of the Harbour Grace gaol?

MR. CURTIS: It is not being used.

MR. HIGGINS: It should not be.

711 Miscellaneous: On motion carried.

712 Consolidation of Statutes:

MR. CURTIS: That is for the index of the statutes.

MR. BROWNE: When will it be ready?

MR. CURTIS: I think the printing is all done, and it is only a matter of being bound.

On motion 712 carried.

713 — Transportation:

MR. CURTIS: That is the Transportation Commission. We are members and pay \$6,000 a year as members, and for travel in connection with the Maritime Trade meetings at Moncton. It comes under my department.

MR. BROWNE: It should not be there at all.

MR. CURTIS: Where should it be?

MR. BROWNE: In the Department of Trade and Commerce.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Matters of trade and commerce come under the Attorney General because he requested himself to handle all matters of transportation. This is the Maritime Commission. The Board of Trade contributes and the money they get from us with which to do it. Our Newfoundland Board of Trade is a member of the Maritime Board of Trade and Maritime Transportation Commission, and their fee they pay they receive from us in this vote here.

MR. CURTIS: This is a miscellaneous amount too—in the past it covered Gerald Murphy's fees and expenses, and it is to cover general transportation.

MR. BROWNE: What became of the action which was to be taken against the Canadian National Railway to recover freight rates? Has that been dropped?

MR. CURTIS: No it has not been dropped.

On motion 713 carried.

715 Fire Commissioner:

MR. BROWNE: Is the Minister in a position to tell us how the appointment of fire commissioner worked out during the past year? Was there very much done or not?

MR. CURTIS: Yes. It worked out very satisfactorily, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ryan has proven to be a very competent and capable official, and he has been extraordinarily useful. Every time there is a fire you find him on hand. Very recently, just about a month or so ago, there was some gasoline wasted in the harbour by the Americans, and he was on the job. He is gradually taking over all the inquiries into fires and he has proven to be most valuable.

On motion 715 carried.

716 District Courts;

MR. HIGGINS: These two officers, grade IV, what are these to be?

MR. CURTIS: They are not all to be appointed just yet. We are feeling our way. As the honourable member knows, each district court judge has a secretary, and she is acting both as clerk and secretary, but we may have to appoint more officers as the need appears.

MR. HIGGINS: There actually has not been any court set up as yet, has there?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, the court is all set up.

MR. HIGGINS: Have they found quarters for Judge Whelan, for instance?

MR. CURTIS: We have the court all set up in the Constabulary building; only temporary but very comfortable.

MR. HIGGINS: When is it to be opened?

MR. CURTIS: We hoped to have it opened about three weeks ago, but when we got the Rules Committee to meet we found there had to be amendments in the Act before that — There is a Bill before the House at the moment, and after it is assented to there is nothing to prevent the court going into action immediately.

MR. HIGGINS: May I ask, will these courts have regular times like the Supreme Court, or will they operate like the Magistrate Courts?

MR. CURTIS: I am hoping they will operate continuously, and in time take on circuits. We are feeling our way in connection with this thing, and

I cannot be too definite just now. The intention is that they will be sitting continuously and will take circuits from time to time.

On motion 716 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Attorney General is in a position to give the expenditure for his department. It seems to me we should have that up to March 31, 1955. Has he got that available?

MR. CURTIS: I think last year we spent our entire vote with the exception of \$30,000, which was a drop balance. That is my recollection. There was a drop balance last year of about \$30,000. We spent roughly about \$1,650,000.

Department of Mines & Resources - VII:

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move we defer this, Mr. Chairman, and go on to page 44 — Department of Public Works.

Department of Public Works: IX:

901 Minister's Office: On motion carried.

902 General Office: On motion carried.

903 Accounting Office: On motion carried.

904 Registration of Motor Vehicles:

MR. HOLLETT: There is an increase there of \$9,000.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): That is due to a normal increase. Year after year, Mr. Chairman, as I think the Committee will appreciate, the volume of work of the Registration of Motor Vehicles Department obviously increases, and every year at the registration period we send

a man to one or two or the larger centres, which of necessity entails the staff here where the largest centre is. So, extra assistance is taken on each year for about three months, to take care of that. That is the answer.

On motion 904 carried.

906 Buildings:

MR. BROWNE: Under extra assistance there \$20,190?

MR. SPENCER: As the Committee will note, Mr. Chairman, in 906 under "Buildings" on page 100, there are two additional employees. These create a certain amount of the \$20,190 extra assistance. Then the same thing applies with regard to engineers. Incidentally, the two, increasing the total from 70 to 72 on page 144, are an additional fireman and caretaker, one of which will be assigned to the new vocational building, for example, but there are five of these caretakers instead of three in that particular group.

906-01 on motion carried; 906-02 on motion carried.

906-03 Maintenance of Public Buildings etc.:

MR. BROWNE: Now we have the amount spent last year. It is very much in excess of that amount — Is that regular maintenance?

MR. SPENCER: Yes, this is just maintenance.

MR. BROWNE: What is the position in regard to Canada House? I notice \$3,000, the Government keeps Canada House?

MR. SPENCER: Oh yes, the Government looks after that House, in the main the \$3,000 that you see there is for cleaning in connection with the offices of the Department of Economic Development.

MR. BROWNE: That much is not spent in cleaning?

MR. SPENCER: Well you have only \$3,000 there. There has to be a couple of cleaners there to work.

MR. BROWNE: How much was spent there last year?

MR. SPENCER: A note from the department says — This is a main vote which must cover the exterior and interior. That is one particular item, Canada House. This heading covers all the votes, all these various activities.

906-03-01 on motion carried. 906-03-02:

MR. HOLLETT: What is the magistrate's residence, \$11,000? What is that for?

MR. SPENCER: That would be carpentry work in magistrates' residences.

MR. HOLLETT: I believe there is a new magistrate's residence at Twillingate?

MR. SPENCER: That is right, during the past year.

MR. HOLLETT: That was built by the Government. Who were the contractors?

MR. SPENCER: I am informed that it would be a local contractor at Twillingate did the job. You may be quite sure we always try to get local contractors where possible. I don't know any better place to get carpentry work done, where every man builds his own house.

The Committee will find, Mr. Chairman, there is a vote this year for one additional magistrate's residence. We will come to that a little later on.

MR. HOLLETT: Could the Minister tell us what was done in connection

with asking for tenders for building of that magistrate's court at Twillingate. Was it published?

MR. SPENCER: Tenders were invited in the press, and naturally the award would go to the lowest tender. At least that is the practice of the department. I cannot tell you who it was. But I know it was some contractor in Twillingate. If the honourable member wishes to have that, there is no reason why we could not get it.

MR. HOLLERT: The reason I asked; I have been informed, notice for tenders was not properly published at Twillingate, and before it was known there the contract had been let. Now I don't mind telling the Honourable Minister — I don't think he would allow it to happen if he knew it. But my information is, there was no publication of tenders in that area. It was, I believe, sent to the magistrate, and what happened after that I don't know. Anyhow the Minister could probably find out about that.

MR. BROWNE: How much was spent on Government House, repairs and maintenance?

MR. SPENCER: \$16,000 was just about what was expended.

906-03-02 on motion carried. 906-03-04: Alterations etc. of existing Public Buildings.

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a big vote here with an increase of \$152,000 more than last year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What was the actual expenditure?

MR. SPENCER: \$300,000 last year. There was a supplementary vote there.

MR. BROWNE: There was \$199,000 voted for supplementary, was it on that vote.

MR. SPENCER: Yes, I understand there was some Supplementary Supply voted to cover that, but there was some savings on that supplementary vote, or there was some savings on some other sub-heads, used to get some savings on this particular vote. There is one large increase Roads Depots, \$77,500, an increase of \$60,000. That is distributed amongst the four districts, Mr. Chairman.

906-03-04 on motion carried.

906-03-06 Rentals:

MR. SPENCER: These are merely rentals and expenses that are paid in connection with various buildings of the Government.

MR. BROWNE: I notice here on page 103 a vote of \$625,500. Light, Heat Power. What is the meaning of that vote?

MR. SPENCER: That is the actual estimate.

MR. BROWNE: It was \$585,000 last year.

906-03-06 on motion carried.

906-03-07: Cleaning: on motion carried.

906-03-08: Rates for Protection and Water: On motion carried.

906-03-09 Fuel:

MR. BROWNE: Does the Government tender each year for the supply of fuel?

MR. SPENCER: That is done through the Department of Supply. We ask the Department of Supply and they in turn invite the tenders.

MR. BROWNE: Is it done that way? I want to know.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs & Supply) : Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE : Is it done for all the institutions in St. John's at the same time or for the separate institutions? How is it done?

MR. HEFFERTON : The Department of Public Works sends a requisition for various supplies and these are lumped together and then tenders are called for them, and specified delivery, as and when required.

MR. BROWNE : And people tender, do they? You award it to the lowest tender?

MR. HEFFERTON : That is the normal proceeding.

MR. BROWNE : Does the department still tender for items over a certain value? What is the minimum value now, under which they do not tender? It used to be five hundred dollars at one time.

MR. SPENCER : Generally over a thousand dollars. In the meantime there are certain jobs which might be undertaken, such as maintenance, and the amount is unforeseen. It is physically impossible for anybody to estimate what they may amount to, for instance repairing old pipes and that sort of thing. The honourable member and the Committee will understand, once one starts repairs one never knows what one is up against. In such cases the practice of the department is to maintain or provide the work, say for the General Hospital, through some particular firm of plumbing and heating engineers, who have been at the work for years, and who get that work because they know every little gasket and other items in the building. I think the firm that does that work in the General Hospital

is a firm by the name of Donnelly, who have been doing the General Hospital for many, many years.

906-03-10. On motion carried.

906-03-12. Miscellaneous. On motion carried.

906-03-13. Unallocated stores On motion carried.

907. Roads and Bridges :

MR. BROWNE : The director Grade IX, is that Mr. French?

MR. SPENCER : Yes.

MR. BROWNE : Who is the second one there?

MR. SPENCER : Mr. Knight and the third one is Mr. Jacobson.

MR. BROWNE : Is he a new man not here before?

MR. SPENCER : He has been here two years. Now he has been with us three or four years approximately.

MR. HIGGINS : Is Mr. Conroy in that department?

MR. SPENCER : No, he is under "Buildings." The first one listed on page 100, Director, Grade V.

MR. HOLLETT : While on this, Mr. Chairman, there are some remarks which I should like to pass along to the minister, they are able men and courteous with anybody who has anything to do with them. I found them so during the past two or three years. The only trouble, of course, they don't get enough money allocated to us in our district. I hope the minister sees fit this year to get plenty of money to fix up our roads. I assure him he is the proper person in his department to take care of it.

907-01, 907-02, on motion carried.

907-03 :

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister is in a position to give any information about what work is to be done in St. John's this year.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, the committee will note \$2,400,000 listed on page 131. This amount is for maintenance of roads and bridges, and is divided amongst the four districts throughout the island. District No. 1, the Avalon Peninsula received \$817,500. District No. 2 Clarenville \$668,500. District No. 3, Grand Falls \$382,000 and District No. 4, Deer Lake, \$465,000. These are not necessarily the political districts but the districts in which the engineer or district superintendent in that area takes care of the roads. This is plus a small amount distributed to various magistrates. Now it is absolutely impossible for us to have here with us the detailed distribution of that money. That is \$817,500 this year for the District of St. John's, and is placed under the heading and under the jurisdiction of the district superintendent, Mr. Crummev, who has a very very expensive piece of territory to cover. And as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has been kind enough to say, he is a very competent and courteous official.

MR. HOLLETT: All his staff too.

MR. SPENCER: He travels a tremendous amount and does a great volume of work. But to tell how much is spent, say, on the Southside Road or Broad Cove or on the Torbay Road or any other section, we would have to go back through the accounts in order to get that. It can be obtained. If the honourable mem-

ber wishes to have it, and produces the question, we will gladly produce the answer.

MR. BROWNE: I thought the minister might have that information here now. We would like to see what is being spent in our district, say, in comparison with other districts on Avalon Peninsula, St. John's East and West, Harbour Main, Port de Grave, Harbour Grace, Carbonear, Bay de Verde, Trinity North and South, and Placentia up to Whitbourne. How is the money spent? Surely, what is the sense being here if we don't know what is spent in our district. We got some idea of what was spent in these districts last year. The minister gave us a report of what was spent by local committees. That is not nearly so important as what was spent under this vote. I would like to see what was spent and what is going to be spent this year.

MR. SPENCER: I repeat, Mr. Chairman, it is rarely if ever that it does come in here unless there be notice of question given. I think it is generally known that of the large mileage of roads to be maintained the district superintendent has set a standard, and he has set that at about \$450 per mile for maintenance of dirt roads or earth roads. It may happen that one particular section on one road would not receive that amount but perhaps in a year or two would receive more than double that amount. I would like to call the committee's attention to the case of the Portugal Cove Road, leading from St. John's to Portugal Cove. Some at least of the committee will understand that road has never been built properly in the sense that paved highways are built. It is merely graded roughly and a coat of oil poured on. That type of

maintenance is very high. In fact it is one of the headaches of the department. If we were in a position to obtain the necessary money to make a capital job of such roads that cost as much as four to seven thousand dollars per mile for maintenance, and that is exactly what Portugal Cove Road cost us last year. We have a similar case each year in the section between Seal Cove and Holyrood. I don't need to describe it. Honorable members know it as well as I do. Every year it costs us a tremendous amount, as much as four thousand dollars per mile, because there is a tremendous amount of traffic there, to make it a dust-free road. Now the ordinary maintenance, which we have not got in detail, is in the main \$350 to \$450 a mile. That takes care of patrolmen and others who look after the maintenance.

MR. HIGGINS: I am glad to hear the minister say they spend as much as \$350 to \$450 a mile. Quite truthfully driving over the Torbay Road, once you leave the highway after passing the airport, the layman at least would get the impression that there has not been \$350 spent on the whole road in the past five years.

MR. SPENCER: He would not know much about it, would he?

MR. HIGGINS: As you say, he certainly would not know very much. But I can say this: if any real money was spent there, Mr. Chairman, it is certainly not apparent to the person who drives over it. I agree with the minister they have done a good job on Portugal Cove Road. But I have a constituent in Gooseberry Lane who complains bitterly about the way the place is neglected. Not later than today a resident of that place accosted me to know, what is the matter with

Public Works they do nothing at all with that road. If the minister would be a little more, I say, humane and personal in connection with the rest of these roads, I think something could be done. But in all seriousness, Sir, I do feel, and I think the minister himself would be the first to agree, the network of roads in St. John's is in a very sad state of disrepair, with the exception of that strip of road running from St. John's to the entrance to Torbay Airport on Torbay Road. The rest is dirt road and at this time of the year, when it is not a sea of mud it is a rocky river. I do hope he is going to make some plans to do something for us this year.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, the minister says, with the present policy being adopted towards the maintenance of roads all over the island—Is his policy of road repairs and so on the best that can be adopted? There seems to be a terrific wear and tear every year—I wonder if the minister could give us some idea.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I don't care to take up the time of the committee at this moment except to say very briefly, that anybody who would have the care and the worry, if you like, trying to find the necessary money to maintain all the roads which we in Public Works, or perhaps, in Newfoundland, would be a better way to put it, have to try and maintain the present roads, I can assure the committee we are not very happy about having to spend so much as \$450 per mile on maintenance on certain sections of road, nevertheless it becomes essential that it be done.

MR. HOLLETT: That is a dirt road?

MR. HIGGINS: No, that is the dustless road?

MR. SPENCER: The earth road does not cost as much as that, as I have already intimated. The great difficulty is that we are unable to provide, with our revenue, the great sums of money necessary to make capital expenditure and rebuild all these roads at any one time. So that we can only carry on as best we can to that end. Now I will admit, and the committee is well aware, that is a very very expensive job. I don't take any credit for it, but I know something about what has been done around Newfoundland, and particularly in the outlying sections. More of our people today are connected by road than ever before, and we hope that by the end of the year there will be still more. That is obvious. But because of that great need, sufficient money cannot be obtained to rebuild all those expensive pieces, such as the section I referred to, between St. John's and Portugal Cove. If we want to rebuild that piece of road and make it a paved proposition, I can say to the committee now, pulling a figure out of the air, it would cost roughly a million to a million and a quarter dollars. That type of funds, unfortunately, are not always available. So we have to try and maintain to the best of our ability, with a view to keeping the service going and extending it where possible.

MR. HIGGINS: Would the minister be good enough to say whether or not he contemplates doing anything on the Torbay or Pouch Cove Road at all this year?

MR. SPENCER: My reply to that, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. Every year we vote to grant money to that road. The honourable member who represents a portion of that district knows that for the last three or three

and a half years, a unit, opening perhaps I could say, east of Torbay (he would understand what I mean)—trying to get the road improved between Pouch Cove and Torbay. Only Thursday last I received a call, just ahead of the snow storm, from a gentleman in Pouch Cove, saying that now the frost was out of the road, and the road had received such a terrible trimming from heavy traffic that it was really very difficult for them to get over it. We sent a grader down, and the grader got nearly in to Torbay, but did not get beyond Torbay at all, and returned to the department unable to accomplish anything worth while. Part of the reason is, as the honourable gentleman himself has observed, we are right down to bedrock in that section of the road between Torbay and the Airport, and before we were able to get the grader beyond Torbay we had this other twelve or fourteen inches of snow, and of course it will be another week or so before it dries sufficiently to get the grader down there again. These things are happening every year where there are soft roads. But I would say to the honourable gentleman that it is the intention of the department to try and rebuild that road all the way to Pouch Cove. That is a policy we set up three or four years ago, and we are hoping to do as much as we can each year to that end. Last year there was some forty thousand dollars distributed in that area. This year there will be about the same amount. As far as I know, we have not the breakdown of the figures yet, it will be something of that order again this year. But that is the purpose to try and rebuild that road all the way to Pouch Cove. We have the same thing in connection with the road going to St. Phillips, the Thornburn Road. We had a vote for

that last year, several jobs were done down there. I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is well aware that several very good jobs were done in that area last year. For instance a new and complete concrete bridge was built across the river leading to the little community to the west of St. Phillips, and a road division made there. There was a very considerable sum spent on it. There is much more needed, and we hope we can continue to do more each year.

MR. BROWNE: It is very nice to hear the minister express the fond hope. In the meantime the road to St. Phillips is not very good, I have been over it in the last month or so, and it is pretty bad in spots. I have seen it worse, of course. Around St. John's you have the greatest traffic and is the minister in a position to say whether any paving is being done in this area at all this year?

MR. SPENCER: No.

MR. BROWNE: Is there any paving being done in the country this year?

MR. SPENCER: There may be, very little. Very few roads are in condition to be paved at this time.

MR. BROWNE: I think it is regrettable a certain amount is not done every year. What happens to the equipment?

MR. SPENCER: There is not a great volume of equipment lying up, the honourable member should be aware of that.

MR. BROWNE: I am not aware of that. I am not aware if you have equipment for road building. Perhaps you don't do the building yourselves. The road to Bay Bulls and

Big Pond and out in that direction was that not done by Concrete Products?

MR. SPENCER: Just the resurfacing and paving, which was done by contract.

MR. BROWNE: Then you don't contemplate anything this year?

MR. SPENCER: Yes. We hope to continue on in that direction as far as we can go, beyond where we finished last year.

MR. BROWNE: I am very glad to hear that.

MR. MURRAY: So am I.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The member of the district is glad, and gladder than either, will be the people.

MR. BROWNE: Of course. I advocated the thing and hoped the government would give more attention to it years ago. As the minister knows, four years ago. It was in his mind then to go as far as Witless Bay. How far are you planning on going this year?

MR. SPENCER: I am unable to say. We will go as far as the distribution of funds will allow. That is something I could not answer. It might be three or four or five miles.

MR. BROWNE: When is the minister going to make the allocations?

MR. SPENCER: The vote is not through yet. We never make allocations until the House tells us how much money we are to have.

MR. BROWNE: As the honourable minister knows, the House very seldom interferes with the recommendations of the minister.

MR. SPENCER: It is nice to know that.

MR. BROWNE: He does not need me to tell him. At any rate, in regard to the question I asked him here, if he could get the figures showing what was done in the district of St. John's West, we will say during the past year, and what he proposed to do in the district of St. John's West during the coming year—if he will be good enough to do that.

MR. SPENCER: Just as soon as the allocations are made. If the honourable gentleman wants the answer to the question. I would suggest that he table the question and we will, as always, endeavour to get the answer.

MR. BROWNE: I thought that while we were on the estimates would be the proper place, and should be the proper place. Personally I think that while on these estimates we should have here before us what was spent on the various roads last year. I don't see any reason why we could not have it.

MR. SPENCER: We never bring it in then.

MR. BROWNE: It used to be done years ago, and I don't see any reason why not.

MR. SPENCER: It is much more work — unable to do it maybe —

MR. BROWNE: In the meantime the members don't know what has been done, all we receive is a lump sum for the four districts, and we don't know — and I ask the Minister he can't tell me.

MR. SPENCER: I don't know either.

MR. BROWNE: Who knows if the Honourable Minister does not, and

how can we know if we don't ask the questions?

MR. SPENCER: You would not expect me, and I don't think the honourable and learned gentleman, with all due respect to the learned gentleman's ability, knows every Act on the statute books in this country — neither do I know where every dollar goes and how much is spent on every road throughout the country. But the information is there, and, with all due respect to the honourable and learned gentleman, we will gladly supply any figures we have if we get notice of question. It has never been the practice since we have been in office, nor since I have been in this House, to come in and say we spent so much money last year on some particular job. But we can find out, if the honourable and learned gentleman wants to know. The record is here. I assure you we have an efficient staff, and will do everything we can to supply the answer.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I think one reason why my honourable and learned friend would like to know that, if he is wondering if it would not be in the interest of the country — For instance, take the section of road from here to St. Phillips — In that district would it not be more economic, while that road is fairly good and easily put in condition for paving, to spend a few extra dollars on that this year and pave it?

MR. SPENCER: You cannot pave it for a few thousand dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: Well in the eyes of the Government, I would say, a few thousand dollars is a terrible amount of money. There is a very good road there, and it is a very nice drive, and there are seventy or eighty thousand people in the area, and that road

would be used most extensively. The scenery over around that way is very beautiful, the difficulty is the road. I am quite sure that the Department of Public Works would in the long run, over a period of five or six years, save a tremendous amount of money.

MR. SPENCER: On any one road, I agree, if we could afford to do it. But there are so many other things, we can't afford to do it.

MR. HOLLETT: A lot of people, you see, would be serviced by that road, and I believe it would be a good outlay.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "Served" not "Serviced" by the road.

MR. HOLLETT: They would be serviced by the road.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hope no road ever starts servicing us.

MR. HOLLETT: I do not get the point. No, Mr. Chairman, I am not joking at all about this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the honourable and learned member for St. John's West demonstrated he is more like a mink than I am.

MR. HOLLETT: If the Honourable the Premier wants to speak he can get up and I will sit down, I am speaking about roads, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to put forward that idea to the Minister — I don't believe it would take a tremendous amount to pave that road.

MR. SPENCER: I can tell the honourable gentleman right now, and the Committee, Mr. Chairman (without standing up, if necessary) (I don't want to take the floor) we cannot prepare the surface of any roads of the type required in here and pave it for less than thirty thousand dollars per

mile. That is not to build the road, but to put a resurfacing on it and pave it. Now how much, you have fifteen miles of road. Have you thought about that? That is \$450,000 to pave St. Phillips Road this year.

MR. HOLLETT: How much would you save in a few years?

MR. SPENCER: And how many other miles do you deny the public of the country, to get it built?

MR. HOLLETT: You have already spent \$841,000 to build a dirt road from Buchans and that is not done yet.

MR. SPENCER: It is forty-two miles.

MR. HOLLETT: And you spent \$840,000 right? I hope that road will be there. What I am trying to point out is that this road would serve the purpose of an awful lot of people, thousands, eighty thousand people here — And I suggest you pay some attention to that now, if you want to capture them — You made a new district out of that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there was a vote yesterday of \$394,000 in Supplementary Supply for roads for last year. Is the Minister in a position to say the total expenditure on that item? What was the total expenditure under the heading last year, maintenance of roads and bridges?

MR. HEFFERTON: \$2,400,000.

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Chairman, there should be some time when we could discuss this question of policy that the Minister has referred to. Surely when we consider the tremendous increase in motor traffic taking place in the last five or six years, in comparison between the mileage then and what was paved and the mileage

now, it is to the disadvantage of motor cars. At any rate there is less mileage per car in existence today, that is paved and fit for cars to go over, than there was six years ago. How many paved roads have been added to the country's paved roads in the last six years? Is the Minister in a position to tell us? That is since they have been in office.

MR. SPENCER: Possibly about fifteen miles.

MR. BROWNE: That is very small.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I think I must refer to one point raised by the honourable and learned gentleman — He has admitted that he realizes the need for these paved roads, and that we are fairly familiar with the process, but if we were to extend the theory advanced by the honourable and learned gentleman, and were to pave the roads in this area, where we have the larger or major number of motor vehicles, we would still have 250,000 of our Newfoundland people around the coastline with not even a trail, or, in most cases, with trails that they had, to go either to their churches or schools or elsewhere. Prior to this administration coming into office there had been some thirty millions of dollars spent on roads. Since this administration came into office, it is quite true, that there has been something of the order of, I am speaking from memory, fifteen hundred miles of road and connecting roads built in outlying districts of Newfoundland. Today very large sections have at least some semblance of roads, not necessarily what we would like to have, but at least they have some. It is true and I have said this before, and I say it again, that the Avalon Peninsula has not fared too badly as far as the number of roads are concerned prior to the present administration coming into

office. It is true they may not have received much attention and maintenance and repairs since we came in office, but they have been maintained. Three quarters of a million dollars and more every year is voted for maintenance of roads in here in addition to reconstruction votes. So that it is not true to say they are left neglected, but quite the reverse. But it is true an effort has been made to connect the larger and greater populations of Newfoundland in sections where no such thing as a road existed before. I think the honourable gentleman and the Committee generally will appreciate that comment.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we appreciate it, and we appreciate the difficulty too of the roads, not only on Avalon but all over the country. I would point out that the large populations on the Avalon Peninsula have very limited roads. There is a huge number of cars but no place for cars to go. If we suggest paving the section around to St. Phillips and Portugal Cove I don't think we are suggesting anything unreasonable, and our suggestion might be adopted. The Honourable Minister was in England relevant to the road situation over there, and a comparison with our roads, I wonder if he would care to say something on that?

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I think, in due deference to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I might just say that is true. On my vacation last year I took occasion to study some of the road building methods in the Old Country. Today, I hope, within a hundred miles or so of the city of St. John's, is a soil technician, whom I hope to have establish here in the very near future. He left England on the 15th, I believe. It is my very sincere hope, and the hope of

the department that we can benefit by bringing this gentleman to do some soil testing for us. It is not going to be a cure for all our ills, but I do think we can do a certain amount of permanent work there with regard to the large number of roads in this area. I have spoken about that before, and I recall an address given to Rotary about a year ago or less, in which I stated to the public, on that occasion, that it would be my desire to see a complete loop from St. John's leading to Pouch Cove and back by the Bauline Line, or some similar route, and a similar one out to the west all the way through to, perhaps, Bay Bulls, across Witless Bay Line and back to Holyrood. That would be very fine. I hope yet that we will see that and in the not too distant future. But the Honourable gentleman knows we are unable to provide the necessary funds. I just about incurred the wrath of my colleagues this year, although every one of them want roads built, when I brought my vote in to the Minister of Finance and the Cabinet.

The estimate that we requested for roads was such a tremendous amount it was obvious to me, even before we brought it in, that we could not get that amount. But the figures we had there were merely figures to supply the demands listed in our office from time to time. We keep a complete list of every demand that is made, and I only wish we could get the money to complete them. Our vote this year is clearly higher than last year, and I hope we can continue to go on in that manner, but to get the money we want this year, with the exception of the Trans-Canada Highway, we could spend twenty million dollars and not satisfy the demands of the people. Nevertheless the people are appreciative of what has been done. It is ut-

terly impossible to do it all at one time. Obviously my colleagues in the Government could not give me twenty million dollars, so I had to settle for what my colleagues were prepared to recommend to the House, and I sincerely trust we give good value for the money we are about to receive.

MR. HOLLETT: I thank the Honourable Minister for the statement he has made, and I do hope he will include that particular area I was talking about in his policy in the near future, if he does not we will have to do it.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to say that I appreciate the work the Government has done in regard to the extension of roads around the island. It must be a dreadful thing in these places to have no roads. I am glad to see the new roads being built. It seems to me today, like in regard to education, everybody is road conscious, and the tremendous increase in the use of motor transportation brings forward the policy of road building and improvement. The Minister happens to be in charge of the department on which most of the demands are made for improved services, and has a tremendous responsibility. We all realize that. Nevertheless, it seems to me he must try to figure out how these demands may be met. In the Province of Nova Scotia I have seen resolutions passed by certain communities where people pursue farming, agricultural populations, protesting against any more paved roads, saying what the province needed was dirt roads, these were good enough. These were communication roads. But Nova Scotia has several hundred miles, I think fifteen hundred miles of paved roads. It has a very complete road system. But they have a system there of financing the roads. There are loans for road-building, money bor-

rowed especially and allocated to road building, and revenues coming in from gas and motor taxes are all allocated to finance that particular thing.

Now I don't know if the Government has given any consideration to that proposition here. It seems to be wise. Then the Government would be in a position to say how much of the revenue coming in to them can be allocated to be spent on roads, and road money borrowed for roads allocated in that fashion. I only just mention it, but the Minister I think would follow my mind. For instance there is the taxation on gasoline that is going to be used by motor cars, well, it should go to financing the roads in some fashion or other, and all gasoline taxes collected from motor vehicles should be used in that way. I think the time is coming when the Government as a whole will have to give more serious consideration — I know they spend a good deal of money on roads — but certainly to the building of more permanent roads; I am sorry that only a small amount is being done this year, and I wish the Minister could see his way clear to do more.

MR. SPENCER: Does the honourable member think the money received for taxation on gasoline and motor cars is not spent, and more?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that in any province of Canada the revenue that is taken in on account of roads, under all headings, is equal to the expenditure of that province on roads. I don't think there is a province in Canada, and I doubt that there is a State in the United States of America where the revenue under all headings from roads is equal to the expenditure of that Province or that State on roads. In fact there is a great burden on the

treasury on account of roads in every Province and in every State of the American Union.

MR. BROWNE: I believe I have the figures downstairs. As far as that goes, I know they have their highroads department separate.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Minister would have anything to say on the local roads programme, how it is progressing, and is it a good policy?

MR. SPENCER: In connection with local roads programme, Mr. Chairman, this year we have a vote of \$225,000 for it, which is exactly the same as we had last year. Before the House closes, I hope to bring in a report showing the details of the expenditure of the local roads. At this time I would like to pay tribute to the people generally who are co-operating with the department in such a splendid manner (I say generally) in giving back the land which belongs to the Crown in order that the roads may be improved. There are only a few, one or two, or maybe a half dozen here and there who still persist in demanding their pound of flesh, as Shylock did, but in the main the people are co-operating very largely. They know the advantage of good roads; and we are endeavouring to give them to them.

MR. HOLLETT: That is done on a fifty-fifty basis, dollar for dollars, is it not?

MR. SPENCER: No, it does not work out that way completely, I would say it works out more like two-thirds and one-third.

MR. BROWNE: Is the minister in a position to answer a question about any particular road—I brought up last year, and I think the Minister of Finance will be interested in this, the

road from Fairhaven to Tickle Harbour Station, on the highroad. Does the minister know if that has been built or how much of it is built? I believe a certain amount of work was done on it. I don't know if it was finished or not.

MR. SPENCER: All I can say there, Mr. Chairman, is that the request has been in for a road from Fairhaven, a little community along the coast of Placentia Bay, somewhat farther in the bay than Argentia. A request came in to get a road from there up to the highroad, because the railway is about a total distance of about nine miles. There is a very small population. The department has undertaken a survey with a view to trying to get that particular road on the programme sometime in the near future. I don't think there was any construction actually done on it.

MR. BROWNE: I had a letter saying there was.

MR. SPENCER: It must have been on the local road basis.

On motion items 907-03-01, 907-03-02 carried.

907-03-05. Erection of Highway Signs:

MR. HOLLETT: That is one thing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw attention to, highway signs. I wish the department would endeavour to get more of these erected. It is very difficult for people going around.

MR. SPENCER: We are making an entirely new effort this year.

MR. HOLLETT: I am glad of that.

907-03-06. Snow Clearing:

MR. HIGGINS: In that connec-

tion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to publicly express to the minister my thanks, on behalf of the people of Flat Rock, for the job he did this year. For some years past it has been found in practice, I think, the plow was unable to go through the village of Flat Rock because of the fact there was danger that the plow would do damage to fences. This year when I approached the minister he said: "Will you get an undertaking from the people that they will not hold us responsible for any damage done while plowing the road." Well I got that undertaking. The minister in the meantime had gone off to Grand Falls on some matter, but as soon as the department was in possession of that fact the job was done. And I think, for the first time in many years, the people of Flat Rock had that done. I would like to say to him again, what I have said personally, how much they appreciate it.

On motion 907-03-06 carried. 907-03-09 carried. 907-03-10 carried. 907-03-11 carried. 907-03-14 carried. 907-03-15 carried.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to draw to the attention of the minister the estimates of the Province of Nova Scotia, which show what I was speaking about a few moments ago. The amount spent on roads is very much higher, apparently, than we spend here. A certain allocation is made from each loan for highroads. In 1953 they had over ten millions of dollars and in 1954 they had eleven million, and in 1955, ten million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are spending about the same amount on roads.

MR. BROWNE: The question was, Mr. Chairman, the premier did not

think there was any province in Canada which was not financing the roads out of income.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I say there was a great burden on the treasury.

MR. BROWNE: I am trying to show him there is, and the province of Nova Scotia seems to be doing it. Here is the vote, and here, a list, a very considerable one, of the revenue from the department of Highways and Public Works.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It cost them to service the loans in the past.

MR. BROWNE: That is given here in great detail for each loan. You see the highway portion of the loan, the rate, and then the estimate for each year, and then the sinking fund and the interest estimated each year for each loan, then other expenses; maintenance of highways, trunk roads, county roads, and the two just balance. I will send it over to the minister if he has not seen it, so that he may have an opportunity to compare and study it, and maybe some benefit will come from this. It seems to be just about equal. It seems to me to be a sound method of financing.

907—Roads and Bridges, on motion carried.

908—Miscellaneous Services:

MR. HOLLETT: Awards under Workmen's Compensation Act—who is that, individuals working on the roads?

MR. SPENCER: That, Mr. Chairman, is the amount we set aside, instead of placing our workmen on an insured basis, from our own department. What it is in a practical sense, we have the Workmen's Compensation Board, we set aside a certain amount

and they pay our insurance and we re-imburse them from that sum.

MR. BROWNE: Historic Sites and Monuments, 5,000, what is that amount for?

MR. SPENCER: Well, that happens to be a request we have from the Historic Society and the monuments people, to erect monuments in certain places throughout the island. Last year the old grange at the estate of the late Sir Robert Bond was dismantled, and a monument erected there. We arranged to get a large granite boulder transferred to Whitbourne, and a block set up, and there is to be a monument. This particular monument this year is listed, as one or two others. We hope to mark the landing of Cormack who landed somewhere near the mouth of Middle Brook near Random Island in Trinity Bay. The historic Sites and Monuments want to mark the place where he first set foot to go in and walk across the island. That is what it is for, to take care of historic sites such as that, and of course there is the ordinary maintenance which is always going on for the memorial at King's Beach.

On motion 908 carried,

909 Wharves, Breakwater and Ferries:

MR. BROWNE: There are three items there, perhaps the Minister might tell us what they are?

MR. SPENCER: The Committee will understand, Mr. Chairman, we now have one or two ferry landings and ferries in operation. That \$5,000 under 03-01 is for any maintenance and repairs necessary to those, particularly Placentia. Under 03-02, \$5,000 is for wharves and breakwaters. We have no end of roads maintained by break-

waters along the shoreline, and now these roads have to be improved, but we have to provide breakwaters to protect them in some cases. In the case of ferries, that is a revote from last year. We have a ferry in mind for a certain spot in the country, which the honourable and learned member for St. John's West is quite familiar with. There has been a move on foot for years to put a bridge across the gut at the mouth of Holyrood Pond. It appears that may not be a satisfactory service. It is a very difficult one. We have had that surveyed and that kind of thing. Now we hope some day we may be able to put a ferry there. These particular amounts are for maintenance and repair of those in existence.

MR. BROWNE: I think the Minister of Finance told us that is to be done.

On motion 909 Wharves, Breakwaters and Ferries carried.

MR. BROWNE: Could the Minister tell us the whole of the expenditure for his department last year?

MR. SPENCER: On current account, five million dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again presently.

On motion the Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again presently. Passed all items under headings from I to IX (inclusive) except VIII.

On motion report received, ordered sit again presently.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 o'clock I do leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock tonight.

TUESDAY, April 19, 1955

NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

On motion the House went into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Courage, Chairman of the Committee,

Department of Health X:

1001 Minister's Office — On motion carried.

1002 General Office:

MR. BROWNE: This increase in the amount there, is that due to the increments?

HON. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mostly increments, one or two cases of increases in salary.

On motion carried.

1003 Accounting Office: On motion carried.

1004 Registrar of Vital Statistics: On motion carried.

1005 Registry: On motion carried.

1006 Ambulance and Transportation Service:

MR. BROWNE: What does that mean? Less proportion of salaries Joint Services. It is joined up with the Department of Welfare?

DR. POTTLE: Yes, the Department of Health carries the pool service of Transportation for a number of departments of Government.

On motion carried.

1007 Headquarters Medical Staff:

MR. BROWNE: There was a token vote there last year of \$1,000, which is now cut off. Have you decided to do without the office.

DR. POTTLE: It is absorbed by other offices.

On motion 1007 carried.

1008 Nursing Service:

MR. BROWNE: There is quite a drop in this. Is there an explanation for that?

DR. POTTLE: The drop, Mr. Chairman, is because we have placed a large amount there in the estimates and there has been savings. This is to enable probably a little more realistic picture. That applies to a number of votes all through the Health Estimates.

MR. BROWNE: Does that mean you are short in staff?

DR. POTTLE: That is so.

On motion carried.

1009 Tuberculosis Control:

MR. HOLLETT: On that vote, is the Minister prepared to tell us anything about the state of the country now relative to tuberculosis? I mean, is it less in the country now. I have not had an opportunity to read the report.

DR. POTTLE: I can say, Mr. Chairman, that within the last nine or ten years the rate of tuberculosis has decreased quite considerably. In 1945 there were 150 deaths, per one hundred thousand population, in 1954 the figure was 29 deaths.

MR. HOLLETT: That was the deaths. What about the incidence? I can well see that the death rate would be less on account of the extra-special attention given, but the incidence?

DR. POTTLE: We have not the figures for an absolute comparison, but we can say that the incidence has not decreased proportionately. That is, the number of people with "TB" has not come down to the same extent as the number of deaths came down. But it has come down very considerably, to the extent that there was a time recently when there were vacant beds in St. John's Sanatorium.

MR. HOLLETT: How many are hospitalized at the present time in the Sanatoria across the country?

DR. POTTLE: In the neighbourhood of nine hundred.

MR. HOLLETT: Nine hundred — terrific.

On motion carried.

1010 Health Inspection:

MR. BROWNE: Who is in charge of that service?

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Douglas Strong. He was a senior officer at Corner Brook.

1010 on motion carried.

1011 Business Management: On motion carried.

1012 Central Laundry:

MR. BROWNE: There seems to be a large increase there. What is the cause of that?

DR. POTTLE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have made a serious attempt this year to staff a Central Laundry according to the needs. I am sure the members of the Opposition will realize this laundry takes care of all the services of all the Government Institutions.

On motion 1012 carried.

1013 Central Pharmacy: On motion carried.

1014 Central Stores :

MR. BROWNE: At various times the Auditor General has complained about the stores. Can the Minister say how that branch is getting on now?

DR. POTTLE: I think the criticism to which the honourable member refers is not in this. It does not apply to this entire section but rather to the institutions.

On motion 1014 carried.

1015 Unallocated Equipment and Supplies — On motion carried.

1016 Prosthetic Services — On motion carried.

1017 General Health Services :

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in this item I notice there are various contractual doctors working all over the country.

DR. POTTLE: Yes, part-time.

MR. BROWNE: How much, about, is each given?

DR. POTTLE: The highest is \$2,400.

MR. HOLLETT: Before going on from that, Mr. Chairman, there was a time when the country was very short of doctors and dentists. In regard to doctors, is the country supplied with doctors now?

DR. POTTLE: I am informed there are two and a half times as many doctors in Newfoundland as there were in 1940. When we come to the subject of the General Hospital we can point that out in another way.

MR. HOLLETT: Under the heading "Rehabilitation" — What efforts are being made for rehabilitation? Is that in connection with tuberculosis cases or any particular cases?

DR. POTTLE: This refers to those people who are physically disabled, such as people who have lost a limb. I circulated a few days ago, Mr. Chairman, details of an agreement made between the Federal Government and the Government of Newfoundland relating to the carrying out of this service, which has lately been put into force.

MR. HOLLETT: The cost of treatment, I see, has gone up \$30,000. Could the Minister tell us what the increase is there?

DR. POTTLE: In non-Government institutions.

MR. HOLLETT: Does that mean lack of hospital beds or what does it mean?

DR. POTTLE: The actual amount set up under this sub-head 1017-03-02 is still \$110,000 and the actual amount spent in this year was \$104,000.

MR. BROWNE: Where is 03-01 being spent?

DR. POTTLE: It is being spent all over the province.

MR. BROWNE: That is not the same as salaries?

DR. POTTLE: No. That is for services done, mostly by private doctors. One is part time salary, the other is fees for specific services.

On motion carried.

1018 Venereal Disease Preventive Service: On motion carried.

1019 Public Health Laboratory: On motion carried.

1020 General Hospital:

MR. BROWNE: Salaries are much lower than last year.

DR. POTTLE: We have made a larger reduction on account of limited staff.

MR. BROWNE: Is the hospital being all used now?

DR. POTTLE: Yes, I might answer that — On page 105, under "Professional" the staffing of the General Hospital, as indicated is now better than it ever has been, and we have seventeen doctors provided under the Professional Section. Eight of these are Newfoundlanders. That situation never prevailed before.

MR. BROWNE: How are you getting on with the collection of accounts there? There is a vote here for legal fees in connection with it.

DR. POTTLE: Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is not as satisfactory as we would like it to be, but the whole system is immediately under scrutiny for an improved system.

On motion 1020 carried.

1021 Fever Hospital:

MR. BROWNE: In regard to 1021, are there any contagious diseases now in the Fever Hospital?

DR. POTTLE: I understand the bed space is practically filled up mostly with cases of measles and meningitis and infectious diarrhoea.

On motion 1021 carried.

1022 St. John's Sanatorium: On motion carried.

1023 West Coast Sanatorium:

MR. BROWNE: They don't seem to have much difficulty in getting staff over on the west coast.

DR. POTTLE: Not so much.

On motion carried.

1024 Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Minister can clear up this matter for me — In connection with a person who is certified for admission to a mental hospital by two medical doctors — the position has been presented to me very forcibly during the last two or three days by relatives of such a person. They want to know whose responsibility it was in the case of a certified mental case, by two doctors? I would ask the Minister if he could explain that.

DR. POTTLE: I think I understand the question of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I believe I know the circumstances of the case to which he refers. As I understand it, Sir, the legislation does not compel the Department of Public Health to admit a patient merely because he is certified. The Department of Public Health becomes responsible for a person certified when this person is not only certified but admitted. If there is no bed available there is no responsibility under the statute for the Department of Health, that is a responsibility for another department of Government. That is not to say we do not offer every service we can to enable those individuals to get hospitalization. That has been done, of course, in this particular instance, which I am glad to say has been dealt with.

MR. HOLLETT: The patient has been hospitalized?

DR. POTTLE: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: The position is, Mr. Chairman, a person who is certified by two medical doctors, and I presume, committed by the magistrate to hospitalization; if the department has no bed available the patient is taken

home to his parents, if you like, and nobody is responsible, even after he has been certified by two medical doctors and committed by a magistrate, simply because the department is unable to find a bed for him. In this case the Honourable Minister took care, in my opinion, as good as he possibly could. But the point I want to get cleared up is — surely a man certified as insane and committed by a magistrate to a mental hospital, surely to goodness, that man cannot be dumped on his mother's doorstep and she is told to look after him. Now that is what happened in this case in the first instance. We brought it to the attention of the Minister, and the Minister corrected that by getting aid to look after the person. Now I understand he has been hospitalized.

I am not finding fault with the department nor the honourable Minister, but I would like to get the situation clarified. Surely it is not satisfactory that a person can be certified and then allowed to go amongst his fellow beings without some restrictions.

DR. POTTLE: The situation is not easily remedied, Mr. Chairman. Nobody on this side of the House is any happier than the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that this state of affairs should exist in spite of the considerable progress being made in recent years, in the improvement of facilities for mentally ill persons. Nevertheless because of this trend of our social service more people are taking advantage of the services, and in response to that demand for improved services the hospital has developed an out patients department now almost as considerable and in some respects more considerable than the hospitals themselves, and through boarding homes the whole work of the hospital has been extended. I can say, in addition,

this year we are making more serious effort than we have possibly in the last couple of years to develop plans for extending the mental hospital by providing low-cost accommodations for a considerable number of patients. But I must say, the situation, in spite of having improved as far as facilities are concerned, has not improved yet to the point where we can be at all complacent, but very much the opposite from complacent. But I see some sign of hope in store, not immediately but within the next year or so. Most of the aggravated cases, such as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has referred to, will be dealt with a little more expeditiously than at present. At present the situation does not give us any comfort at all.

MR. HOLLETT: Still on that point, not that particular case, I note the total vote for health has been reduced by some seventy thousand dollars, which is not much when we come to talk in millions. I believe it is eight millions. That is on current account. That is administration, I take it. That is really less than it was last year, by seventy thousand dollars. I should have thought this Government at any rate, as the years go by, would be increasing the grant rather than reducing it even by a small amount of seventy thousand dollars. Has the Minister any explanation for that? He has given the explanation that the vote for salaries is being cut very considerable, just that one item alone. The estimate last year was \$8,393,400, was that not spent? Why does not the Honourable Minister tell us what they did expend not what they estimated last year?

DR. POTTLE: The amount spent to the end of February was 8.1 million dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Now there is a plan on foot to provide extra accommodation because the situation certainly is very much aggravated at the present time. What is the accommodation in there now?

DR. POTTLE: 785 in the main building and 120 in the Geriatric Ward of the Orthopaedic Wing of the General Hospital.

MR. BROWNE: I think it is recognized the population of the mental hospitals in this country depends on the population of the country, and as the population grows we have to make more provision. Would the Minister tell us what type of low-class accommodation he has in mind?

DR. POTTLE: No, the details have not been worked out as yet. But the Department of Health has been given authority to work in collaboration with the Department of Public Works to see if good, sound, reasonable accommodations could be provided at a moderate cost.

MR. BROWNE: You mean building of course?

DR. POTTLE: On the grounds, as part of the extension of the main building.

MR. BROWNE: How many people are in boarding houses? There could not be many like that?

DR. POTTLE: They are institutional cases.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Minister indicate whether we compare favourably to other provinces?

DR. POTTLE: No we don't compare favourably.

MR. HOLLETT: That means, we have more mental cases?

DR. POTTLE: No, oh no! I will just make one statement, Mr. Chairman, it is not alarming but an actual fact I stated before. It is true in any province or state which takes care adequately of its mentally ill, there are as many people in the mentally ill institutions as there are in general hospitals or sanatoria and all other hospitals combined.

MR. BROWNE: We are very much behind in that case.

On motion 1024 carried.

1026. Gander Hospital.

On motion 1026 carried.

1027. Botwood Hospital. On motion carried.

1028. Cottage Hospitals and Nursing Stations.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could inform the House what steps have been taken relative to a cottage hospital or some sort of hospital on Bell Island?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have had interviews with several groups of people from Bell Island, some of them groups of clergymen from different denominations and some of them groups of private citizens and some of them consisting of the citizens' committee and finally some of them consisting of the membership of the town council. These talks have gone on over a period of more than two years. There has been a definite evolution of thought from a purely sectarian hospital, owned and operated by one religious denomination, to the idea of a community hospital, owned and operated by the community and serving all the people. It is at that latter stage that the idea stands at the moment. I have strong hopes

that all of these discussions will end in the building of a hospital at Bell Island.

MR. HOLLETT: While on that point, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister or the Premier could give us any idea with regard to steps being taken to erect some sort of a hospital in White Bay area. I notice our friend from White Bay is not here tonight. In his absence I would like to ask if any steps have been taken or if the government intends to take them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I propose to make a statement on the matter of the health facilities and matters generally in White Bay, probably tomorrow. I have the data on my desk but I prefer to have a formal statement prepared to circulate rather than depend on what happens when I merely say the things.

MR. HOLLETT: We will know tomorrow?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Possibly tomorrow.

On motion 1028 carried.

1029 Grants to Non-Government Hospitals. On motion carried.

1030. Expansion of Existing Health Services:

DR. POTTLE: May I add a little item of information on 1029-02 Grace Hospital which receives \$14,000 from the government. What prompts me to say this is that in the year 1954 over fifty per cent of all births in Newfoundland took place in a hospital, and in 1955 over fifty-five per cent of all births in Newfoundland took place in a hospital. In St. John's 95 per cent took place in hospital.

Carried.

1030. Expansion of Existing Health Services:

DR. POTTLE: This extension of health services refer to the National Health Grants which are a matter of agreement between the Government of Canada and the government of Newfoundland, according to a given formula in each case, and the extent and variety of the several grants. If the committee would refer to Page 20 of the Estimates they are given under different headings. The Departments of Health and Welfare set out the formula in each case. These are matching grants. In the main they were started in 1949.

On motion 1030 carried.

1031. Geriatric Centre:

MR. BROWNE: That is the orthopaedic wing.

DR. POTTLE: Yes— and an extension of the Mental Hospital, with 120 people.

MR. BROWNE: What became of the patients in there getting treatment for bone diseases?

DR. POTTLE: They are on one wing of the hospital the other is in the main part.

MR. HOLLETT: Before we pass on—I am not quite clear. We are considering here \$87,000 and on page 20 the amount is \$948,200.

DR. POTTLE: Normally they might very well balance. But we have to provide for—You see one year overlaps with the other, shall I say, and we only get back in the main what we spend, consequently we have to provide in these estimates for a continuous service which arose during the

last month of the last year where expenditure might be higher or lower as the case may be.

MR. BROWNE: It is on a fifty-fifty basis?

DR. POTTLE: No. There is a different formula, Sir—some are on a per capita basis.

MR. BROWNE: Is that amount there our expenditure or do we get anything back from that?

DR. POTTLE: Yes, the revenue is provided on page 20. It means this, if we are to take advantage of certain services we have to spend a certain amount. If the Federal Government grants were not there we probably would not be providing the services. We kept them at a maximum and extended our own service.

MR. BROWNE: I know you cannot make any money out of them.

DR. POTTLE: No.

On motion 1031 carried.

Department of Public Welfare—XI:

DR. POTTLE: May I say one word before the Public Welfare estimates come up. I do want to pay tribute to the officers of the Department of Health. I have been associated with the department for three or four months, and in that length of time I have learned to appreciate their services, and I do want to pay, as I say, honest tribute to their work, because I believe Newfoundland is well served by their staff in the Department of Health. Newfoundland may be in the peculiar position that it does operate a so much greater proportion of health service as compared with health services in other provinces and there is a greater responsibility, therefore, upon the officers of the de-

partment to carry out their responsibilities properly. I do want to have my word of commendation expressed to them in this public way.

1101. Minister's Office: On motion carried.

1102. General Office:

MR. BROWNE: I notice an increase of \$11,000 here—what is that increase?

DR. POTTLE: An increase in staff. They are transferred here from 1106—Regional Welfare Services.

MR. BROWNE: That vote is up too.

DR. POTTLE: Yes, I know. I will explain that when we come to it. We have a new officer there in 1102 who is a research officer. The officer, Grade VII, is transferred from Corner Brook office, and the officer Grade V represents the decrease. Officer Grade V represents an increase. In one case a typist has been promoted. The great difference is in the three increases, and in as much as two of them are heavy salaries it accounts in a large part for the difference. The salary of the Administrative Assistant also has been increased.

On motion 1102 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Who is the Assistant Deputy Minister?

DR. POTTLE: J. A. Clancy is the administrative Assistant.

1103. Accounting Office: On motion carried.

1104. Registry: On motion carried.

MR. BROWNE: There is an increase in staff here.

DR. POTTLE: One person has been transferred from the City Welfare Office.

On motion carried.

1105. Ambulance and Transport Service:

DR. POTTLE: That is a proportion of the total transportation.

On motion 1105 carried.

1106. Regional Welfare Services:

MR. HIGGINS: What does that extra assistance consist of?

DR. POTTLE: That provision is to be found occurring in various provisions of the estimates, Mr. Chairman. In this instance, as in all other instances, it is for temporary staff and replacements and so on, seasonal.

MR. BROWNE: The regional welfare service has been increased in number by five, and the cost by \$25,000.

DR. POTTLE: Last year, Mr. Chairman, there were more places provided for than actually appeared in the estimates. This year we are providing full strength. That is what gives the difference.

On motion carried.

1107. Mothers' and Dependents' Allowances:

MR. BROWNE: Where did the staff go that is cut out there?

DR. POTTLE: Under 1109.

MR. BROWNE: The vote remains there. This is a million dollars.

DR. POTTLE: Yes, because they cannot be transferred all at once. We don't know how fast they will go over under Social Assistance and cannot

repeal the Mothers' Allowance Act until they come over to Social Assistance.

On motion carried.

1108. Child Welfare.

MR. BROWNE: That is children out in foster homes—Maintenance of Children? How much is that supposed to represent?

DR. POTTLE: Five hundred and fifty.

On motion carried.

1109. General Assistance.

MR. BROWNE: In Social Assistance, given for the first time in this, you have able-bodied relief. Is the minister in a position to say how much he spent, say in the first three months of this year for able-bodied relief?

DR. POTTLE: This calendar year?

MR. BROWNE: Or in the past fiscal year?

DR. POTTLE: Yes, that information was given to the honourable member, up to the end of February.

MR. HOLLET: Able-bodied relief and sick relief amount to six hundred and some odd thousand dollars.

DR. POTTLE: That was for thirteen months, including February of last year. I just want to say, briefly, one or two things, Sir. First, it may not cover the actual amount required, but we do not think that it is good psychology to put a large amount in for relief. At the same time the House should remember that this province, by statute, has placed itself in a position unique amongst the states of the western world in obligating itself to provide for those who

cannot provide for themselves. I don't want to extend this statement, Sir, as I could with profit. But the record will speak for itself, since we became a province in 1949. I have made it clear in a very great number of official statements to the Government of Canada and amongst ourselves that there are circumstances over which this province has no control, and these circumstances very often, especially as they apply to fishing areas, make it very difficult, or make it impossible for people to earn a livelihood throughout the year. This is a responsibility which we are not passing over just without thought to Canada. But there is a national responsibility here, Sir, which we feel should be realistically faced. I am speaking in general terms. In a more frank discussion I could be more specific. This question will be on our minds, I feel sure, as we approach the Dominion Provincial Conference in the next week or so. I think it would not be in the interest of Newfoundland therefore to place a very considerable vote in the estimates for poor-relief. That would be an indication we were going to accept full responsibility indefinitely.

MR. HOLLETT: I quite realize the Government's responsibility. But I would like to point out I have had several complaints of people who are in receipt of relief that always point out to me the great difficulty for persons to live on five dollars a month. That happened in a good many of the outports. Take a man and his wife and eight or ten children. He gets about fifty-five dollars a month, it looks a lot, perhaps when we speak of relief, but it is not much when you have to buy food for ten or twelve people. I am quite sure the honourable Minister realizes the trouble they

are up against, and how difficult it is to cope with it. I realize that, because I lived in the days when I had to issue relief, when these poor creatures got just \$1.80. But I do maintain now that \$1.80 was probably as good then as \$5 today. I fail to see how any person unfortunate enough to receive able-bodied relief is much better off with what they now receive than the individual who got \$1.80 in the 1930's. They may be somewhat better under certain circumstances, of course, but take the lone individual with five dollars to depend on in White Bay, Green Bay, Burin or anywhere on the southwest coast. I am darned if he is doing very well. I would like the government to think of that when they bring this matter before the Federal authorities, because there is a case where some help can be given to the needy, I am not saying this in any critical mood. I know the difficulty because I lived through it, and I know the problems, I lived through them.

On motion 1009 carried.

1110. Federal Provincial Allowances:

DR. POTTLE: There is a revenue side to offset these expenditures—Page 21.

MR. BROWNE: That is about half.

DR. POTTLE: Yes, half. I agree with you.

On motion carried.

1111. Home for the Aged and Infirm:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, did I hear a rumour there is to be a new building built in connection with this? I remember raising it last year.

I think I heard the Government was going to do something about this home for the aged and infirm, which is in bad condition and really is not suitable.

DR. POTTLE: The government is allowing a quarter of a million dollars as a beginning in the present estimates, and plans have been practically drawn up in their final form or will be.

MR. BROWNE: When?

DR. POTTLE: I cannot say definitely at the moment. That should be done, say, within the next three weeks or so.

MR. BROWNE: What size?

DR. POTTLE: When finished in its final form it will accommodate two hundred people.

MR. HOLLETT: A new building?

DR. POTTLE: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: It will cost much more than \$250,000.

DR. POTTLE: That is what we think we may be able to spend only this year.

On motion carried.

1112. Infants' Home:

1113. Boys' Home and Training School:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I believe I saw some advertisement in the papers recently for a matron. That is the one at Whitbourne, is it not?

DR. POTTLE: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: There is a staff of 17. Does that include the matron? And what would the salary be?

DR. POTTLE: It is provided under "Institutional Grade V."

MR. BROWNE: I suppose there is a report to the Department of Welfare.

DR. POTTLE: Every year.

MR. BROWNE: How is it getting on? How many are there now?

DR. POTTLE: We have 43 boys there.

On motion carried.

1114 Girls' Home and Training School:

MR. HIGGINS: As the Minister, I take it, is aware, a very considerable instance of absenteeism from that home occurs and escapees from the home, which resulted in a substantial number of people ending up before the courts on charges of juvenile delinquency. Would he advise the House whether that situation has been corrected or whether there is any trouble along this line now?

DR. POTTLE: The incidents to which the honourable and learned member refers were instances in a large part of adults contributing to the delinquency, civilians and others, who have made it very difficult at times for us to carry on satisfactorily in that little institution. In fact it is not an institution. It was a little house the Department of Public Welfare took over from another service in the Department of Health. The little building has never been adequately set up to do the work designed to do, and we have never, for that reason in part, been able to attract the kind of staff who could do their work accurately. As a result therefore of this situation we are making arrangements to set up an institution on the Admiralty pro-

perty on the Bay Bulls Road. We are now taking steps to put it in proper order to take care of a larger number of girls under more adequate conditions.

MR. HIGGINS: Incidentally, is there any age limit as to the age at which they won't take girls in there. Is there any maximum or minimum?

DR. POTTLE: No there is no arbitrary limit, shall we say, in the lower age limits, we would not want a very young girl to be taken into an institution. Ordinarily a very young girl can be controlled in a substitute home. As far as the upper age, they are not normally committed to us beyond the age of 17, but they may go over 17 after they come officially into our care.

MR. HIGGINS: They could come in at say 16 and stay until they are 19.

MR. BROWNE: There are some very good salaries out there. I don't think you should have very much trouble to recruit people for that institution. How many girls are there?

DR. POTTLE: Anywhere probably from nine to fifteen, depending on the season.

MR. BROWNE: Is there really need of a much larger institution?

DR. POTTLE: It is like a hospital, Mr. Chairman, if you build a large building you can fill it. We have a population of 400,000 people, and to think that there are only eight or ten girls out of 400,000 people who need at least custody not to say reformation is not being realistic. How many there are we don't know. It depends on how thoroughgoing you are in your apprehension of people. There are people now coming up before the courts who are fined the ordinary fine and are no better off because if they pay the or-

dinary fine, they should get extraordinary treatment.

MR. BROWNE: That should be recognized, and it should be stated here the number of girls coming before court or the number of boys or men that come before court are very insignificant.

DR. POTTLE: But the number that comes before court is no indication of incidents of trouble.

MR. HOLLETT: The Minister's idea is that if he builds a large place he will get more delinquents.

DR. POTTLE: No — That is a characteristic turn of argument. I think it would make the point more logically so say it is unrealistic to think we have only eight or ten girls out of a population of 400,000 who need special help. There are in fact very many more. That does not make Newfoundland any worse than other provinces.

On motion 1114 carried.

1115 Orphanage Grants:

MR. HOLLETT: That Mr. Chairman, requires some explanation: Could the Minister explain the discrepancy in the grants to the different orphanages.

DR. POTTLE: I think the pattern is pretty consistent, excepting with regard to the United Church Orphanage. Both the Roman Catholic and Church of England denominations operate Orphanages for boys and girls. In the first instance the United Church Orphanage operated an orphanage for girls, and in the course of time the number dwindled, especially within the last eight or ten years. It has dwindled very considerably so that the orphanage has turned its attention elsewhere. That is what happened there.

Now they are caring for children who are say, foster children and are also caring for retarded children. They have turned their sights in other directions because they were not getting enough children and partly because of the way the institution was set up they could not take boys. They could only take the girls, consequently very few wished to break up their families by sending the girls to an orphanage and keeping the boys at home. There was not a demand on the orphanage for orphanage care.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it, Mr. Chairman, if there should be a call from either denomination for an increased grant they would get the proper consideration from the department?

DR. POTTLE: Oh yes. I may say the present estimate shows an increase from 1949 the amount has been increased from ten dollars a month to twelve and to fifteen dollars and now to eighteen dollars a month in these estimates.

On motion 1115 carried.

1116 Miscellaneous:

MR. BROWNE: I don't think we should allow this to go by without some report on the John Howard Society. The Minister, I am sure, is interested in that, and may be able to tell us how it is getting on.

DR. POTTLE: The society issues a report each year. As far as I can say, as impartially as I can, the society is doing at least fairly well. It has an executive officer who has but recently taken up his post. My view is — I cannot say how many it has generally rehabilitated but there is a fair response at least from the community, and it is filling, I would say, a proper place in the community. St. John's

city has received the organization very well. Whilst I am not at first hand acquainted with every individual case — let us realize that it has not been an easy job — I would certainly like to have a comment from my learned friend.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister and myself were involved in the founding or beginning of the John Howard Society here, amongst other citizens who had continued on with the good work, while we moved on to other things.

I have reason to believe that the society is doing a very good work. Like every other movement of its kind it had its mistakes and had a certain number of people who took advantage of the fact that well-meaning people are very easily taken advantage of. In the beginning there was one gentleman, I remember, who came from a place not too far from St. John's in a southerly direction, who went to a weekly newspaper and gave an account of how he had been rehabilitated by the John Howard Society, and went around describing himself as "the man who had been saved" and got about three hundred dollars. He is in jail now. But for every one of these that have taken advantage of the association there are two or three who have benefited by it. I know of two cases of fellows who just managed to stay straight who have succeeded in getting work. I know there are others, I don't know what the measure of public support is. I know last year there was a campaign which netted something. But they go regularly to the penitentiary, I believe, with shows during the holiday seasons and particularly during Christmas. I think they justify their existence in the community.

On motion 1116 Miscellaneous carried.

1127 Family Court: On motion carried.

1148 Detention Receiving House (token): On motion carried.

1119 Northern Labrador Affairs:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have some statement from the Minister relative to Northern Labrador Affairs, \$879,000 — I wonder if he could outline what is being accomplished.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will know that there is a revenue item against this account, standing on page 21, under 1167 — 03 (02) amounting to \$265,000 which is a return from sales of products, representing it would seem a decrease from the year before, mainly because the stocks were piled up the year before and we have not had to replenish the stock to the same extent as before.

MR. BROWNE: What stock?

DR. POTTLE: Food and stores.

MR. BROWNE: The revenue has gone down, not the expenditure.

DR. POTTLE: Yes the expenditure under 1119-03 (05) has gone down by \$80,000.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, and the other has gone down over a hundred thousand.

DR. POTTLE: There are six depots from Hebron south. These are manned by depot managers whom we have placed on permanent, pensionable, civil service status. They are men of experience in all cases. What we have tried to do is develop, broadly speaking, a welfare service rather than a striding service with these people. We have endeavoured to improve their

economic life, for instance, their means of catching fish and by enabling them in various ways to earn their livelihood as economically as possible. In this year coming, it will seem as if we shall for the first time, square our account. In other words, there will be very little deficit in our account there, if any, this year. That never happened before. In doing that, Sir, I may say, we have not just kept our eyes on squaring the account alone. There are many problems there. One of these is the question of housing.

I am not able to make any formal statement now. But I can say, more seriously than ever the department is considering the matter of resettlement of these communities into new locations. The whole question of the relationship of the Government with the northern people is one which requires special study. But I would refer any of the honourable members to our director of Northern Labrador Affairs, Mr. Rockwood, who would be glad at any time to give you a complete story of what is taking place there over the last year or two. We have developed a working relationship with the Federal Government whereby a general health campaign is going on to reduce "TB" and all other diseases. Incidentally, these people can — for the first time in the history of these people a comprehensive effort is being made to survey their health needs and provide hospitalization for them and rehabilitation afterwards, which we believe is one of the first steps towards helping them get back on their feet. But for some time there will be a backlog, shall I say, of social problems to be met with amongst these people. But I see by collaboration with the Federal Government and amongst our own departments of Government signs of bringing these people closer to what

we might regard as a decent standard of living.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the population?

DR. POTTLE: Twelve hundred Esquimaux and two hundred Indians, fourteen hundred altogether.

MR. HOLLETT: Do they administer sick relief and relief as well? I do not see it here?

DR. POTTLE: It is done through the depot examining officer who acts as welfare officer for that purpose.

MR. HOLLETT: It does not go through this account at all.

DR. POTTLE: No.

MR. BROWNE: Is there a grant from the Federal Government for relief?

DR. POTTLE: It was refunded until last year. Then in the general overall health concessions one of the concessions we made was to forgo the refund of relief.

MR. BROWNE: Do you get any concessions from the Federal Government now? Does the Federal Government accept responsibility for Indians?

DR. POTTLE: Only on reservations. Here they have agreed to go up to two hundred thousand dollars on capital account on agreed projects, which would be, for instance, a nursing station or a residential school or welfare appliances.

MR. HOLLETT: It will take about \$300 a head to take care of them through this department which comes out of the Government directly as assistance, in addition to the amount spent on relief and sick relief. I am not saying this in any derogatory sense.

DR. POTTLE: It may be the actual fact.

MR. HOLLETT: I am wondering just, would it not be better almost — of course there are Esquimaux who would not want to live in any other part of the world — if they were moved. In Newfoundland we have moved some of our people from some of the outlying places to centralized places. I don't suppose that would work in the case of these people.

On motion 1119 carried.

1120 Corrections:

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Minister would tell us how that branch is getting on?

DR. POTTLE: Again I can speak both in general and in specific terms. I think we are very fortunate in having a man of Mr. Walling's experience, and I am quite sure that since he has come here he has given proper attention to the individual care of the boys and girls under his notice. He has gathered around himself a number of the staff of our department and other persons as well, and has helped to mobilize, I think, the interest of the community in the matter of corrections as an approach to the whole situation of juvenile delinquency. I would say the division fully justifies itself, as an extension of welfare services.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Honourable Minister has the figures for the twelve months ending March 31?

DR. POTTLE: They are usually a month behind. We have a month's grace in the Act.

MR. BROWNE: I want to get the total.

DR. POTTLE: Is the honourable

and learned member thinking about what might be the actual expenditure for the past year. It was 7.4 millions. I am told.

On motion carried.

DR. POTTLE: Before the estimates as a whole are passed, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the same kind of remarks with regard to the Department of Public Welfare as in regard to the Department of Health. My association with the people has been very happy, and I would like to express publicly my appreciation to the senior members and all along the line who contributed to the work of this far-flung and widespread department, and not least of all, to the men in the field, the many welfare officers who carry out a friendly duty, and upon whom we depend to carry out what is sometimes just, shall I say, carry out our theories, which on the face is good, but while it is good, in fact it depends upon these men. It is a big job we have to do. It is not merely distributing funds, but in the distribution of funds we preserve human beings all along the line. I think one of the good things we do in the Western World is to try and provide dependents at a decent level. These men are behind the scenes to do that. To them I give my appreciation as I do to all the members of Public Welfare.

On motion. Department of Public Welfare XI, carried.

Board of Liquor Control:

1201 Administration: On motion carried.

1202 General Office:

MR. BROWNE: There is an increase of two there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We opened two new stores, one at Stephenville and

the other at Channel-Port aux Basques. I think the estimates cover only the established, pensionable posts.

MR. BROWNE: On page 20 there is an increase of four more.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In addition to those shown as pensionable established posts there are, of course, other employees in purely temporary posts.

MR. BROWNE: Is that the explanation of the increase to \$2,500 under 1202-02-02? There is an increase of \$9,000 there.

On motion 1202 carried.

1203 Sales and Miscellaneous:

MR. BROWNE: There is an increase of \$34,500. There is an increase of staff of eleven under that heading and increase of fourteen altogether for the department.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. That is accounted for mainly by the opening of these two new stores.

MR. BROWNE: When were they opened? Recently?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No they are not opened.

On motion 1203 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Before we go on from that, what is the revenue received from the Board of Liquor Control?

MR. SMALLWOOD: About three million, I think. About the same as forecast for this year, I believe the figure is three million. It is on page 7. It is 3.4 million.

On motion the Committee recessed for ten minutes, after which Mr. Chairman returned to the Chair.

Department of Municipal Affairs & Supply: XIII.

1301 Minister's Office: On motion carried.

1302 General Office:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, travelling expenses \$1,000. The same was there for last year. What were the travelling expenses last year?

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister Municipal Affairs & Supply): About \$1,225.

On motion carried.

1311. Municipal Affairs Administration:

MR. BROWNE: Could the minister give the travelling expenses last year for that?

MR. HEFFERTON: Between fourteen and fifteen thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For seven months, ten thousand seven hundred. It was \$13,360 the year before.

MR. HOLLETT: What is all the travelling about in that section?

MR. HEFFERTON: Auditing and inspection.

MR. BROWNE: Does the government supply auditing services to the various councils?

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes. The annual report is done by the auditor general. In addition to that we have two of our own men going around to do it.

On motion 1311 carried.

1312. Local Government Affairs:

MR. BROWNE: Annual grants to local councils—Have you got the details of these grants?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what is meant by "gen-

eral details." These are revenue grants based on a certain formula.

MR. BROWNE: So much is paid to each council.

MR. HEFFERTON: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: Do you know who these are paid to?

MR. HEFFERTON: It is paid to them all, according to their revenues. I don't think it is broken down that way.

MR. HOLLETT: Are these councils supposed to take part in active politics, as councils?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Required to? No law compels them to. I don't know of one that forbids them either.

MR. HOLLETT: I see. I am referring, as the honourable the Premier well knows, to certain telegrams and a message which went on the air from the Honourable the Premier in reference to the telegrams.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They asked me to offer myself as a Liberal candidate, and therefore the next member for the local district.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that one of their functions?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If they wish to make it one of their functions.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't think, for instance, that this council in the city should wire the Premier and ask him to represent St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is highly unlikely for the city council.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, a local council. They are a body which has been set up to look after the interest

of the people in certain communities in Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They think the best way to do that is to have me for their member. Will the honourable gentleman quarrel with them.

MR. HOLLETT: I won't quarrel. But I wonder if the people in the district quarrel. As the Premier knows all too well, Mr. Chairman, that affair was not strictly according to Hoyle. This House votes monies each year and grants loans every once in a while to these local councils, and here we get them wiring the honourable the Premier to come down and represent them in the next election, as a Liberal, of course.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course.

MR. HOLLETT: It may be small stuff. But it is not small stuff as a principle.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They don't think it is small stuff.

MR. HOLLETT: I am surprised at the Honourable the Premier backing that up. I am surprised at him. I don't think it is right. I am quite sure it is not proper. What does the honourable minister say about it?

MR. HEFFERTON: There is nothing whatsoever to stop them doing it anymore than to stop a local road committee. We give them money to spend. If they have a meeting and ask somebody to represent them.

MR. HOLLETT: Then the minister agrees it is perfectly all right?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am very proud of it.

MR. HOLLETT: I never heard of the like.

MR. CURTIS: Does any member

of the city council take part in politics?

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to see the city council get together and ask the Honourable the Attorney General to represent them in the next election. I would love to see what would happen, or the town council—they have not one in Gander nor Grand Falls yet or Windsor—sending a message to the Honourable Minister of Public Works asking him to come up and represent them next time. I wonder what kind of a row would be raised up there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No row.

MR. HOLLETT: I am surprised at the Premier being a party to anything like that. More than that, he typed out a long telegram and sent it to the Gerald S. Doyle News Bulletin, so I am told. I was not there when it came there, I guarantee you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or it would not be broadcast.

MR. HOLLETT: Oh yes. It is none of my business about broadcasts. But that stuff went over not only "Doyle's" but all the other broadcasts in St. John's, or most of them. Most of the news consists of releases from the various ministers.

MR. MURRAY: That is the news.

MR. HOLLETT: That is news? In other words, using the news bulletins in order to propagate so called "Liberalism." I think it is lousy. That is a good word.

MR. SPENCER: I could tell the honourable gentleman how to avoid that to some extent. Get these gentlemen compiling the various news bulletins not to pester the various ministers so much as we are pestered in my office at any rate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I don't know how this got in here. Is this item carried?

On motion 1312 carried.

1315. Housing:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, is this the administration of the various phases of housing going on?

MR. HEFFERTON: 1315-03, yes. The first part refers to administration. There are various changes there. Our subsidy is being changed. The maximum for subsidized housing would be \$7,500, about 75%. Last year we paid somewhere around \$3,500.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Subsidized rental housing.

MR. HEFFERTON: 25% is our share.

MR. BROWNE: Where are these houses located?

MR. HEFFERTON: On Empire Avenue, St. John's East, in that area. 1315 on motion carried.

1331. Supply Administration: On motion carried. 1332, Purchasing: On motion carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, how is the advertising arranged. Is that by tender or is so much allocated to each paper. How is it done? Will the minister tell me?

MR. HEFFERTON: It is certainly not done by tender because most of the advertising is just daily advertising, calls for maids for hospitals or doctors or something of that kind, and it just goes out to the various newspapers or over the air, depending on the urgency of the matter.

MR. HOLLETT: That applies to printing also.

MR. HEFFERTON: No. All printing is done by tender. Except during the last year we have been doing quite a bit of printing in our own shop, consequently you see a reduction there from last years' estimates. It is down to \$145,000.

MR. HOLLETT: Are the newspapers asked to tender, or is so much advertising allocated to each newspaper in St. John's each year?

MR. HEFFERTON: The printing is all done by tender, every single bit of it. The lowest tender invariably gets it.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the minister could tell me what amount was paid out to the various newspapers in St. John's this year, for printing?

MR. HEFFERTON: May I remind the honourable member there is a question on the order paper now, I think, and I will give it tomorrow.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there is a drop in the vote for advertising of ten thousand dollars. Would the minister explain how it is intended to drop that?

MR. HEFFERTON: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we have tried to cut down on advertising. Our expenditure was \$2,000 lower. We hope next year to be able to get it down at \$25,000. There is a deliberate attempt in four or five votes to cut down expenditure.

MR. BROWNE: Have you got the actual expenditure for any of these items for the fiscal year, under 1333?

MR. HEFFERTON: We have not the actual figures. The end of March is not so long passed, consequently we have not the accounts in.

MR. BROWNE: I have them for eleven months here, but not in detail. The whole department's vote was \$575,000 for eleven months. Would they be on the same basis for the other month, do you think?

MR. HEFFERTON: Somewhere around the same. There may be a little variation, not very much.

On motion Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply carried:

Department of Fisheries & Co-operatives: XIV:

1401. On motion carried:

1411. General Office. On motion carried.

1421. Fisheries Administration:

MR. BROWNE: There seems to be a reduction in every branch of this fishery administration. Is that because of the new setup under the Fisheries Authority?

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, I think the reduction in salaries is on account of the salary of the ex-Deputy Minister of Fisheries. He was getting a salary of \$15,000 a year—that is the reduction there.

MR. HOLLETT: On that point, I asked a question some days ago relative to the amount owing by that one-time officer, asking if it had been paid back to the Government? Could the minister reply to that now?

MR. KEOUGH: If I remember correctly, Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman's question was, if when he left the service he owed any money—that is a paraphrase of it. The answer is no.

On motion 1421 carried.

1422. Fisheries Production Engineering:

MR. BROWNE: You passed 1421? In reference to the Newfoundland Fishermen's Federation I notice an increase of ten thousand, from \$10,000 to \$20,000. Did we not make arrangement the other day in regard to a trust fund?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, we did not.

MR. BROWNE: We passed a bill here the other day in which interest from \$800,000 was to be paid over to the Fishermen's Federation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No we did not. We passed a bill.

MR. BROWNE: I understood the purpose was, so interest could be paid to the Fishermen's Federation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was not the purpose. But the statement was made it could be given to the Federation of Fishermen. It did not say the bill was passed so the payment might be made, but that we were considering if we would give the interest to the Federation.

MR. BROWNE: Is this \$20,000 supposed to be that \$20,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, the bill went through the House as I recollect, for investment of that Fisheries Assistance Fund in trustee stocks. The provision was that the Consolidated Revenue Fund could be reimbursed from that interest for any amount paid out in any given year to the Fishermen's Federation, but the vote of any amount to the Fishermen's Federation would be carried in the estimates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And there was no obligation on the Government to pay it, nor on the House to pay it.

MR. KEOUGH: The only charges made throughout the year against the Fisheries Assistance Fund were charges in respect of pumps bounties. Bounties inaugurated in the days of Commission of Government whereby the Government paid one third of the cost of pumps to any fisherman who wished to install a pump, to fifty dollars. Since we desired to continue that bounty, and the charge cannot be properly made against the Fisheries Assistance Fund in here.

MR. BROWNE: The \$20,000, is that used as salaries for the Federation or how is it spent? Is it just a grant in aid or something like that? What is the purpose?

MR. KEOUGH: Yes, it is a grant in aid. It is not allocated. We do not give it to the Federation for any specific purpose. We don't tell them what to do with it. It is a grant to them.

On motion 1421 carried.

1422 Fisheries Production Engineering:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I notice here a new vote of \$15,000 for exhibitions. Is that to be along the line of the exhibition at Trepassey? It seems to be a substantial amount if the Government only gave \$500 at Trepassey. It would look after thirty such exhibitions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We hope to see that and more.

MR. KEOUGH: It might be more elaborate than that, Mr. Chairman. It is hoped that during the current year we will be able to hold exhibitions of the type held in Trepassey. It is hoped in the event that an All-Newfoundland Exhibition is held in the Stadium the Fisheries would have a certain section there in that. Then

the balance of the vote is to enable us to acquire certain permanent exhibits such as model long liners, Danish Seiners and equipment to be exhibited, which could be exhibited at all these exhibitions.

MR. BROWNE: Experimental fishing, I notice is up again from \$5,000 to \$30,000. Would the Minister be good enough to explain what that is?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is to cover, we hope, at least it is intended to cover the costs of experimental fishing in small whaling.

MR. BROWNE: At Dildo?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not at Dildo. There is no whaling done at Dildo.

MR. BROWNE: Mink whales?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They come in on the beach. This is experimental in deep water.

MR. BROWNE: Could you tell us the nature?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes to try to catch them by traps and boats, out in deep water, and not to depend on them coming in to shore.

MR. BROWNE: What for?

MR. SMALLWOOD: To insure the supply for minks.

MR. BROWNE: This is for the mink business?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right, yes.

MR. BROWNE: So that you have votes in the Mines and Resources Department and another vote in Fisheries?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: And the Fishery

Authority has a vote for experimental fishing too?

MR. BROWNE: Are they catching whales?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, they are not catching whales. But the scientists stationed here are examining into the whole questions of whales.

MR. HOLLETT: It is a touchy subject.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No — only with the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: We try to transfer the touchiness to the other side.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a bit of a job.

MR. BROWNE: The mink are going to have a whale of a time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

On motion 1422 carried.

1423 Fisheries Research — On motion carried.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Minister would be good enough to explain, "Fisheries Economic Research?"

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman I take it what my honourable and learned friend has in mind is the functions there are set down as these. I will enumerate the duties of director then set forth the function — To report to the Minister and the Deputy upon data concerning Dominion and overseas markets for fishery products. To direct collection, extraction and tabulation of statistics and other information in Newfoundland and other provinces and countries for this purpose. To maintain lists of Federal Department of Trade and Commerce and Fisheries and appropriate departments in other counties and organiza-

tions of trade and fishermen and other corporations. To direct or supervise the preparation, publication of supporting surveys and other documents originating in that branch of the Department and consult with and advise other division leaders in the department on matters of statistics and fisheries development.

MR. BROWNE: Is that Mr. Bruce Feather?

MR. KEOUGH: He is the assistant. He does not have an official assistant. The next person under him is a statistician.

MR. BROWNE: Your department of Fisheries does not put out a report does it?

MR. KEOUGH: It is not required by this Act to put out a report, and while we hope to, we have not gotten around to it as yet.

MR. HOLLETT: The contractual officer there, how much does he get? Is this \$500 here?

MR. KEOUGH: Yes. He also acts as Assistant Deputy Minister of Fisheries.

MR. HOLLETT: Is there a Fisheries Economic Research within the Fisheries Authority also? Is there a vote for that?

MR. KEOUGH: I don't think so. Anyway such research in economic and statistical matters as the Fisheries Authority wishes to have done has been done up to this date by this division of the department. It may develop as the Fisheries Authority goes along, that they would be absorbed into that function, but it won't be in the coming year.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder where the vote for the Fisheries Authority is found?

MR. KEOUGH: Under Capital Account.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Page 133. We have not come to that yet.

MR. BROWNE: Why is that all under capital account? Why are the salaries not voted in current account?

MR. KEOUGH: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that is a question I cannot answer. I am not responsible for the layout of the estimates.

MR. BROWNE: Who is? Perhaps the Premier would tell us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The whole of the cost of Fishery Development is regarded and treated by the government as capital expenditure; the whole of it, including administration, which in turn includes salaries.

MR. HOLLETT: In that case, Mr. Chairman, should not both Fisheries Production Engineering and Fisheries Economic Research be capital expenditure?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, because they are part of the ordinary Department of Fisheries.

MR. HOLLETT: According to the statement the Honourable the Premier just made these things definitely belong over here in Capital Account.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not in our view, they do not.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to say this: The Fisheries Authority is there for ten years, obligated to the tune of \$75,000 a year for ten years. How can we call that capital expenditure. Surely that is an annual expenditure which should be charged here to the Department of Fisheries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Annual expenditure on the building of new roads and as an annual expenditure for not ten but five hundred years is still capital, and fisheries development is capital expenditure, no matter how you look at it.

MR. HOLLETT: Look at these again, Mr. Chairman, Fisheries Production Engineering, Fisheries Economic Research, Vessel Construction and Inspection, these have all to do with the Fisheries Authority the members of which are getting paid a salary of \$25,000 each, and have a staff there and an office costing \$154,000. What have we got to have four other offices for these different things here?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Move to reduce them to a dollar.

MR. HOLLETT: I may suggest this might be considered later on under that item.

On motion 1423 carried.

1424. Vessel Construction and Inspection:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I notice bounties are down by \$25,000. If you are increasing the rate of bounties why are you expecting a reduction of \$25,000?

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, that figure has been arrived at on the basis of actual demands for money and payments over a period of years. It has been running around fifty thousand dollars. We thought that perhaps an additional \$25,000 would handle it for the coming year.

On motion 1424 carried.

1425. Fisheries Development Committee: No amount.

1426. Fisheries Training School:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, could the minister give us some explanation of that Fisheries Training School, just how it is progressing and if they are set up in the outports or here in St. John's?

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, during last year the government inaugurated this programme of fisheries training schools. During the last year it employed the services of two persons one to conduct a school of navigation and the other to conduct a school in engineering. Last year there were seven courses held. We were late getting started. They did not get started until January. The courses were in engineering in Fortune, and navigation at Grand Bank; engineering at Grand Bank, Navigation in Fortune and in Marystown, engineering in Bay de Verde and navigation in Bay de Verde. This year to date we have ten schools in engineering and nine in navigation.

MR. HOLLETT: With only four officers doing all that work?

MR. KEOUGH: This year the additional services were required of two persons. In other words two instructors in engineering and two in navigation.

MR. HOLLETT: They are kept quite busy, I imagine.

MR. KEOUGH: Oh, they are!

MR. HOLLETT: How long are the courses?

MR. KEOUGH: They run four weeks, and if they can they run six.

On motion 1426 carried.

1451. Co-operative Administrations:

MR. BROWNE: These are only token votes. What is the meaning of that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: As distinct from \$1.00.

MR. KEOUGH: At one time there was a Department of Co-operatives, and the expenses for the deputy minister and his travelling are made up under that heading.

MR. BROWNE: I notice now you have taken on some new staff. Are these employed now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is the next item.

On motion 1451 carried.

Co-operative Extension: 1452:

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps the minister could tell me if there are any plans for the extension of this work during this year?

MR. KEOUGH: The personnel provided for here has been taken on and, as a matter of fact, there was a considerable extended programme begun last year. In answer to a question that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition directed to me, I hope to be able to supply some fairly comprehensive information tomorrow, and if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will show it to his honourable and learned colleague he will be able to pick up the information from there.

On motion 1452 carried.

1453. Registry of Co-operative Societies: On motion carried.

On motion Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives carried.

Department of Economic Development:

1501. Minister's Office: On motion carried.

MR. BROWNE: I am sure the votes here, \$3,800 must be far too low for travelling expenses.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The travelling I see here is \$3,000.

MR. BROWNE: Has the minister got the figures for what it was last year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Actually no. I have not got it for last year, but I have got the aggregate from 1949 to 1954 that whole period of four years, \$11,600. That is an average of roughly \$3,000 a year. I have not got it by years, but the aggregate was an average of \$3,000 a year.

1502. General Office: On motion carried.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the motor vehicle, operation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have a car in the department, one car.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that a token vote for the purpose of a new car or operations or what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not shown, \$600. I have not the details of it here. I don't know too much about it. I have sometimes seen the car itself driven. I have never used it. I have been driven in it once or twice. It was the car formerly of Dr. Valdmans and now of Mr. Pushie.

MR. BROWNE: Where were these trade fairs?

MR. HOLLETT: That travelling expenses there, that would be for Mr. Pushie, \$800, would it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. I don't think so. I think that must refer to Mr. Short. The Trade Fair referred to is of course mainly the Interna-

tional Trade Fair at Toronto in which we have participated for the last three if not four years, indeed from the first edition of it, and in which we have become the largest single exhibitor. That we have become by insisting on the right to have an all-Newfoundland exhibition or exhibits put together. We had to struggle for that right. And the Trade Fair officials have never ceased to struggle against our doing it, but we have never given in, and don't intend to give in. We are either going to have an all-Newfoundland exhibition and exhibitors put together in the fair or we don't go to the fair. And as we have become the biggest single exhibitor our wishes are being respected. We expect this year to have even better than we did last year. And last year we think we had the outstanding exhibit of the Industrial Trade Fair.

I may say in passing, this year we are doing something a little different. Last year and other years before, the fixtures that were used were made each year by firms in Toronto, and they were useless to us after the fair was over. Now we are having the fixtures so made as to be portable, and we are bringing them back here and are going to use them in the big fair in the fall in the Stadium. We are going to have a huge fair this year, this fall, in the stadium, an all-Newfoundland fair. That will be agricultural, fisheries, industrial, in other words the products of our fields, factories, and fisheries. The fixtures, the backdrops and all the fixtures of this great fair in Toronto will be used by us in the Trade Fair here in St. John's. I might say Mr. Pushie, Mr. Short and Mr. Vardy, all of them are the persons who run and organize and initiate and shape up, follow up and manage the Newfoundland participa-

tion in the fair. I managed only once so far to get to the fair. I am going to try and get up this summer, if I can. No. I was there twice. I came back last year from the Coronation, flew back to Toronto, and saw it then.

MR. BROWNE: That is the fair which takes place in the summertime?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: That is not the trade fair, which takes place sometime around this time of the year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. It is a huge International Trade Fair in the exhibition grounds in Toronto, which takes place in the summer.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, could the Premier tell us if any great influx of orders resulted from that fair to our various industries?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, we can trace very positively and unmistakably an increase in the volume of business to go to Newfoundland each year over the preceding year as a result of our participation in the International Trade Fair. There is no any doubt of it.

MR. HOLLETT: In what field?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In all these we exhibit.

MR. HOLLETT: Might I ask the Honourable the Premier if Superior Rubber had any exhibits there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes they did.

On motion 1502 carried.

1503 Tourist Development:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, judging by the remarks made by the Director of Tourist Development and by the Minister of Public Works one

would feel that the amount voted here or to be voted here, \$84,200 was a little premature, because they seem to be there to interest people to come to Newfoundland. Yet both the Director of Tourist Development and the Minister of Public Works have made statements to the effect it would be better that nobody at all come here this year. What is the situation? It seems to be a good time for the Minister to tell us what it exactly is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My attitude is the attitude of our Tourist Development Board. The amount now is actually less than it has been and less than the annual amount used to be before we came into office. Actually more than this amount has been spent annually, earlier. But the position is that we are not ready to go all out for a big influx of tourists into Newfoundland. We are just not ready. We have never been ready. We are in fact quite a little more ready than we were, but still far from being ready. We rather dread the thought of the new ferry coming, for instance, before the road is completed from Port aux Basques to Corner Brook. Even when that road is completed, not paved but completed so that at least you can drive over it from Port aux Basques to Corner Brook, we will still have the problem of getting from Corner Brook eastward, say, to Grand Falls and then still further eastward from Grand Falls to St. John's. We have a huge job ahead of us to have a fairly decent road. Then over and above that is the problem of accommodations. We need badly, very badly, a modern hotel at Port aux Basques, a great modern hotel of at least 75 rooms, thoroughly modern. Now instead of a hotel that might be a motel, a very modern motel. Then between there and Corner Brook we need accommodations at

several points, at least three, four or five points. At Corner Brook it is not too bad. It will be better between Corner Brook and Grand Falls and in Grand Falls it will be very good. But there is a big job yet to be done with the road and in accommodations. But what do we do? Close up the Tourist Board in the meanwhile, disband our organization, disband and throw away the contacts we maintain in a hundred directions! I would say that the Tourist Board has to concentrate much of its effort on ordinary publicity for Newfoundland, and participation, for example, in the Trade Fair, its effort has to take the line of endeavouring to interest these people in hotels and the building of hotels or motels or tourist cabins. A large part of the director's efforts are directed in that direction of trying to interest people in hotels and motels. Now that is not easy. Again and again and again and again and again, at least ten or twelve times in the last three years, at least we had ten or twelve different parties negotiating for the building of hotels and we have the latest one on Monday morning in Montreal on my way through to Ottawa. I have an appointment to meet a hotel group, ten or twelve of them. I am frankly a little skeptical.

MR. BROWNE: What about the Florida man?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We never took him seriously at any time.

MR. HIGGINS: He took you seriously.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He may have done so. It was one-sided. We never took him seriously at all. He telephoned me to Jamaica from the Lord Nelson Hotel in Halifax. I was completely open-minded. He asked me to meet him in Miami on my way back.

I was a guest at his hotel. His is one of the most modern, absolutely beautiful, of those beautiful modern hotels in Miami, beyond my power to describe, a beautiful hotel. It cost millions upon millions of dollars. He owns three or four hotels. He owns that one and three or four others in Detroit. He is controlling shareholder in the, not in charge, but controls the Lord Nelson in Halifax. Yet, as far as his coming to Newfoundland is concerned, I have no faith in it at all, none whatever.

MR. HIGGINS: Strongly enough two or three weeks ago there was some magazine called "Favorn Keeper's Guide" or something like that. In that issue he announced coming here to build a three million dollar hotel and as many motels as the Premier would like.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will believe it when I see the bulldozers move in and start excavating.

MR. BROWNE: I think it depends upon the loan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That may well be. He has not asked for a loan. He did not even get that far.

MR. BROWNE: Is there anything to assist ordinary persons who might have accommodations to make those accommodations more suitable?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have ideas and we have tentative plans of classifying accommodations. We have done a lot along that line. I don't know if the members of the House have seen the public literature published by the Board on where to stay in Newfoundland. That is supposed to be pretty complete. It is a list of not only hotels and boarding houses but private homes around the island that will accommodate people. But we

have other plans of getting an organized form of guides and of schools for guides. We have other plans of having chefs and cooks in the places that will cater to tourists organized and brought into classes where they can get some training not only in how to cook food to please tourists but what kind of food it is that tourists like and how to serve it, etc.

But all that would be premature until we are really ready to invite tourists in here in large numbers. That we are not ready to do as yet.

MR. HOLLETT: I would say the whole thing was premature. But by the end of this year we will have spent over a half a million dollars, five or six hundred thousand dollars on this department of Tourism alone. The net result, according to the Honourable the Premier, is nil.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say that.

MR. HOLLETT: I am interpreting what the Honourable the Premier said as meaning "nil." As far as I can see it is nil. The Government who had started a policy of tourism away back in 1949 has spent five or six hundred thousand dollars, and what have we got? What can we show for that policy of tourism? It is all very well to get up and talk about the millions of dollars and hotels, and how they hope to have many of them come in here and all that sort of stuff. What good is it? We have spent enough on this department to build a good hotel somewhere. I think the whole idea is silly myself — people travelling around the country.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would suspect, if the director were Bill Smith or Tom Jones the honourable member would not be quite so pessimistic about the tourist industry as he is.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not pessimistic, but I see nothing there yet, nothing being done.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exactly! He would see things done if it were Tom Jones.

MR. HOLLETT: Documentary films — And the Tourist Director travelling all around the world. His travelling expenses last year, I believe were something of the nature of \$5,550. I see nothing to it at all at the moment. Why does not the director come and give us a concrete plan of action? Are we going to pay out this money every year for nothing?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not save that for the election? If the honourable member and the director are going to be candidates on opposite sides, he can save it up and use it then.

MR. HOLLETT: I see. Is he going to be?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does not the honourable gentleman think so? Or are these remarks just impartial objections and comments?

MR. HOLLETT: I understand the Honourable the Premier and the said director have been moving around in pretty close company of late and attending all sorts of functions. I could enlarge on that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't see any point.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then why mention it.

MR. HOLLETT: Who mentioned it in the first instance?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman just did.

MR. HOLLETT: Perhaps the honourable the premier would like me to enlarge on it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why hint if you will not enlarge? Why hint? Why not come out with it?

MR. HOLLETT: Am I not taking a leaf out of the Honourable the Premier's book when he hinted at least that the director is going into politics or something. I shall certainly say it to him on the hustings when he gets there. Don't worry I will be able to take care of myself on such an occasion, I hope.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is a sort of dummy himself, isn't he?

On motion 1503 carried.

1505. Economic Development:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now this contains the travelling of Mr. Pushie 1505-02 (01). It cost for the first eight months of 1954-55, four thousand dollars, including the big trip to Europe, the long trip to Europe.

MR. BROWNE: What benefit will the Premier state honestly he considers that trip last year was? Was it any benefit to this country?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I frankly don't know yet. I might be able to answer that better a year from now. Frankly, he was working on the question of a third paper mill. That was the main, central theme of my trip, but not by any means the only one.

MR. BROWNE: That did bring you into Eastern Germany?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We went to Germany. We went to Berlin, and when in Berlin the Military Attache of the Canadian Legation asked if we would like to drive into East Berlin.

We drove in and out. I would not make too much of that. We drove in to Austria several hundred miles, within the Iron Curtain. You cannot get to Vienna except by doing that.

MR. BROWNE: But you were in Austria in regard to a paper mill, were you?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No!

MR. HOLLETT: Italy?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. BROWNE: What were you doing in Austria?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Business, not for the country, for the province.

MR. HOLLETT: As tourists?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not tourists. The honourable gentleman have been guessing, but there is nothing to prevent their guessing.

MR. BROWNE: Why don't you tell us?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have reason.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The committee sounds more like "Twenty Questions."

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Premier, and Mr. Pushie and several others go to Germany, Italy and all over the world and run up a bill of many thousands of dollars. I think this House is entitled to some explanation as to the reason of the trip and the results. Otherwise I don't know what the people are going to say. We would not say, of course. We understand. But does the government know what the people are going to say?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will take my chance, as I have done before on

what the people will say. You know what they have said every time I have gone to them.

MR. BROWNE: Does not the honourable the premier remember an election away back?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am talking about recent years, in recent times. In the old days I ran as a candidate and I was defeated. That was before I had matured and Newfoundland had matured, yes.

MR. BROWNE: Before Newfoundland had learned to appreciate you?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, quite so.

On motion 1595 carried.

Department of Economic Development, on motion carried.

Department of Labour:

1601—Minister's Office—On motion carried.

1602—General Office—On motion carried.

1603—Labour Boards, Committees and Enquiries:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister has the actual figures for expenditure on this vote last year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The figures are here for some years. Do you want the whole list?

MR. BROWNE: I just want to know the total of 1603.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not got it here in the form of totals. I have the amounts for each of them over a number of years. I have not added them up.

Minimum Wage Board—for eight months—\$1,400.

Labour Relations Board—\$7,000 in 1952-53, and \$8,400 in 1953-54.

Workmen's Compensation—a token provision is suggested—nothing last year?

MR. BROWNE: How much was the Labour Relations Board last year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not here—Only down to 1954.

MR. BROWNE: The whole vote for the whole department must be down considerably.

MR. HOLLETT: Was not Workmen's Compensation a separate entity? Is there any need of a vote for that?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to make a statement regarding the Workmen's Compensation. They built up a very great reserve in a couple of years. Do they intend going on building up much longer? Or will they be making a refund or what do they intend, lowering their rates? What do they intend to do?

HON. C. M. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): The board does, Mr. Chairman, make refunds every year, if it is found possible. All of the work of the Workmen's Compensation Board, together, I might say, with all of these boards here, will be found in the report that I have previously tabled here. So that, if any of the honourable gentlemen want to know what is going on in all of the departments they can find it in the report that I have previously tabled in this session.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Minister explain why there is a token vote there for Workmen's Compensation?

MR. BALLAM: This does not apply to Workmen's Compensation as such, this token vote here is a vote we make for blind persons in order to sort of get blind persons working. The trade does not like to take them on and to assume the responsibility of their payment for Workmen's Compensation. So this Government, in order to compensate for such persons — we have not had any instances heretofore — and this year we reduced the vote from \$1,000 to \$100, as a token vote, but if the occasion does arise whereby we will have to compensate blind workmen we shall be able to do it, from what you call countervailing savings.

MR. HOLLETT: A sec. Thank you.

MR. BROWNE: I think last year there was an item in the Workmen's Compensation Board regarding the fact they were going to build a new building. Has that been decided upon definitely?

MR. BALLAM: Yes we amended the Act whereby the Board could build when and if approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. We amended the Act.

MR. BROWNE: You have not done so yet?

MR. BALLAM: No. We anticipate doing it this year, we hope.

On motion 1603 carried.

1604 Boiler Inspection:

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether any of his boiler inspectors made an investigation into the cause of the trouble at the Superior Rubber Company, and if they found out what happened to the boiler out there?

MR. BALLAM: I don't know how this is connected with the estimates here. But in order to please my honourable friend, I would say, yes, immediately after the thing happened our inspectors were called. I have a complete and detailed report on what happened.

MR. BROWNE: Can you tell us?

MR. BALLAM: It was a breakdown in the equipment. It did not blow up. It broke down.

MR. BROWNE: How did it break down?

MR. BALLAM: It broke down because in the boilers, as you know, and almost every boiler in every plant they close them down, you see, in order to effect repairs. In certain boilers they have a lining with bricks, fire bricks etc. and they have to renew them — if you want to get technical now I can. They strip them and shed them and all sorts of things. In this instance the lining of two British boilers just broke down, which could happen to any boiler anywhere at any time.

MR. BROWNE: Do you know their age? The age the boiler was when installed?

MR. BALLAM: We have a complete report on the age, capacity and so on of all boilers. It is a very efficient department, don't worry.

MR. BROWNE: Will you table the report here tomorrow?

MR. BALLAM: I will consider it, I won't say I will.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps you might get the permission of the Premier.

MR. BALLAM: Look — if we do you will be sorry.

On motion carried.

1605 Apprenticeship :

MR. BROWNE : There is an increase here of \$35,000 in this particular vote, and on 1605-03 an increase from \$35,000 to \$68,600. Is the Minister in a position to say what these are?

MR. BALLAM : In Apprenticeship Training, since last year, our apprentices have been increased, that would account for the increase there.

MR. BROWNE : Supplies have increased and instruction costs?

MR. BALLAM : As the apprenticeship scheme advances and the number increases so must the supplies, etc., increase accordingly. Incidentally all of these items under Apprenticeship Training are on a fifty-fifty basis, with the Federal Government.

MR. HIGGINS : Mr. Chairman, there is a building somewhere on Bond Street, that I remember seeing there recently, with a sign "Department of Labour, Apprenticeship Department." I wonder could the Minister tell us is that building rented or owned by the department?

MR. BALLAM : We have no room in our building down there, and arrangement was made for offices in that building on Bond Street.

MR. HIGGINS : It is just rented?

MR. BALLAM : Yes. We do these things through the Department of Public Works, which provides space for not only our department but every department.

On motion 1605 carried.

1606 Minimum Wage : On motion carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD : Mr. Chairman,

I don't suggest by any means that we go on for any great length of time now. But it is 11:00 o'clock. Let us start the Department of Mines and Resources. The Minister has hurried back from around the bay. He went over late this afternoon to give a lecture in Bay Roberts tonight, and I asked him to hurry back. He has broken all speed records getting back. I think it is only fair, as he has gone to that much trouble to serve the house, that the House now should take a little trouble to hear him at least begin his estimates.

MR. BROWNE : Perhaps the Minister might have a statement to make explaining his increases. That would save time.

Department of Mines and Resources:
VIII :

801 Minister's Office : On motion carried.

802 General Office : On motion carried.

803 Accounting Office : On motion carried.

804 Forestry :

MR. HOLLETT : There is an increase in the salaries there. I wonder if the Minister could explain that?

MR. ROWE : Mr. Chairman, the report of the Royal Commission on Forestry indicated that we should take some steps in the re-organization of the Forestry Division of the Department, if we are to do even a part of the work they envisaged in that report. As you will see under page 87, that is just to make the adjustment to implement the Forestry Report. The general idea is that we set up regional schemes with forestry inspectors in charge so that there will be a decentralization process. To do that we have

to place the responsibility on some of our men in the field, and that may also entail additional staff. At any rate it will certainly entail additional responsibility. Details will have to be worked out later. We did not have time between the submission of the report and the preparation of the estimates to work out the details.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to know just what is aimed at when the Honourable Minister talks about decentralization in connection with forestry?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the answer to it is to be found in the chapter in the Report of the Royal Commission dealing with the administration of the department. I cannot give the details of that now. I shall endeavour to do so during the year, to implement as far as it is feasible in one year some of the recommendations therein.

MR. HOLLETT: What recommendations? Give us some idea.

DR. ROWE: I could read the chapter, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, let us have the chapter read. And let us have the chapter on boglands and after that on pastures.

On motion 804 carried.

805 Agriculture:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, is the Honourable Minister going to give some details on that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, why not go down through this item by item?

805-01 carried.

805-02-01 on motion carried.

MR. BROWNE: Why not pass the whole thing. It is all over

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are familiar with it. We believe in it. We understand it. We advocated it.

MR. HOLLETT: But can't explain it, without reading the chapter.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If you had —

MR. HOLLETT: We maintain we were being rushed through, the whole estimates are being rushed through in order that the Premier may get to Ottawa on Saturday.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't forget to say "To shine" — rise and shine.

MR. HOLLETT: It would be better to shine before you go up there.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I can give the details.

MR. HOLLETT: That is all I asked for, the details. But the Honourable Minister said: all right, I will read the chapter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee is now on 805-02.

On motion carried.

805-03 Improvement of Standards:

MR. BROWNE: What is that \$3,000 for?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, that is to provide for training of five students at Truro Agricultural College.

MR. HOLLETT: Six hundred dollars each?

DR. ROWE: Scholarships.

MR. HOLLETT: They can't go very long for that.

DR. ROWE: It is part payment.

MR. BROWNE: Are there students there now?

DR. ROWE: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: How are they selected, as a result of examinations or on someone's recommendation?

DR. ROWE: They make application. We advertise and announce the policy. They make application, we then select them.

MR. BROWNE: Do you get many?

DR. ROWE: I don't know the exact number. Not too many. We have enough this year.

On motion carried.

MR. BROWNE: On the next item, Demonstrations and Experiments, where are these being held?

DR. ROWE: They are the experiments we have been carrying on in horticulture, fruits and the like all over, with various field men in selected areas. For example in Bay D'Espoir last year we initiated experiments there on apple trees and strawberries.

MR. BROWNE: It would be too soon to come to any conclusion about apple trees in one year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The strawberry plants are working out very well.

MR. BROWNE: Where are they, the strawberry plants?

DR. ROWE: They are distributed by the field workers to selected parts of Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: Surely it must be recognized that growing strawberries is beyond the experimental stage in Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not exactly experimental. It is demonstrating by having one or two get them and grow them and and sell them and get the cash and a lot of them will imitate their example.

MR. BROWNE: I know it was a very big industry along Long Pond and Manuels.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are trying to restore them.

MR. BROWNE: Most people used to grow them.

DR. ROWE: Some are making a living right out of it.

MR. BROWNE: When the Americans came most people stopped growing them. I remember on Bell Island, one man grew thousands and thousands of them and gave them away during the depression times. But after that they gave them up.

On motion carried.

805-03-04. Grants to Agricultural Organizations: On motion carried.

805-03-05. Health of Animals including compensations:

DR. ROWE: In respect of that, Mr. Chairman, the expenditure that we had to incur in respect to the anti-bovine TB campaign is showing results, and we don't have to spend so much money, nor do we need so much to recompense the farmers for cows destroyed.

MR. BROWNE: Does not the Federal Government contribute to that?

DR. ROWE: Yes, in part.

MR. BROWNE: In what part?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They don't contribute to this amount. They contribute to eradication. This is the amount we contribute. They also contribute.

DR. ROWE: They send down the veterinarians.

MR. HOLLETT: How is \$18,000

to be spent on standardization of marketing?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, that takes in a number of things, including the construction of a retail warehouse which is set up at \$15,000, part of which is the warehouse on the West Coast, and there is a token vote in there for a central cold storage and inspection services and travelling, which costs \$3,000.

MR. HOLLETT: Is the cold storage plant being built or has it been built or what?

DR. ROWE: It is only a token vote for the cold storage.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Just to keep the vote there, so as not to let it disappear from the estimates.

805-03-06. On motion carried.

805-03-07. On motion carried.

DR. ROWE: That is the limestone, agricultural limestone. We subsidize it.

MR. BROWNE: How many sources have you got for that?

DR. ROWE: One, the cement plant at Corner Brook.

MR. BROWNE: Chalkers used to supply a lot of limestone at one time. They had a mine somewhere down north. Do they do that now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not agricultural lime.

805-03-09. On motion carried.

805-03-11. On motion carried.

805-03-12. On motion carried.

805-03-13:

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, 805-03-13 is the subsidized veterinarian

service. We had two, one established at Corner Brook and one at Holyrood, I believe, and we subsidized them at the rate of \$3,000 a year each, and also paid part of their travelling, in fact, the major part of their travelling expenses. These were the only conditions under which we could get any one to come. Already one of those two has found it rather difficult to make a go of it, and we now have to reconsider that matter again. At any rate it is a service most acceptable to our farmers.

MR. HIGGINS: That veterinarian on the west coast, has he gone back?

DR. ROWE: Yes, he has gone back. He was a Newfoundlander.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think he was ever happy there at all, from the beginning until the time he left.

805-03-13. On motion carried.

805-04. Development:

MR. HOLLETT: Could the minister give the details on the \$25,000 blueberries?

MR. ROWE: I have the breakdown here of that. It is mostly the burning of blueberry land. That is the chief way of maintaining the blueberry crop on the barrens, by burning over every two or three years. The crops deteriorate, and by burning the land over we get new and heavier crops from year to year. Our inspection service costs about \$3,000.

MR. BROWNE: I take it you have not given serious consideration to the recommendation that you relinquish the blueberry lands to private individuals?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not as a general practice. We would not rule out

theoretically the idea that the government would ever lease some land, but we certainly would not consider it in highly populated areas.

MR. BROWNE: Has the minister any idea of the value of blueberries produced last year?

DR. ROWE: I could not give it offhand. Actually, Mr. Chairman, I think it is upward of two million dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Last year the price dropped.

On motion carried.

805-04-02. Commission of Enquiry:

MR. BROWNE: What is the total cost of that Commission of Enquiry, up to date?

DR. ROWE: We would not have compiled that yet. It was only tabled last week. I am not sure if all the odds and ends have been cleaned up as yet.

On motion 805-04-02 carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, but I feel that 805-04-03, 805-04-04 and 805-04-05 are wrongly here. I am not so sure, but I feel they ought to be under capital account.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the \$80,000 for?

DR. ROWE: We have broken it down. Transportation took \$31,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: From the mainland to Newfoundland.

DR. ROWE: And we provided \$7,500 for a veterinarian if we can get one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We hope to get the best one in Canada,

DR. ROWE: We provided a grant of \$6,000 for the Mink Breeders' Co-operative.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that made up of all the mink breeders in the island?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have not quite all joined yet.

MR. HOLLETT: Who is the president?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Victor Clouston. President of which one? The Co-operative is Mr. George MacNeil.

DR. ROWE: Our apprenticeship school will be \$19,000, we estimate. That is the very crux of the programme.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that in the \$80,000?

DR. ROWE: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Had the minister any response to an advertisement appearing in the newspaper some time ago?

DR. ROWE: I have not had time to check on it, Mr. Chairman. It was only a few days ago that the advertisement was in.

MR. HOLLETT: While we are on fur farming, I wonder if the minister could clear up the rumour that has been getting around about the 2c. a pound meat, whale meat. What is the meaning of it?

DR. ROWE: I have no comment to make on it at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No doubt he has heard the rumour from the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, we can give a few facts if you like to have them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, we would like to have them.

MR. HOLLETT: It is definite of course that these men were promised when they came down here they would be given meat for 2c. a pound, and I think that is about two cents a pound, probably, less than Victor Clouston himself could have gotten it for. I think that is more or less correct?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am getting information, not giving it. I am being educated.

MR. HOLLETT: Correct me if I am wrong.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am listening with all two ears.

MR. HOLLETT: We know that is quite correct. We will give you some more facts, if you like to have them, but the hour is late and I am going to put it off until the debate on the budget, when I will have more to say about it.

On motion 805-04-03 carried.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, on 805-04-04 and 805-04-05, the honourable the premier has already indicated the Government's general attitude towards these two items. In fact he did so at some length, and the opinion of the Royal Commission is pretty well stated, and these are the estimates of what we expect we shall need to spend in the year on this experimental work on pasture lands and bog lands, forty thousand in one case and twenty thousand in the other.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am going to take some advice in the whole matter, and think it over more and consult with my colleagues. But at the moment my impression is that these two items ought to be elimin-

ated and entered under capital account expenditure. They are clearly capital account. To go out and start draining bogs and improving wild pasture land, if that is not capital account then there never was such a thing. However, I don't suggest doing that right now.

DR. ROWE: Under 805-05-01, the amount is to provide additional equipment for one of the most important phases of the land programme, and the actual work of land clearing. As the committee knows, in the past few years, the government has spent very large sums of money for land clearing all over the province, and we have, of course, not only to replace broken down and worn out equipment but must also from time to time try and extend the work. We propose here now the addition of one new truck for our trailer, and other new equipment.

On motion 805-05-01 carried. On motion 805-05-02 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: That seems a large amount of equipment.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, we have twenty-four tractors at the present time, and the cost of maintaining them in our garage and the parts and all the rest is pretty heavy. I think it is not out of line at all with the experience of industry generally.

MR. HOLLETT: About \$2,000 a piece, on maintenance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is other equipment as well. That would not include all our machinery.

MR. HIGGINS: You have to keep parts on hand all the time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not excessive to keep these machines in good condition.

MR. HIGGINS: We have the same thing in the council.

On motion 805-05-02, 805-05-03, 805-05-04 carried.

805-05-05. Wages and Travelling:
On motion carried.

805-05-06. On motion carried.

805-05-07. On motion carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, unless the Committee wishes otherwise, I move that we rise, and report progress and ask leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the committee rose.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the

Committee of Supply have considered the matter to them referred and have passed items under Current Account, X to XVI inclusive, and under heading VIII from 801 to 805 inclusive. The committee asks leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion report received. Committee on Supply ordered sit again tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 11:00 a.m. of the clock.

On motion the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 20, at 11:00 A.M.

CONTINUED IN VOLUME II 1955