



Proceedings
of the
House of Assembly

During the First Session
of the
Thirty-First General Assembly
of Newfoundland

1957

PROCEEDINGS
of the
FIRST SESSION
of the
THIRTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
of the
PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

WEDNESDAY, March 20, 1957.

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

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to inform you, His Honour, the Administrator, Sir Albert Walsh, Knight Bachelor, has just arrived to open First Session of the Thirty- First General Assembly of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair.

His Honour, the Administrator takes the Chair.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): May it please Your Honour, the House of Assembly agreeable to Your Honour's Command, have proceeded to the choice of a Speaker, and have elected John R. Courage, Esquire, Member for the District of Fortune Bay and Hermitage, to that office, and by their direction I present him for the approbation of Your Honour.

HIS HONOUR THE ADMINISTRATOR: On behalf of Her Majesty I assure you of my sense of your efficiency and I do most fully approve and confirm you as the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Your Honour's ready approval of the choice with which I have been honoured by the House having constituted me in due form the Speaker of the House of Assembly, it has now become my duty in the name of the representatives of Her Majesty's loyal subjects, the people of this Province, and respectfully to claim of Your Honour their accustomed rights and privileges and that they shall have freedom of speech in their debates, that they may be free from arrest during their attendance in Parliament and that I as Speaker, may have full access to Your Majesty's presence and that they have confirmed to them all their ancient rights and privileges which have been confirmed to them by Your Honour's predecessors.

HIS HONOUR THE ADMINISTRATOR: On behalf of Her Majesty I do confirm this House in the enjoyment of all its ancient and undoubted rights and privileges.

His Honour then read the Speech from the Throne as follows:

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

I welcome you to this first Session of the Thirty-First General Assembly of Newfoundland, and congratulate you upon your election to this House. I trust that you will have a pleasant term of useful service to the people of our Province, and that under your wise guidance the interests of Newfoundland will be materially advanced. You are the Third General Assembly since Confederation, and although much has been accomplished in the two General Assemblies that have preceded you, much remains to be accomplished if Newfoundland is to be a thoroughly successful and happy part of the fast-growing Canadian nation. For all of you it will, I feel, be a labour of patriotic zeal to shape your legislation always with the thought of Newfoundland's true welfare in mind.

As you are aware, the Prime Minister of Canada has announced the appointment of the Royal Commission, the creation of which was provided for in Term 29 of the Terms of Union under which Canada and Newfoundland united federally in 1949. Term 29 provided for the appointment of a Royal Commission that would review the financial consequences of union upon the finances of the Government of the new Province, and would recommend to the Government of Canada the form and scale of the additional financial assistance, if any, that might be required by the Province to enable it to continue Public Services. You are, I am sure, quite familiar with the wording of Term 29, so I do not need to dwell upon that subject at

this time. My Ministers feel that the work and recommendations of the Royal Commission are of very great importance to the future of Newfoundland, and they feel that Newfoundland's case will receive skilled, fair and sympathetic consideration by the Royal Commission on Revision of the Financial Terms of Union, have energetically prepared evidence and argument to be laid before the Royal Commission. They feel that the preparation of the case for the Province has been made with great thoroughness and efficiency by the committee of distinguished Newfoundlanders to whom the task was entrusted, and they await the outcome of the review with confidence.

A few months ago my Ministers appointed the firm of Arthur D. Little Inc. of Boston, Massachusetts, to undertake an economic and commercial analysis of the new industries established in recent years by means of Government Bonds. This firm has commenced the work of making this analysis, and my Ministers hope to have the benefit of its report within the next few weeks.

My Ministers last year appointed a Royal Commission to examine into economic and social conditions along the South West Coast of the Province. The Commission completed their examination some time ago, and their report is now nearing completion. It is hoped that this report can be laid before you in the present session. My Ministers have no knowledge of the contents of the report, and are unable to determine whether its implementation will require action by you in the present session.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a growing feeling that there is need for a review of the whole matter of Civil Service pensions in this Province. The con-

siderable growth of the Civil Service, both established and non-established, in recent years has caused the question of pensions to become a concern of major importance, and my Ministers propose soon to appoint a Royal Commission to take evidence and make recommendations on the question.

Announcement has already been made of the fact that the plans and specifications of the first four new University buildings have been completed, and of the Government's hope soon to award a contract for their construction. You will be asked to vote the necessary funds, and I am sure that you will do so with considerable satisfaction. The notable growth of the Memorial University in recent years has given all Newfoundlanders much cause for pride, and there will be universal confidence that this growth will be maintained and even increased in the next few years.

There has been considerable controversy, arising out of differences of opinion, in recent years over the matter of the weekly closing day in shops and such establishments. My Ministers will propose to the House the setting up of a Select Committee to conduct public hearings and take evidence from all persons or groups who wish to appear, and to report to the House.

For a great many years in Newfoundland there has been a strong feeling amongst many of our fishermen, that the customary measure for salt dried codfish, namely, the quintal, is no longer a satisfactory one. My Ministers have received from the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen a request that they propose to this House a law that would abolish the quintal as a unit of measurement of salt fish, and substitute a simple measurement by pounds avoirdupois. It is proposed

to ask the House to set up a Select Committee to hold public hearings at which all interested parties will have the opportunity of expressing their preferences. This Select Committee will report back to the House.

Mr. Speaker, some few years ago your House passed legislation enabling the Government to deal with a problem that had arisen in connection with certain grants of mineral lands and forests lands. Many of these areas had been granted a good many years ago, on certain conditions of development. The conditions had not been carried out, but the grants had never been cancelled and the lands in question reverted in the Crown. This Honourable House passed laws requiring that the conditions be fulfilled, and that the land revert to the Crown in case of continued failure to fulfill them. This legislation, which went a long way in the direction of giving the concessionaries in question ample opportunity, even at the last hour, to carry out the conditions of their grants, has been the means of bringing back into possession of the Crown considerable areas of mineral and timber lands of value and importance. My Ministers are so encouraged by the results of that legislation that they propose in this Session, to ask you to pass similar legislation affecting other kinds of land granted under conditions which have not in fact been carried out. It is not proposed that this legislation shall apply to land measuring less than 200 acres in area. Although the number of cases involved would be small, the areas of land would be considerable. The continued failure to fulfill the original conditions of the grants of this land has retarded, and continues to retard Newfoundland's progress. My Ministers feel that the time has come when steps should be taken to provide the proper remedy.

It is the belief of my Ministers that an indispensable feature of Newfoundland's rapid expansion and progress in the next few years is the construction of many miles of new roads and reconstruction of many miles of existing roads throughout the Province. My Ministers intend to embark upon a large programme of such road building, and with that in mind they will request you to pass legislation dividing the present Department of Public Works into two, by creating a new Department of Highways and giving it jurisdiction over all matters of roads, bridges and the like. All other functions of the Department of Public Works would continue to be discharged by the existing Public Works Department.

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

You will be requested to make provision of Supply to Her Majesty.

I know that you will apply yourselves with zeal to the public business that will come before you in this Session, and I pray the blessing of Providence upon your labours.

His Honour the Administrator then left the Assembly Chamber.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled, "An Act to Amend the Trade Union Act," and I ask that this Bill be now read a first time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that at 3:00 of the clock

today His Honour, the Administrator, was pleased to open this first Session of the Thirty-First Parliament, and His Honour was pleased to confirm me in my election as Speaker of the House of Assembly.

I would like to again acknowledge to the Members of this House my thanks for the very high honour that they have conferred upon me.

The responsibilities that go with this position are very great and the burden is heavy, but I wish to assure honourable members that I am sensible of these responsibilities and that I shall endeavour to perform my duties with the strictest impartiality. I would like to feel also that the fact that I was elected unanimously is a guarantee that I can at all times count on the fullest support of all honourable members of this House.

In your name I asked His Honour if he would confirm the ancient rights and privileges inherent in this Parliament, and His Honour was graciously pleased to grant us these traditional rights and privileges freely.

At the time of opening this House His Honour was graciously present to make a Speech from the Throne, a copy of which I have obtained and of which, for greater accuracy, the Clerk will now read; if it is your wish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We might dispense with it, Mr. Speaker.

It was agreed by the House that the rereading of the Speech from the Throne should be dispensed with.

MR. C. SHEPPARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move that a committee be appointed to draft an address in reply to the gracious speech with which His Honour, the Administrator, has been pleased to open this First Session of

the Thirty-First General Assembly of Newfoundland.

In doing so I would like, Sir, with your permission, to make reference to certain parts of the message contained in that speech.

The people of Newfoundland have again shown that they have confidence in the policies of the Government of this province which has been in office since union with Canada. They have shown that they have renewed and added confidence in the Premier who leads this Government; and they have shown that they have confidence that under this Government the amazing progress of our province will be maintained and magnified.

One of the things that must have interested us most, Sir, I think, is the reference in the speech to the appointment of a Royal Commission, under Term 29 of the Terms of Union whereby Newfoundland became a province of the great Canadian Federation. With visionary wisdom the negotiators of that union inserted this clause; and we are about to witness the Royal Commission embarking upon its task. We know that the eminent and conscientious men who form that Royal Commission will address themselves to their task with incomparable skill and integrity.

It has become increasingly more evident in late years that in order to have a happy, successful Canada we cannot allow ourselves to think in terms of a "have-not" province. Rather we must endeavour to employ our financial and natural resources in such a manner that no part of our nation may feel that because of geographical position or for any other cause it is being relegated to the position of a depressed area. It is, I think, Sir, fair to sug-

gest that the concept of mutual help has permeated the thinking of world statesmen both on the international and national level. I think also, Sir, that it is fair to suggest that the policies of our Federal Government are being shaped that together all of the partners in this nation may enjoy in equal measure an equal share of prosperity, services and security. The confirmed pessimists will continue as always to spread alarm and despondency. They say there is nothing good in Confederation, and have so blinded themselves that they would have us believe that some great evil was done this Island Home of ours. They now say that this great evil is to be sealed upon us through the Royal Commission to which I refer. These pessimists are without pride of ancestry or hope of posterity.

It would be foolish, of course, to suggest that all of our problems would be solved by the recommendations of this Royal Commission. But is it not reasonable to assume that, working together in good faith and mutual understanding, we shall adjust the original conditions envisaged by Term 29 to conform to the conditions existing and likely to exist as we develop and expand. The keynote to a mutually satisfactory revision, Sir, in my opinion, is good faith and sympathetic understanding on all sides. We are convinced that these conditions shall prevail.

Let us now turn to a matter of a more domestic nature, but never losing sight of the fact that we are, and I hope always will be, part and parcel of a great family of nations—I refer, Sir, to our proud and glorious history as the first-born of the British Commonwealth, and whose sons lie broken and scattered over many a land and sea in mute testimony of your right

and my right to gather in this Parliament today.

The Speech makes reference to the fact that an analysis of the new industries established in recent years is being made and that a report may be expected shortly. It is not unreasonable to assume that certain honourable members will again indulge in their favourite pastime during this session. For myself, I am prepared to await the report to which reference is made. But, with your permission, Sir, I would like to comment here that the new industry presently operating in my district appears to have overcome any initial difficulties it might have experienced and is now operating on a full time expanding basis; which means much to the economy and prosperity of the district. The rates and standards of production have improved to the point where, in free competition, this plant has recently succeeded in obtaining an order for almost half a million dollars worth of its product. This order is over and above its normal market outlet, which I understand also continues to expand at a satisfactory rate.

The high level of prosperity enjoyed by our people is continuing and there is every reason to believe that it will continue as our economy expands. We have cause to believe with every confidence, that we are on the threshold of great mineral development within the boundaries of our province. Both industry and Government continue to endeavour to make possible the development of our natural resources on the land and on the sea, and undoubtedly we are approaching an era of production with amazing implications for the good of this province.

It is unfortunate in a sense that we must look to the outside so much

to obtain people with the energy, the confidence and the capital to develop these resources while within our own Province there is a tendency on the part of those of us who should be in the foreground, not only to hesitate, but even to actively and passively resist the forward momentum of our economy.

The Government's never-failing interest in our most valuable resource, the youth of our country, is reflected in the intention expressed in the Speech to proceed with the first phase of the erection of four new buildings comprising part of the Memorial University. It is a matter of public knowledge and concern that we have approached somewhat of a crisis in educating our children at the primary, high school and university level. With the completion of these new buildings and the added enrollment in the faculty of education together with the increased facilities I feel one of the first steps towards a better supply of more fully trained educators and thus an easement of our current teacher problem will have been achieved.

It has been shown time and time again that in the field of education we face many problems—We have the ever increasing demand for more and better schools, which is but another sign of our forward march—The provision of these schools and facilities is a problem of major concern not only to the Government but to our individual constituents. We have witnessed, Sir, quite recently, an example—the setting up of a system of local taxes for this purpose. The Government in former sessions made provisions for the voluntary adoption of various forms of local taxes by individual communities for this purpose. And very wisely the Government left the adoption of these methods of school

financing to these individual communities. With some experience in certain aspects of school financing, I am prepared to suggest that all of us with like interest should study closely this legislation to ascertain if it might not be the most suitable and equitable answer to the problem. I would stress, however, that communities contemplating this form of school financing should in all cases place the full implications before all the people to be affected, and only after careful study and approval by the communities, implement school taxes on the individual local level.

That part of the Speech dealing with the matter of weekly closing days in shop closing areas is of particular interest to my district and to other districts where the Shop Act is applicable. At the present time we have no uniformity in this matter, and we have a situation where it is now possible to step from one settlement in a particular shop closing area into another settlement in another shop closing area nearby, with business establishments observing entirely different closing days. This situation makes for confusion and uncertainty and serves no useful purpose. It is my considered opinion, Sir, that uniformity in holidays, applicable to all shop closing areas, should be the aim of any proposed legislation or amendment to the various pieces of legislation dealing with the subject.

I would not insult the House, Sir, with any lengthy reference to that need which exists in all parts of our province. I refer to the expressed intention of the Government to pursue a great programme of road building and reconstruction. All forms of development whether they be industrial or social depend upon good communications, and this particular form of

communications we must have or stagnate in our various isolated settlements. This aspect of the Speech may not be so appealing to the members of the House whose districts have relatively good roads both summer and winter. But, Mr. Speaker, I feel that most honourable members will agree that those parts of our province undeveloped in this respect will not look to this Government in vain.

Mr. Speaker, together with all honourable members of this House, I am confident that we can look forward to the continuing and continued prosperity of our province and a bright future for all our people.

In making this motion, Mr. Speaker, I am fully cognizant of the fact that a great honour, together with a great burden of responsibility has been placed upon all of us as we gather to represent a great and noble people in this proud edifice where so many learned, gallant and illustrious men have guided the destinies of this land and have preserved for our people this, the greatest bulwark of freedom, the parliament of free men. Let us Sir, so dedicate and conduct ourselves that we may, with God's help, preserve and maintain that tradition which is ours, but which we often prize so very lightly.

(Applause)

MR. J. O'DRISCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion that has been moved with such elegance by the honourable and gallant member for Harbour Grace. It is a special pleasure for me to be associated with him in this motion for, as the House is aware, he had a distinguished career in the armed forces during the Second World War, and he has displayed a rare ability which should carry him

a long way in the public life of this province.

Perhaps the House would bear with me if I expressed a purely personal word before I go on to comment on some of the matters that are contained in the Speech from the Throne. In the first place I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Premier and the Leader of the Liberal Party for the invitation that he so generously extended to me to be his standard bearer in the District of Bell Island in the recent general election. I have never been a politician, and when I received the invitation I had to give it some very pretty hard thought before I could accept. I had some idea what I was undertaking if I accepted, I did know enough about politics to realize that representing a district in this House meant much more than just sitting here for two or three months while the House is in Session. If that was all it meant almost anybody could be a member of the House. I know that now today it is practically a full-time profession, and people who live in our districts do not cease to have problems the day after the House closes. These problems run into hundreds, and there never seems to be an end to them. I thought, as a businessman, I had a lot of experience in dealing with letters and telephone calls and telegrams but it was never until after the election last October that I really began to discover the number and variety of affairs that the elected representative of a district had to grapple with. I could not say that I did not have some suspicion of what would confront me when the Premier invited me to be a candidate last September, and that is why I considered the matter pretty carefully before I said yes.

Now that the election is over, and I find myself in a seat in this Hon-

ourable House, my mind is made up that I will devote myself to the task of giving the people of Bell Island the very best that lies in me for the next four or five years and at the same time that I will make every effort to be a useful and loyal member and supporter of the party and Government that are running the affairs of Newfoundland.

I sincerely trust the House will forgive me this personal word which I felt I had to express before touching briefly upon two or three matters mentioned in the Speech. I shall not delay you with any extensive reference to that part of the Speech from the Throne which deals with the Revision of Term 29 of the Terms of Union. Enough has been written and spoken about this term in recent months to drive it home to all people that this is truly very important and for the future prosperity and success of this province. We all know that Newfoundland is still away the most backward of the ten provinces, that in spite of the splendid progress that has been made in recent years, in spite of all the advances that have been made since the outbreak of World War II and since the advent of Confederation, the hard fact of the matter is that Newfoundland is still far behind Nova Scotia in such things as roads, hospitals, schools, water and sewerage services and electricity and a lot of other things. Even a great centre of national wealth such as Bell Island, for instance, does not even have a hospital; there are still great stretches of our coastline that are not linked up by road; our schools still require rebuilding and enlargement and improvement notwithstanding all that has been done in recent years. Is it, Mr. Speaker, too much to hope that the forthcoming review of the financial side of Confederation will result in a

big increase in the subsidies coming to us from Ottawa? Frankly I am not in a position to express an opinion on that matter. I am encouraged by the opinions of those who have given the matter very deep and exhaustive study. Some of our ablest Newfoundlanders have served over three years on our own Commission preparing the case for the Royal Commission, and all I can learn from these men is that they are very confident of the outcome. Mr. Speaker, I know that all patriotic Newfoundlanders will be pulling strongly for Newfoundland in the next few months while our case is being reviewed, and regardless of party affiliations, everyone in this House will hope for a successful outcome of the work of the Commission.

As a businessman I am glad to know that the large firm of Arthur D. Little of Boston are making a thorough-going analysis and appraisal of the new industries, as they are called. This Boston firm are very well known, they have nearly two thousand financial experts and industrial and technical experts and have had great experience in going into all kinds of business enterprises and making just this kind of analysis. I sincerely trust the Government will receive a useful report on each individual enterprise amongst the new industries and that everyone may be found to be basically sound. It would be a wonderful thing for Newfoundland if they all succeeded.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at the contract that will soon be let for the construction of the first four buildings of the new university. I am sure that all members of this House heard the news with great pleasure. There are thousands of young men and women in Newfoundland today who will have a better chance in life

because of this university, and Newfoundland herself is bound to become a better place because of the existence and work of this university. Many of us rubbed our eyes the other day when we read the Honourable the Premier's announcement that the university has eight hundred enrolled students and will have eleven hundred in the year that starts next fall. It is a pretty wonderful sign of Newfoundland's progress and gives us cause to have greater faith than ever in the future of our Island Home.

Mr. Speaker, at the start of my remarks today I asked the House to forgive me for expressing a personal word, and now again I am asking the House to forgive me if I depart from that Speech from the Throne for my closing words. This House, as we all can see, is pretty lopsided. Here on this side of Your Honour there are thirty-one of us. Across the floor are four members of the Opposition. It is lopsided, we must admit. But we must not blame the people who sent us here. They had every right to vote the way they did. But at the same time we must admit that the House is a bit one-sided. This does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that the four members of the Opposition need to feel bashful or discouraged or down-hearted. They have their duty to perform just as we on this side have our duty to perform. I can't see why we cannot all perform our duties, and conscientiously too, in a gentlemanly way and as good Newfoundlanders. Newfoundland has Responsible Government, and it has had it for the last eight years. For eight years we have been a province of Canada. Our Newfoundland people are looking to us for guidance and for leadership. We can all be loyal to our party, to our side, and we can all be loyal to Newfoundland at the same time. To-

day is a happy day for all of us, and as we take our seats here in this Honourable House may our last day here in this General Assembly be just as happy four or five years from now.

I have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

HON. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the motion which has been most ably proposed, I want to say at the outset that I have no intention of raising any controversial issues at this particular session. The reason is obvious. The reason is on our side of the House—it always was, as a matter of fact, a reason. But I want, Sir, at this time to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, upon the very high honour which has been conferred upon you, an honour, Sir, which all of us would in a sense be envious of, because it is one of the highest honours that any country can confer upon a citizen, that of being the first citizen of this the tenth province of Canada. I congratulate you, too, Sir, because I know that you have the ability to carry out the duties, and very onerous ones, with which you will be taxed. I promise you that in the coming session you will be taxed with onerous duties. But I feel you have the ability, Sir, and the good judgment to carry out these duties.

In congratulating you, Sir, I want too to pay tribute to your predecessor, the Honourable Mr. Sparkes who has given to this House and to the country, faithful service all the while that he sat in the Chair in which you now find yourself. I only hope and trust that this Province will not be deprived of the public services which the Honourable Mr. Sparkes can and is

well qualified to give to this Tenth Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. HOLLETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, there are one or two other congratulations which I have to make, and they are sincere, of course.

I congratulate the mover and seconder upon the manner in which they proposed the motion to draft an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I will say that I was impressed by the oratorical effort made by the proposer, and I do hope that we shall have the benefit of this oratory at a time when it will be probably more needed than it is today. We shall see what the Honourable Member for Harbour Grace can do in this House when things are not running just as smoothly as they are at the present time. I congratulate both the Honourable Members for the manner in which they have made this motion.

There is one other thing which I think, as Leader of the Opposition I would be remiss in my duty if I were to forget, i.e. to congratulate the Honourable the Premier, (and that does not mean that we will not cross swords, that we will not in effect politically stab at each other.) In all sincerity I wish to tender to him, Sir, hearty congratulations upon the fact that he is confirmed in his office as Premier of this Tenth Province, and not only that but that he has had the honour, a distinguished honour, to see representing a district of this province here in this House one of his own sons. That honour, Sir, comes to very few people in this Province or any other province of Canada. I do hearty congratulate him on that signal honour.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Bell Island referred to the lopsided-

ness of the House. In one respect, Sir, undoubtedly this House is lopsided, but when I point out to you, Sir, that we of the Opposition have with us today the people, the people of Newfoundland, I say we are lopsided in this direction. But when these people leave, Sir, when these people leave I will admit that lopsidedness is in that direction, and God help this House if we run into rough water. You will see some of them crossing over to keep the balance of this good ship of state. There is no question about that. We are going to run into stormy water. I give now a free invitation to all members of the opposite side; we have life belts on this side and we have accommodations when the weather gets tough and rough.

Sir, it is true there are thirty-one members, but I would like to point out that I suppose my honourable friend from St. John's East had more people go to the polls to vote for him than probably any other four which I might pick out on the opposite side. If I so desired I could say the same for my honourable friend from St. John's centre and from St. John's South. They had a lot of people go to the polls to support them, and much more than any two or three of the members which I could name on the opposite side of the House. So as you see, we, of the Opposition, do represent a cross section of the people of this country. They have delegated us to assist you in governing, and if by opposing you we can assist in the better Government on any particular matter then I know that the people and the Government will be happy to have us here.

Now, Sir, I don't think I should say very much about the Speech from the Throne. How in the world the Honourable Member for Harbour

Grace could make such an excellent address on that innocuous document which was read here today beats me. Did anybody in this House see anything whatsoever in that Speech from the Throne? I have been sitting here four or five years, and I have heard several Speeches from the Throne; and this one, Sir, beats me completely. What is there in it for people to take hold of? What do they see in it?

We are told the Royal Commission for Term 29 is being set up. Everybody knew that— Everybody knew that in this country.

We are told that Mr. Little of that firm—some little man in the states—is to look into the matter of the new industries. He spoke of the new industries with bated breath. That is the only mention of the new industries there. "Too little and too late," did somebody say?

They spoke of the Southwest Coast Commission sitting for a year, I think. Everybody has been told a dozen times they had completed their work.

Civil Service Pensions; the four university buildings, the weekly holiday. What did they say about Fisheries? They are not going to weigh the fish any more by quintals at all. They are going to do it by pounds, avoirdupois or something like that. How important it must have been to them as they drafted it.

Then there is a sentence about forest lands and a short sentence about roads and we are then asked to vote supply.

Now we on this side of the House must say that it is the only Speech from the Throne since we have been here containing absolutely nothing. I think the Honourable the Premier will agree with me when he gets on

his feet—there is no question about that.

I want to congratulate the Honourable Member for Harbour Grace. To hear him speak, that Speech from the Throne is one that ought to be read in the House of Commons in London. There is nothing in it—absolutely. It is the most futile Speech from the Throne I have ever seen and ever heard of. Go back and look at all the old Hansards, what do they say? For instance, about the fisheries. Newfoundland has been a fishing country. What do they say? They are not going to weigh the fish the same as before—that is all. There was not one iota more—Change the quintal—

What about the new great mineral development? There is nothing in the Speech from the Throne about Javelin nor the Labrador Exploration Company nor all the other big companies, BRINCO—Nothing about that. I have not heard it—

What about the paper mills? Did they mention that? Was there any word of the great paper mills, the three or four paper mills we are to get? Why our people will be left without any hope whatsoever when they hear that read over the radio.

What was said about the new industries? Oh yes, Mr. Little—I hope Mr. Little is not set up to try and prevent us on this side of the House from going into matters touching on the industries because Mr. Little will have a hard time and so will the Government if they mean to prevent us from saying anything about the new industries. But I said I was not going to get controversial.

Dr. Valdmanis, of course, is not mentioned at all.

Is there anything about schools in it, anything about unemployment? I

believe the mover of the motion said we were enjoying the greatest prosperity the Province ever had before. Do not let us forget there are twenty thousand people unemployed today, twenty thousand people in the St. John's area and eighteen thousand, I believe, to be exact. Any man today who is unemployed in Newfoundland is not enjoying any prosperity whatsoever nor are five or six or seven people who are affected by his earnings. They are not living in a great prosperity, not by any means whatsoever.

There is nothing about that. There is nothing about all these important things. And, Sir, I do wish that there had been. I do wish that the Speech from the Throne had contained some reference to the paper, to Javelin, to the mines and the great earnings which are going to come to our people and how the Children's Health Scheme would be financed by it. It would be lovely if we could hear something about that. We may hear something as the time goes on, but it is too bad that somebody forgot to put these in the Speech from the Throne.

The honourable member for Harbour Grace spoke of the people having confidence in the Premier and in the Government. I have no quarrel with that at all. The last election indicated that beyond any doubt, and we admit it. It makes the burden of the Government all the more difficult for the honourable gentleman. By the way, as we look across at them it almost looks to me like a magistrates' convention. I can think of a magistrates' convention in the old days, Commission of Government. We had the magistrates all on one side and the Commission on the other side. It was a little bit unbalanced then too. But I will say this, Sir, the people have elected on the Government side, to

say nothing about the Opposition, some men in whom I have the greatest confidence. There are seventeen magistrates over there, Sir, and out of that seventeen new faces I do expect that somebody will emerge who will be able to assist the Government and to help the people of this country to a higher and better standard of living.

I am not going to say any more because I understand, Sir, on this your first time in the Chair, you have invited us all to partake of refreshments, and I do not want to delay the House.

I do say that I am very proud to be here. I am glad of the honour of representing the people whom I do represent and I am glad to be associated with the three members on my left, and I can assure the people and I can assure the Government that we will give all within our power to assure good and better Government for Newfoundland.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House some sixteen per cent of us are former magistrates, on that side fifty per cent, half of them, the Honourable Leader himself and his honourable colleague next to him. I am very happy indeed that they have half who were former magistrates. I think men who have spent years and years on the bench as magistrates administering the law, to speak, ought to be all the better for that as law makers. I believe they will study the Bills as they are brought before the House and enact the laws with all the greater interest because of the fact they were magistrates. I believe furthermore that the fact that they were magistrates throughout this island it gave them experience in dealing with the problems of our people right out

in the field and not in a comfortable and well-lit chamber. I believe that will make them all the more valuable as legislators and as members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to add mine to the chorus of congratulations you have been receiving since your election today as first commoner, the Speaker of this House. It is a position of very great honour, very great honour indeed. One day your portrait will join these on that wall, because there are the portraits of the former Speakers of the House of Assembly, this side of the bar, and it is a very honourable company. They are some of the greatest Speakers Newfoundland ever produced, they are men who have made a very great contribution indeed to the upbuilding of this people and this island—and you will join that honourable company in due time.

Your predecessor, the Honourable Mr. Sparkes is, if I may be bold enough to say it, the greatest of the speakers in this House in modern times. I personally knew every Speaker beginning with the Honourable John R. Goddison—Judge Morris, W. R. Warren and John R. Goddison, Mr. Higgins and the five on that side. I knew personally these seven. Your immediate predecessor makes eight Speakers, and I believe that in the present century Mr. Sparkes was the greatest of them.

You served for nearly eight years as his Deputy. You have had a magnificent training, Your Honour, and if you do not turn out to be one of the great Speakers I for one will be greatly surprised. Certainly you will have the warm support of the whole House, on both sides of the House, because you have that personal popularity which ought to be very valuable

indeed in any member of this House who presides over its debates.

May I offer a very special word of congratulations to the two honourable and gallant members who moved and seconded this present motion; the honourable and gallant member for Harbour Grace and the honourable and gallant member for Bell Island. The mover of the motion, the honourable and gallant member for Harbour Grace served in this late war with very great distinction indeed. I believe he was a policeman on the beat. I believe he was a member of the police force who served as a policeman on the beat. I believe he was then taken into the office of the police force at clerical work and I believe he was engaged at that clerical work for the police force when war broke out and he enlisted in the British Army. In no time at all he was a Sergeant and after not very long, became a Lieutenant and then a Captain and came out of the war with the rank of Major. Then he joined the magistracy of Newfoundland and became rapidly one of the most distinguished of the law men occupying seats on the Newfoundland Bench. I bespeak for him, and I think all of you who hear him today will agree that I am not over-optimistic when I bespeak for him a fine career in the public life of this Province.

The honourable and gallant member for Bell Island who seconded the motion is likewise a war veteran having been a soldier in the Royal Newfoundland Regiment in the First World War and having then joined again in the late war, in charge, I believe, of the home guard and then overseas with the Royal Artillery, and from the Royal Artillery he was transferred to the Royal Newfoundland

Regiment with the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

It is a rather striking fact that just about one-third of the members on this side of the House are war veterans. I think some eleven or twelve of the members here have served in Her Majesty's Forces in one part or another of the world.

I greatly regret the absence today of two of our members, two of our Ministers, the Honourable Minister of Finance and the member for Grand Falls who is in hospital but is, I am happy to say, shortly to leave the hospital so that I hope he will be back here in his place on Monday when the House reassembles; and the Honourable Minister of Health, the member for St. Mary's who is, as is fairly well-known, confined for the most part to his house although he has been able to come along and attend some Cabinet meetings, with his foot propped up; in the Cabinet room.

May I say this word further, that we have here on this side of the House thirty-one members and that is the largest membership that ever sat on this side of the House or any side of the House since this House was constituted well over a hundred years ago. Never before today did as many as thirty-one members sit on one side of the House. There was a time when this Cabinet was made up of forty members. The Premier of the day was the late Honourable Sir Richard Squives. There were forty members elected to that House. Ten of them were Opposition members and thirty of them were Liberal, and of the thirty, one ceased to be an active member of the party because he, of course, was elected to be Speaker of the House and that left a total sitting here of twenty-nine out of forty. Now we have thirty-one which is the largest

number this House has ever seen on any one side of it.

May I say that I grow increasingly convinced, session by session, that this Chamber is too small. It is very much too small. You may say that it held more when it held forty. That is true, but when it held forty, as I said before, there were really only twenty-nine on this side and ten on the opposite side. We have clung tenaciously to the old traditions here in this Province notwithstanding the fact we have become a modern province of Canada. We have clung to many of our old traditions and I am, for one, very fond of the splash of pageantry and liturgy that occurs here on opening day. I like to see the Lieutenant-Governor arrive accompanied by his attendants and representatives of the armed forces and the like, but admittedly it is a bit crowded when they come in and when they go out there is scarcely room for them on both sides of Mr. Speaker. The distinguished visitors who come here on opening day feel the place to be over-crowded, and there would be two or three times as many if only there was physical room to hold them here. It seems to me that one day we will have to take this wall out, cut the wall away and let the other Chamber, which is about the same size, into this and make the two into one, and perhaps put the Speaker's Throne at the eastern end of the building and have the members facing north and south, up and down this way, which would make ample room for the public up and down the south side of the Chamber both downstairs and up and would make perhaps some room at the back of there which might well be part of the public section of the Chamber. If our population grows as it has been doing and Newfoundland continues to expand as it has been doing perhaps we

will not always have a House of only thirty-six members but it might go to forty or fifty in six, eight, ten or fifteen years, and generally a larger Chamber would lend dignity and spaciousness to it and generally make a great improvement. Then when the building is rebuilt, as is being done, the eastern wall being a completely new wall all of the old wall having been removed to be replaced by completely new. This is to be done on the west and north side as well as the front. In the course of time this will be a completely new building, the grounds in front will be paved and there will be new trees in new positions and a magnificent parking space on the side over here. Generally and in the course of time this People's House should become the great shrine, almost, of democracy in this Province. Certainly if you leave us in power long enough to do it we will give you a building of which you can all be extremely proud.

I should like to say one or two things to my honourable friends opposite: Like the honourable and gallant member from Bell Island I too feel that the House is somewhat lopsided. There are only four members on the other side. There are four men only. They are usually able men but they are four only in number and if some fifty or sixty pieces of legislation comes before this House at the present session, as there will likely be, it is a great task for four men to undertake to study that legislation line by line and word for word. It is perhaps too great a task for them. Not now for the first time do I say that I have certain misgivings about the smallness of the Opposition, about the fact that the people of Newfoundland elected only four on that side of the House. I do not think that that is good. I said that before. I said it here in the last ses-

sion of the House. I said it leading up to an election. I said it during the election. I said it during the campaign. I said it publicly, and I say it again. It is not intrinsically good for this House to be so one-sided. That is not good for Newfoundland. If we politicians can look at it a little more selflessly than that, it is not good for politics, it is not healthy politics. So, with all my other responsibilities I have been taking on me the responsibility for trying to assist the Opposition. I hope to have more success in that than I have had up to now. At all events I am happy to see them occupying their new space in this building, their own offices. I regret greatly that the newspapermen have had to be put out of those rooms. They have changed places temporarily—it is purely temporary—with the Opposition. For decades the Opposition occupied a room down here in the basement, a dark, dismal dungeon, which they reached by going down the winding stairs with the iron spiral staircase. They have moved from that up into two fine, well-lighted rooms on the next floor, behind the public gallery. I hope to have the pleasure in this present session of proposing to the House that the House vote each year to the Opposition, whoever the Opposition may be, a sum of money, a reasonable modest sum of money to the Opposition as such, not to any individual member of the Opposition but to the Opposition Party, whoever they may be, a modest sum of money towards the cost of maintaining their own secretariat or at least a secretary or possibly a research clerk or worker who would assist them in preparing their questions and seeing that they do not ask the same question twice, as they frequently do, when one honourable member stands and gives notice of a question to be followed immediately by another hon-

ourable member of the same party asking identically the same question couched in other words in other verbiage; and generally to help the Opposition. I hope in this present session that a larger remuneration, salary whatever the Leader of the Opposition gets, whatever it is called, over and above the ordinary indemnity, that a larger allowance than the present one be voted to the Leader of the Opposition. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in so far as we can; we cannot take the place of the Newfoundland people who are the ones who sent us here, but in so far as we can we want very sincerely to help the Opposition, to help them to be stronger than they are, to be more effective than they are, because we can't help ourselves any better than by helping the Opposition to be strong. If we are unopposed by the Opposition, if we are not severely criticized by the Opposition and if the Opposition are not always on their toes to detect wrong doing on our part there will be greater temptation for us to do wrong maybe wrong by omission only or as well as positively. I do hope sincerely that my honourable friends opposite will not feel discouraged.

One of the strongest Oppositions I ever saw in this Chamber consisted of two men, the Leader and one follower. The Leader was the present Senator Bradley and the follower was the late Ronald G. Starkes. The two of them were just enough to move and second a motion. I was helping them at that time. I was a newspaperman. On the opening day of the House they gave notice of three hundred questions and on the following day they gave notice of some two or three hundred more, and every day until it ran up into the many hundreds. I wrote every one of them. It was a labour of love, a great joy for me, as an

amateur politician, to prepare these questions. The honourable and learned member for St. John's South (I do not have to distinguish them now.) That is one advantage of the recent Redistribution Act. We do not have to distinguish between them. There is only one case in this House where two members represent one district (Harbour Main), was a member of the House at that time, and sat then on the Government side. He was a supporter and perhaps a member, I don't remember, but he was certainly a supporter of the Government. There were hundreds and hundreds of questions tabled by the Opposition of two men. But I assure you these two men were anxious to make their positions a full time job. Being members of the House was not in their view a job for mere amateurs, and being members of the Opposition was not a part-time hobby; it was a full time job. These two men set out to bring the Government tumbling down and I dare say if they had had long enough they might have succeeded. They worked hard.

So the present honourable gentlemen opposite need not feel a bit discouraged. In fact, you know, the old saying—"the bigger they come the harder they fall." That should be their motto as they look over here on these thirty-one members—"the bigger they come the harder they fall" and they should hammer away at us, it will make us better.

If I can repeat an anecdote that is told of the Duke Wellington and if I can do it without being misunderstood by my honourable friends on this side of the House, I will adapt it—He looked at his army, before some battle, and he said as he looked at his own troops, ragged and bedraggled as they were, badly trained and badly equipped, "I don't know," he said to

his adjutant or right-hand man, "I don't know how they affect the enemy but, by God, they frighten me." I say here that my honourable friends and colleagues and supporters on this side of the House, do not frighten me, but I will tell you what does frighten me, it is the tremendous majority and the small minority on the other side of the House.

I do not intend to stay in politics all my life, Mr. Speaker. I intend to get out of politics before I am kicked out. I want to get out an "undefeated champion" if I can. It may mean winning another two or three elections, but I do want to go out "undefeated." There is something I want far more than that: I want to go out having helped some to make politics in Newfoundland, the political game, and it is a game as well as many other things, I want to help them make politics vigorous, vital, true, sincere but above all vital, full of life, full of vitality. You cannot have that if politics is too one-sided, you cannot have it. People finally will grow discouraged even with voting, people finally will get just a little fed up with elections, people finally will get more interested in baseball and television and other things than politics. The day may come when we even may have to pass a law requiring people to vote, as they had to do in Australia. That comes eventually when politics gets to be too one-sided. So in this session and in the next ten or eight or twelve or fifteen years or however long or short it may be, let us do something to make politics the aggressive, the very aggressive, thing it used to be here in Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going to adjourn as usual until Monday. I wonder if the Opposition will be ready on Monday, if the Address in Reply

is brought down, would they be ready to proceed with the debate?

(Mr. Hollett nods).

There will be, I believe, some fifty odd Bills, most of them of no great consequence, most of them originating, in fact, in the Department of the Attorney General, who continually tells us this Act or that Law ought to be amended in this way, in that way or in another way, and we do it as a matter of course. We are not particularly interested. There is no very vital legislation in here affecting the iron deposits of Labrador. In the House this afternoon as one of our visitors is Mr. John C. Doyle of Canadian Javelin. With him is one of the senior partners of that great American firm of Pickands Mather and with him is one of the senior lawyers. They are here, I believe, to confer with the Attorney General's Department with proposals to amend the NALCO Act and other legislation. Whether or not these will come before the House I frankly do not know. I imagine they will, and I certainly hope they will. I hope we can agree with Javelin completely and Pickands, Mather. There is no guarantee that we will. We will try to agree with them and try to bring in the legislation before the House, but if we do not, then the legislation that will come here this session will not be of very great or world-shaking consequence.

Now in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I have only this final word to say—perhaps if I say it I won't be believed—perhaps I am overplaying—perhaps over emphasising, but, will the Opposition take my word for it, and time will tell if I am sincere in this or not, will they take my word we are anxious to accommodate them, we are anxious

too to give them whatever time they want, we can stay here as long as they can. Whatever time they want to study any Bill they need just say the word and we will give them any time they want. We do not want to rush you nor hustle you. We do not want to make you work too hard. We want to collaborate with you. We think it can be a very easy-going session. I doubt if there is going to be any mad passion roused or great oration here in the present session of the House, and, with the help of the Opposition, we should have a very pleasant time indeed.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that a Committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now name that Committee: The honourable member for Harbour Grace, the honourable member for Bell Island and the honourable member for St. John's Centre.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Highways."

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Development Loan Act," and a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Supply): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Community Councils Act, 1956" and a Bill, "An Act to Make Further Pro-

visions Respecting the Supply of Water in the Town of Carboncar."

DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Memorial University Pensions Act."

Notices of Questions

Notices of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Browne, Mr. Duffy, and Mr. Hollett.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have other questions here, but due to the fact which was mentioned before, we have an invitation to attend for refreshments, I shall defer them.

On motion of Mr. Smallwood, the House at its rising adjourned until Monday, March 25th, at 3:00 of the clock.

MONDAY, March 25, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

None.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees:

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that the report by the committee set up to draft the address in reply.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may we have that stand until later in the day.

On motion report deferred until later in the day.

Notices of Motion

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Economic Development): Mr. Speaker,

I ask leave to table the sixth annual report of the Industrial Development Loan Board of Newfoundland, for the period ending March 31, 1956.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask that the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions for the granting of supply to Her Majesty.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table of the House the copy of the Public Accounts in printed form, that is ready in proof form for the printers. These are not the actual copies which will be distributed to the House in due course.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the practise of the previous Minister of Finance to ask leave to do that when he had the bundle by his side.

MR. HIGGINS: He was a fast worker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They were perhaps printed a little faster. It may take a whole day now to get them printed.

On motion leave was given to get the reports printed.

Notices of Questions

Notice of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett.

Notice of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Browne.

Notice of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Duffy.

QUESTION NO. 1:
(See Appendix).

QUESTION NO. 2: Mr. A. M. Duffy
(See Appendix).

QUESTION NO. 3: Mr. A. M. Duffy
(See Appendix).

QUESTION NO. 4: Mr. Malcolm
Hollett (See Appendix).

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, in the last four or five years I have been in the House, we have asked the Honourable Minister of Finance for those, and he has given them to us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is financial orders—That does not say that Minute of Council. The first part of that question will not be answered in any case by anyone.

MR. HOLLETT: We always got the first part of the answer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, never. We do not table the Orders in Council, never did and never will. We table only Treasury Warrants and the like.

MR. BROWNE: We should get them. They would make interesting reading.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, when my honourable friends opposite turn the table they can have great fun reading the orders that were passed in the last eight years just as we had great fun reading the orders of the Commission of Government for the fifteen years before us.

QUESTION NO. 5: Mr. Malcolm
Hollett (See Appendix).

QUESTION NO. 6: Mr. Malcolm
Hollett (See Appendix).

MR. HOLLETT: I appreciate having these answers coming along so swiftly but I do not like the answer given to Question No. 6. (3). I am wondering from that if the Government have no knowledge of how many are employed in the new industries.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, they are private industries.

MR. HOLLETT: They are not.

MR. CHALKER: As far as I am concerned any information available can be procured from the management of the various industries.

MR. HOLLETT: May I enquire if it is the plan of the Government to employ people like Little to investigate private companies like Bowring Brothers and Ayre & Sons. Are these private companies? We ought to have that settled right now.

QUESTION NO. 7: (Mr. Malcolm
Hollett (See Appendix).

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question—May I take it that the accounts have been tabled with the Government.

MR. KEOUGH: I should simplify that—The necessary returns have been filed with the Government, yes. It is not a sworn statement, apparently I understand from good authority the practise of having a sworn statement more or less went out of fashion some years ago. But we do have a certified copy of the audited statement of the company. And the Auditor General's Department is satisfied the purpose of the Act is carried out, as far as he is concerned.

MR. HOLLETT: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, may I ask why the Government takes an unsworn statement when the Act in question calls for a sworn document, as this particular Act does?

QUESTION No. 8: Mr. Malcolm
Hollett (See Appendix).

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of
the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I

ask if it is the intention of the Government ministers to answer questions verbally. If so we would like to know so that we could have a stenographer somewhere to take down answers. I wonder if it is the intention to answer that way or to table the replies as formerly?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would imagine where figures and the like are involved or given in answers the answer would be given in writing. But the minister would have the right to quote figures and then table the paper. But where questions do not call for answers in figures, I think they might easily be given orally when a simple "yes" or "no" or the name of a person. I think the minister might speak slowly enough so that honourable gentlemen on either side would have the time to take down the answers, and if he were to speak a little too fast anyone interested could slow him down by asking him to repeat it. In other words, the desire is to accommodate the House, both sides, especially the Opposition as much as possible.

Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before we take up the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could ask the Honourable the Premier if his intention was drawn to a message from Bell Island, published in the Evening Telegram last week: "A member of the Committee set up to study the hospital question and make recommendations to Joseph O'Driscoll, Liberal, Bell Island, under Premier Smallwood's five-year development, told officials yesterday." I wonder if the Honourable the Premier could tell us what the five year development plan is, and if it only applies to Bell Island.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will first say that it is not. It has nothing to do

with Soviet Russia, and nothing to do with the "five year plan." It is merely this: I have asked my friends in this House to tell me what in their view their districts need, what Newfoundland needs.

MR. BROWNE: Your friends.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My friends. I have some friends in this House, and I have asked—

MR. BROWNE: Over there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, mostly over on this side, I would not say all. My honourable friend who asked the question I think would qualify as a friend. He has proven himself to be a friend more than once, and I hope I have done likewise, and I hope that will not cease to be the case for the few remaining weeks he may be with us in this Chamber, and that we can work together amicably for the benefit of Newfoundland, and I hope if he goes to another place he will work equally, indefatigably in the interest of Newfoundland. Wherever he is I hope he will do that and I believe he will. I have asked my friends if they would be kind enough to tell me what, in their views, would be needed to make Newfoundland a much better place in which to live. Now I have not asked each individual member to give that information for the whole province but only that part of the province he represents in this House. If the honourable gentlemen opposite care to do that same thing I will be more than glad, more than obliged.

I have this to say, however, all of them represent mostly St. John's constituents, and with the exception of the honourable and learned member for St. John's South and the honourable and learned member for St. John's East, most of the areas they represent

are urban, strictly urban areas, within the city limits of St. John's. That being so there is perhaps a little less field, a little less need for the Government of Newfoundland, as much, to interest itself in the progress of this section of our province, whereas the outports, parts of St. John's South and St. John's East, I think, distinctly are areas in which the Government can be of some practical help. And I would be most obliged if honourable gentlemen opposite where they represent strictly urban areas I would be happy to have any information they can give me. The idea is, after the revision of the Terms of Union are effected and the award has been made, and we get the report of Mr. Perry and the report of the Arthur D. Little Company, when we get all that date in, we will sit down and see what we can do to plan an orderly and quite intensive improvement in Newfoundland generally. Naturally any member of the House would like to help in that, and would be more than welcome. There is nothing mysterious about it at all. I was interested to see the Bell Island correspondent take up the matter of the hospital in Bell Island. So much to the good. That is only one hospital—That is only one district.

MR. BROWNE: Do I understand from the Premier, Mr. Speaker, this is not to be given consideration by the Government until after the reports mentioned are in?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would not say they are not to be given consideration, but I would say not to be given final.

MR. BROWNE: Until we know where the where-with-all—the goose that lays the golden egg we want to have a look at her first.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't be pessimistic!

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Public Works: I presume he has seen the interview which he gave to reporters of the "Daily News" published this morning. He stated that in regard to the road to Placentia it was completely impassable almost every spring for the past four, five or six years. I wonder if he stated that, if he did, and he seems to have done it, without knowing it had been open for the last two years anyhow and other years. I would like to ask him if by this he means that the present flying column patrol set up is being replaced by fully mechanized system—could he say how many teams the Government are going to put on there and also say whether that would be Government teams or whether the road is being repaired by contract?

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question—I have, as everyone here knows, have had reason to use the Argentia Highway every spring since I moved here to St. John's, and know that since 1950 that road has been closed three times for a period of two weeks.

MR. BROWNE: Not in the last two years.

MR. POWER: I said for the last five or six years. You are reducing it to the last two years. Now with regard to the changeover in maintenance of Newfoundland roads, I want to say what I said in the interview. The changeover will be gradual. The plan we had in mind this year was to try to reorganize maintenance east of Gander, because the whole thing is too big to handle in one year, and to continue into the west coast next year when we have had more experi-

ence. I had in mind to ask the Government to agree that the Department of Public Works would operate several of these teams, and when we had established costs, etc., or know the cost in advance by our amortization scheme over the years, to ask for tenders from contractors to take certain of these sections; because it is not always wise for a Government to own a lot of machinery which has to be serviced.

MR. BROWNE: Especially if we cannot get a loan.

MR. POWER: Don't be too sure—We could get a loan next week if we wanted it.

MR. BROWNE: How many teams were you going to put on the Argentia Road?

MR. POWER: The pattern of the Argentia Road has not yet been settled.

MR. BROWNE: In other words this is largely theoretical and not definite?

MR. POWER: Yes. The decision to do it has been made by the Department of Public Works. I assume the Government will agree. I have spoken to some of my colleagues about it. But the Argentia Road is another matter.

MR. BROWNE: You have not decided how many teams?

MR. POWER: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Honourable Minister of Public Works this last question? We have voted a much lesser amount for the maintenance of highroads and secondary roads than in previous years—The Premier told me it is because it is going to be put out in contracts.

MR. POWER: As everyone knows I am very new to the department and do not know.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps the former Minister of Public Works could tell us.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I can say, in answer to this verbal question, that some work has been done on contract. As the present minister has indicated, however, it was practically impossible to jump into contract work on maintenance without having first determined the approximate cost itself. That, I believe, is the intention of the present minister and will no doubt be approved by the Government, to try and determine that, and then decide what work may or may not be done on contract. I have a very exact personal knowledge of the effort all across the Dominion of Canada, and not only last year did this matter come up. I have discussed it with various ministers from one end of Canada to the other, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and I know the difficulties that are involved. I take it the minister is now endeavouring to approach it from a very proper manner, and I have no doubt that good results will be obtained.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Honourable the Premier a question, as to why it is we have not had a Hansard since 1951? It makes such interesting reading, I wonder when we might get 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955 I don't expect.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I agree it will be a few years yet, but I believe there is one either ready or practically ready. Incidentally in that connection I have been having a most entertaining time for myself reading the verbatim account of the reports of speeches made in the National Convention, and I am hoping the House will provide funds for publishing the proceeding of the National Convention as well as

Hansard—Then we would give the honourable gentleman lots to read in the next few years especially if he is in rethirement sometime he will need some interesting and entertaining reading.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, could the Honourable the Attorney General tell me whether consideration has been given to the appointment of a judge for the family court?

MR. CURTIS: That matter, Mr. Speaker, comes under the Department of Public Welfare.

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable member for St. John's South, no consideration has been given to the appointment.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, further in regard to Hansard, I understand it is the custom of the Honourable the Premier to look over the Hansard before it is printed with a view to correcting any mistakes may be made and so on?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: That is my information— We have never been afforded that opportunity, I may say.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend is entirely misinformed. When the Late Captain Murphy was appointed editor of debates or editor of Hansard, I endeavoured orally, in conversation with him to point out to him the urgency, the importance of adopting a uniformity of style throughout the book. If honourable gentlemen read the Canadian or British Hansard carefully and frequently over a period of years they will know that there is a definite style. For instance: In any one day, is a minister is mentioned,

his name is spelled out and then in brackets "Minister of Finance" or whatever it is, but if he speaks subsequently throughout that same day he is just "Mr. Abbott" or "Mr. Harris" as the case may be. That is one of hundreds of little points which altogether make a proper style, and not having different ways of doing it on different days of the House. I am afraid that we were not too successful in getting uniformity of style in the first editions of Hansard that were printed, and I asked to see the proofs for that one purpose and one purpose only, and I did it more as an old-time newspaper man and a reader of proofs than in any other capacity, but as for corrections or changing anything, not one syllable, not one single syllable.

MR. HOLLETT: I was not referring to any particular changes, merely editing— I was wondering if it were not possible to have a daily record as in Ottawa. It would not cost any more, I am quite sure, and members would be kept aware of what is going on from day to day. Would the cost be tremendous or what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Terrific, yes. We have one reporter, we have Miss Murphy who is the stenotypist, and every word uttered in the Chamber she takes down on the machine, but when does she get the opportunity to type? It is done for weeks and weeks and weeks after the House is closed. She may be months at it, transcribing the remarks from that machine, putting it in typewritten form. And to get that daily, to get tomorrow what is said today would take a staff of about fifteen reporters.

MR. HOLLETT: I submit there are enough stenographers in the Government employ to do Hansard every hour.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is not even one Hansard reporter in the employ of the Government today — Ordinary stenographers can't even begin to do it. Now the Supreme Court has one or two down there, quite capable of doing it and Mrs. Finn, who is not employed by the Government, may be the fourth fully capable of doing it, but there are not six in all Newfoundland, unless they be on the Americal Bases, who are Hansard Reporters and who could sit for fifteen minutes and take down every word uttered, there are not six in the whole Province, not in all Newfoundland. Will Crotty used to be one. He is dead. All the old-time Hansard Reporters are dead, gone—The Supreme Court has two. I think Miss Louise Saunders is probably capable of doing it and Miss Murphy on the Stenotype and Mrs. Finn. That would be five. I doubt if there is a sixth.

MR. SPEAKER: At this time I should like to announce the names of the members of the Internal Economy Commission who have been appointed in the manner prescribed:

Mr. Speaker,

Chairman of Committees.

Honourable the Premier.

Honourable the Attorney General.

Honourable the Minister of Finance.

Orders of The Day

On motion a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Highways, read a first time.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Premier could tell us whether it is the intention to have two separate ministers?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: A Minister of Highways and a Minister of Public Works, a new portfolio?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The appointment of an honourable gentleman who is now presently Minister of Public Works, yes.

MR. BROWNE: Do you care to make the announcement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, indeed. I will be glad to do so at the right moment.

MR. BROWNE: There are a good many applicants for the office, I presume.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would say there are enough members on this side to fill the department five times over.

On motion Bill ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

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

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

On motion a Bill, "An Act to Make Further Provisions Respecting the Supply of Water in the Town of Carbonear, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Community Councils Act, 1956," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

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

On motion the report of the Committee appointed to adopt an Address

in Reply to the Speech From the Throne read:

To His Honour the Administrator,
Sir Albert J. Walsh, Knight Bachelor,

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.) Claude A. Sheppard.

Joseph P. O'Driscoll.

A. M. Duffy.

Assembly Room,
March 21, 1957.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that this report be received and adopted.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I would say at the start of that speech on the Address in Reply that I am very happy to represent Newfoundland, and may I say "Newfoundlanders," here in this House once again.

I want, Sir, at this date again to offer our congratulations to you on your elevation to the Chair. As I have already said: it is an honour greatly to be desired by any member who ever sits in this House. You, Sir, are from Fortune Bay. I come from Placentia Bay, and I take it that you and I might very well get our heads together and see what we can possibly do for these two important bays. In fact, Sir, if you and I got our heads together we might do something about controlling this House and seeing that things are as we want rather than what is wanted by certain members on the opposite side. So I suggest, Sir, we might have a little, shall I say "plot." However that is by-the-way and on the side. But I do want to say, Sir, how glad I am to see you here. I congratulate you and compliment you

as a man who has worked hard, taught school, studied law when you were at the age when most people have been practising law a long time, and are now in practise. For that alone, Sir, you deserve congratulations from this House.

Now, Sir, I want to say again how pleased I was with the speech made by the Honourable member for Harbour Grace the other day. It was a very excellent speech, well put together and well delivered. I think I took down a few notes while he was speaking. There was not much that the honourable member had to speak about. The Speech From the Throne as I already pointed out, was a very slim one, there was not much fat on it, and there was not much examining to be done by anybody who got up to move the address in reply. He did say, one of the first things he started out with was the last election, the recent election and that it had proven that people had great confidence in our Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is now reviewing a debate which is completely finished and disposed of in this session.

MR. HOLLETT: I might say irrespective of what the honourable member for Harbour Grace said, it has been stated the people of this country have shown great faith in the Honourable the Premier. We can look across the House I am impressed by that. And I must say the people of Newfoundland surely did have great confidence in the Premier and in the cause which he represents.

There is not very much I can say with regard to what the honourable gentleman said. The Premier has put his foot down on that, so I better not say very much more about it. I might

say that the opinion was voiced by the mover and seconder of the Motion that a hand was generously extended to him to come into the Liberal Party and stand for the District of Bell Island.

The Speech From the Throne last year did have something in it which was worthwhile, and it started off with the childrens' health benefits. I do not know to what extent the programme outlined by the Honourable the Premier at that time has been carried out. He did say at that time it was the greatest system of the kind to be found anywhere in North America. The Government took full responsibility for the cost and expenses of all dental, medical and optical care of children. I do not know if the honourable minister would like to tell, even right now, how far they have gone ahead with that particular plan. I would like to know the progress which has been made and that the children were being taken care of as promised by the Government last year.

The Speech From the Throne last year also referred to local roads, and a hardy annual now, the Terms of Union. I think the Terms of Union have been on the carpet ever since 1954, and every year it appears in the Speech From the Throne. This year it also appears here, and as a matter of fact if I remember correctly the Honourable Minister of Finance in his budget speech last year did say that he hoped that when the budget was brought down this year a substantial amount would appear there for the review of the Terms of Union under Term 29. There was a great to-do about unemployment assistance and sick relief, dependents' allowances and able-bodied relief and also fishery development, and it was stated last year in the Speech From the Throne that a programme was taking shape and

that great new plants were being built at Quirpon, Merasheen, Seldom-Come-By and LaScie. One of the largest fishery establishments in Newfoundland in fact in the whole of Canada was being built at LaScie. We as yet have no information as to that nor just how far this plant has progressed and how much fish has been processed and what the future of that plant may be. Now that we have a new Minister of Fisheries and a man who, I say, ought to know a lot about the fisheries, we will hope that we can get a good report on the plant at LaScie and on the other plants as well.

The Speech last year also referred to fishing companies which were to get some financial help, it referred to BRINCO and referred also to the never ending growth of prosperity since Confederation. We have heard that so often, Sir, that it begins now to be a little bit boring, to hear about the never ending prosperity since Confederation. Surely the honourable members on the opposite side of this House do know that there has been never ending prosperity since the last war in every country in the western hemisphere, and it was not brought about by Confederation. It was not the fact that we got into Confederation that such prosperity existed as it never existed before in the whole of Canada. Or was it? Perhaps it was. Perhaps we got into Confederation and brought prosperity to Canada and North America and other countries in the western hemisphere. We will be told that in a short time if we are not very, very careful.

There was very little in the present speech, Sir, about which we could talk, and I think I might as well pass over it. I believe—yes, the Terms of Union were mentioned, Term 29 and one or two other things. I took some notes

on that at that particular time, but what I have done with them I could not say at the moment—Oh yes, I have them here.

The Royal Commission on the Terms of Union was set up, and on that as a member, was the Chief Justice, Sir Albert Walsh. Then reference was made to the Arthur D. Little Firm of New York, which was to make a special analysis of all the new industries. I do hope that when this firm, this "Little" firm, does get busy they make a special analysis of all the new industries, and that they express the opinion that they would like to hear from us on the opposite side of the House. I maintain we on this side can tell them more about the new industries than is known generally by honourable members on the Government side of the House. So we would be very, very glad to give the "Little" firm all the information we possibly can and help them to come to a fair and just appraisal of the new industries.

There was some reference also to the Southwest Coast Commission. That, I believe, has been sitting for some time. I am quite convinced that the Honourable Minister of Fisheries could have sat down in his own sitting room and drafted a report on the Southwest Coast, on the needs of the Southwest Coast and some of the remedies which might be applied advantageously, without going to all the trouble and expense of setting up a commission and having to wait so long for a report on that.

The present Honourable Minister of Fisheries has been interested in the fisheries since he was knee high to a grasshopper and as a matter of fact is interested in the coast too to a great extent. I believe he has some interest in some of the fish plants now exist-

ing on that coast. He is, therefore, quite capable of arriving at a reasonable report relative to the Southwest Coast and conditions out there. I would say this, Sir—Several of us come from the Southwest Coast, and we will all agree, no doubt, that what this Government has done for the Southwest Coast is practically nil. I believe members coming from the Southwest Coast who are sitting on the Government side of the House today could say that since Confederation very, very little has been done by the present Government for the fishermen of the Southwest Coast. I do not think that anybody could deny that—So we on this side of the House and all the members on the Government side, from the Southwest Coast, are going to get together and demand that a fair deal be handed out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A new party?

MR. HOLLETT: No. There is no need of any new party. And as I look across at the Government side of the House I see no reason for any party at the present time. I have no doubt, Sir, before the present five years are up we will get sufficient from the Government side of the House to set up a new party. I won't say what we will call them, but they will be ready, Sir, to set up a new party in order to offset some of the things even now developing in the minds of some of the Ministers, the five year planners on the Government side of the House. I was reading the other day "The New Five Year Plan in Russia," an excellent plan — and I give the name to the members on the Government side—"The New Five Year Plan in Russia."

We are going to have four new university buildings, and the matter of the weekly holiday is to be dis-

cussed, I understand, and a select committee is to be set up. I do not want to say very much about the weekly holiday at this time. I think it is rather unfortunate that the question of the weekly holiday should have to come before the House of Assembly, because I see, Sir that every section of Newfoundland could very well demand a weekly holiday on a different day of the week, if it should be advantageous to any particular section. In other words, a weekly holiday on Saturday here certainly would not suit certain parts of the coastline, certain towns and villages along the coastline. And similarly a holiday on Monday might not suit here or there or anywhere. Offhand I would say the question of the weekly holiday is one which might very well be decided between those who work and those who sit in their offices and collect the benefit of their work. It is a matter of getting together, I think, and ironing out the difficulties. And I see no reason why this particular Government or any Government should be asked to sit down and lay out one particular day for a holiday, a Newfoundland commercial holiday. That is only just an opinion. That could be altered by persuasion, if the select committee could show some reason for it. I believe there should be law, mind you, behind the weekly holiday, but to say when it should be I don't believe is a question for us here.

Then there was mention of a quintal of fish, and there was the question of new roads and one or two other things in the Speech from the Throne. There was very little, Sir, in that Speech from the Throne into which anybody could get to his feet and comment. I do not intend to deal very long upon that. I don't intend to deal any longer on it, as a matter of fact.

The election, Sir, was fought with vim, I take it, by everybody in this House, and as has already been said, it showed confidence in the Honourable the Premier and consequently we on this side of the House admit that. We admit that. We are not decrying the fact at all. We will endeavour to help the people of this country by assisting the Premier and his Government in all matters which are brought before us for consideration. We shall not agree with very much they will bring in, if I know the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't be pessimistic now!

MR. HOLLETT: I don't think we will agree with all of it by any means. I think it would be rather sad if we did. I have an idea a good many things are to be brought in which may not be, when thrashed out, in the best interest of the country generally. I do not mean to say people in the Government will bring in such ideas deliberately to hinder anybody, but they might bring in a five year plan, Sir, which we on this side might not be thoroughly agreeable to.

However, it is nice to see such fine looking men on the opposite side of the House, who come from here, there and everywhere. Some of them represent a few people and some represent a lot of people. I noted here that the member for Labrador North has eight hundred and seventy-three votes and the member for White Bay South, the Honourable Minister, has one thousand four hundred and thirty-seven votes, and the Honourable Minister from St. Mary's has one thousand one hundred and sixty-three votes, altogether three men had three thousand four hundred and seventy-three votes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman should at least be fair

and point out if the honourable member for Labrador North has received eight hundred odd votes he represents an area bigger than the whole Island of Newfoundland and almost twice as big as the whole Island of Newfoundland. It is not his fault there are not more people down there.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not dealing with territory or square miles but with people, and I am pointing out, Sir, the Honourable Minister of Health and the Honourable Minister of Education, and the honourable member for Labrador North altogether had three thousand four hundred votes while our honourable member for St. John's Centre had thirty-seven hundred and the honourable member for St. John's East thirty-eight hundred and the honourable member for St. John's South thirty-three hundred. I am not going to say one man is as good as any three on the opposite side but I do want to point out they do represent a good many people on this side of the House, and consequently we have to speak with the voice of these people. I am not forgetting the fact that the honourable member for St. John's North did have two thousand six hundred and ninety-four votes, and I am quite sure he will be quite an addition to the Government side of the House.

I have so many papers here, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I am going to get mixed up a bit. I have some notes here with regard to the increase in the Progressive Conservative votes, which was considerable. I feel the Honourable the Premier has sort of a smile on his face, but it is an increase, according to my records, from twenty one per cent up to thirty five per cent of the electorate in the districts into which we did send candidates. And in places like Grand Falls, where

in 1951 we only had one thousand six hundred and seventy votes and that included at this time Bishop's Falls and Botwood. But this time with Bishop Falls and Botwood out we had two thousand one hundred and twenty one votes. In St. George's, Port au Port in 1952 we got twenty seven per cent of the votes and in 1956 we had thirty nine per cent of the votes. Even in Burgeo and LaPoile where the Honourable Minister of Fisheries was elected our votes went from five hundred and forty seven only to nine hundred and fifty two, while the Liberal vote was reduced to two thousand two hundred and one in 1956. Now these were small gains for us, Sir, but nevertheless they were gains and we are going to have more as we go along, as we get older. I do not know what time the Honourable the Premier's term is supposed to be up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is forgetting that the Liberal party went up to sixty six per cent from sixty four per cent in its third election. Yes, from sixty four per cent we went to sixty six per cent of all votes cast.

MR. HOLLETT: The Honourable the Premier will concede that only about fifty per cent of all the people in Newfoundland voted anyway.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the other fifty per cent voted we would be around ninety five or ninety per cent.

MR. HOLLETT: In any case, Sir, as a result of the election we have seventeen new men on the opposite side of the House. And while I am about it I would like to congratulate the Government on having back today the Minister of Health. He was the first casualty since the election. There will be lots. We had them last year.

I am glad to see the honourable Minister of Health here. He is a great asset to the Government. I am also glad to see the Honourable Mr. Spencer returned safe and sound from his journeys. If he falls into the footsteps of his predecessor who went from all over Newfoundland, of course, I take it, to Rome, Germany, Berlin, Hamburg, Jamaica, Ireland, London, New York. I do not think there is a capital in Europe (I was going to say in the world) which his predecessor has not visited. Therefore I do hope and trust that the Honourable Minister for Finance, the new minister, will find time to visit us here occasionally in Newfoundland. And I do hope we shall have an opportunity to see him here in the House every once in a while. It is refreshing to know that the Honourable Minister of Finance does come back to Newfoundland once in a while. I am very happy to see him here today particularly on account of his absence the other day. We have now seventeen members on the opposite side of the House who are babes in the woods as far as this House is concerned, and I think, therefore, I could be pardoned if I do try to lay before them at this particular time a small picture at any rate of this country at the present time. In order to do this I think I would have to go back to 1949 when we went into Confederation because that is all we hear from the opposite side—the thousands of you who read the "First Eight Years." I know the honourable members on the opposite side know what I refer to when I refer to the "First Eight Years," the manifesto of the Premier prior to the election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "The Best Eight Years Yet."

MR. HOLLETT: Everything was promised there, practically everything.

There were ten points, I believe, which were to be (I thought I had some notes on that but I dare say they have gone too). They do not stick to us these promises. They leave us very, very quickly, and they leave us in the "red." I had some notes on "The Best Eight Years Yet," but rather unfortunately I mislaid them. But in that best eight years the Premier did promise he is going in the next five years to devote his energies, and he has lots to devote to do certain things. And I have no doubt he intends to do it or try to do it. I see my honourable friend has the actual manifesto here. It is a marvellous document. Any member of any candidate who went out with that in his pocket across this country all he had to do was show the pretty pictures and everything of that kind, and the people would not have time to think anything else but "what a wonderful Government to get out a book like that." There is the Premier on the cover, with a most determined look on his face. I think, it is the best bow tie I have seen in a long time. He has with him the loggers and the fishermen, and one of the fishermen carrying a net. I think that is wrong—I think our nets are bigger than that. I think the Honourable Minister for Fisheries better take a look at that new net with a long handle. However it is a very excellent picture of the Premier. But I was referring to his promises. I shall give my strength and my time to ten great purposes: Revision of the Financial Terms. I believe that Newfoundland should and could get at least so and so. I think it is rather unfortunate that the Honourable the Premier did mention any particular amount because I am hoping we will get more than he did mention. We are going to need it badly. However he is going to devote his energy to that and to the

third paper mill. We will soon be able to write a song on the third paper mill. That was promised to people in his manifesto but there was not a thing about it in the recent Speech From the Throne, not one word. There is a great new mining boom coming up. And we all believe there will be some mining boom coming up because they are coming up all across Canada. There are some that are being written off and thrown in the discard as fast as they come up but there are some which will come to something. And the Honourable the Premier is going to give us a network of roads. We have two thousand miles now. I suppose the network will increase that two thousand by another thousand or so. There is a great children's health scheme. We were already promised that. More and better schools. We are actually going to have more and better schools. We shall have to have more with the population increasing as it has increased recently. Confederation has been blamed, somewhere in this work, for the increase in population.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not blamed. Credited.

MR. HOLLETT: The booklet tells us how the Newfoundland population is growing fast. We have seventy thousand new Newfoundlanders since Confederation. Our population is growing by over ten thousand a year. This is true growth. This is true progress. This is how he tells us Newfoundland is going ahead under Confederation, and as an afterthought he adds, and the Liberal Government. It is just an afterthought.

MR. HOLLETT: Another four or five years of Liberal development and our population will be over half a million in Newfoundland. It is a won-

derful manifesto. There is no question about it.

But in view of that and in view of the political youth, shall I say, of half the members on the Government side of the House, I think we ought to refer briefly, possibly, to the financial picture or to the picture of Newfoundland. For that reason I will have to go back to Newfoundland. You all remember, of course, that when we went into Confederation a beautiful picture did present itself from the financial point of view. We, as you know, had been long under a national debt which was taking anywhere from four to five million dollars every year to pay the interest. Well, when we went into Confederation that was taken away from us. I believe the national debt at that time was around sixty-eight to seventy million dollars. That was lifted from us. While on that subject let me say right now—Don't anybody get the idea in this country that that was a sort of a free gift from Canada to us. It was no such thing. It was an investment by Canada. It was an investment by them. They were prepared to buy shares in this country to that extent, to the extent of our national debt. And if anybody thinks that it was not a good investment I have here before me the figures which refer to the income tax and the corporation taxes paid by Newfoundland last year and by Newfoundland since we went into Confederation. And I know that last year, and this was in the press some time ago and available to everybody, Newfoundland paid twenty-five millions eight hundred and eighty eight thousand dollars, or 1.03 of the total amount paid in under corporation and income taxes by all the Provinces of Canada, or at the rate of sixty-two dollars per head of our pop-

ulation. Sixty-two dollars per head of our population was collected by the Federal Department of Finance from Newfoundland. From New Brunswick they collected fifty-three dollars per head and from Nova Scotia fifty-eight dollars per head but from Newfoundland they collected sixty-two dollars per head. Thirty-two dollars of that was for personal income tax. Just note—From Newfoundland last year they collected thirty-two dollars from every man, woman and child on income tax whereas in Nova Scotia they only collected thirty-two. Now that does not mean actually that we are any less prosperous or any less prosperous than Nova Scotia. It just shows that when we went into Canada as a tenth province we had to shoulder our responsibilities. We had to pay our income taxes, we had to pay our corporation taxes, etc. And I have figures here which show that since 1950 to 1956 from the Province of Newfoundland there was a total of \$128,229,326. That was for personal income taxes from individuals and from corporations. So that it was a good investment for the Federal Government from the financial view alone. They took our national debt of seventy-eight million dollars and since then they have collected one hundred and twenty-eight million two hundred and twenty-nine thousand three hundred and twenty-six dollars in income taxes and corporation taxes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Have they spent anything here?

MR. HOLLETT: I was speaking about what they took. I have an idea if they had not spent anything here the Liberal Government would be broke long, long ago. They spent enough to keep the Government afloat. They spent a good bit of money here. I am not talking about that, I would say that in addition to income and

corporation taxes they took from us probably another twenty or twenty-five million in excise taxes and customs taxes, etc. So do not let anybody think that when we went into Confederation we went in as a burden. It was a good investment by Canada to take us over. They already have the national debt we did owe liquidated and more besides. It is true they spent money here and will have to spend money here, but, Sir, you can note that in income taxes and corporation taxes alone, last year, they collected twenty-eight million dollars from the people of this country, and if you add another twenty or twenty-five million for excise taxes and customs taxes on the one hundred and fifty or two hundred millions which we imported, if you add that and also the amount of customs duty which should be credited to Newfoundland you will find we are paying more in revenue to the Federal Government than they are spending here in this country. That may be as it should be, but do not let us forget it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is Newfoundland, Ontario and Quebec are the three "have" provinces and give Ottawa more than Ottawa gives us.

MR. HOLLETT: No, I am not saying that. Everyone has to give more than he gets if we are to finance operations. If you want the figures. They have five million odd people there and they paid last year in corporation and income tax 49.9 nearly fifty per cent of the total amount which was collected, that is the people of Ontario. If Ontario is a have province, Mr. Speaker, she certainly is contributing to the revenue of the Government of Canada because last year in income tax and corporation tax alone she paid fifty per cent of the whole of or forty nine point nine per cent or a per

capita of two hundred and forty one dollars whereas we in Newfoundland paid sixty two dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But we paid Ottawa more than Ottawa paid us?

MR. HOLLETT: I would not be exact on that. I have not the exact figures. The figures I am quoting are exact. I would say we are definitely paying more.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We, and Ontario and Quebec.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not talking about Ontario but about the country I know. Mind you we were not going to pay any taxes when we went into Confederation. I could read it from statements made by the Honourable the Premier, where we were not going to pay any taxes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I never said that in my life, never once in my life. I said we would not pay property tax.

MR. HOLLETT: And you did not say the cost of living would be lower?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes I did, and so it did come down.

MR. HOLLETT: Is it lower today? Was it ever lower?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, for three years after we went into Confederation, at least, it was lower.

MR. HOLLETT: Nonsense! The promise was only good for three years?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, that is not the answer.

MR. HOLLETT: Let me say, Ontario paid forty point nine per cent of the income and corporation taxes; Quebec paid twenty-five point eight per cent; British Columbia ten point two per cent; Alberta four point nine;

Nova Scotia one point six; New Brunswick one point two and Newfoundland one point three; Prince Edward Island one point three. These are the figures. You cannot dispute them. They come from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. What I want to say is that it is not good for a people to be always thinking we live by the bounty we get from Ottawa. We have to stand in our own shoes and fight our own battles. And we have to pay revenue into the Federal chest. Naturally we have to pay our share because not only does the Federal chest have to fish out for relief and services in the various provinces but it also has to pay defence, and the defence expenditures are terrific, something like two billion dollars a year. The Federal Chest has to take care of that and all sorts of other things. I do not think it is good to be always claiming we are a have-not province and only live by the bounty, the handouts we get from Ottawa. Just think, we are paying all that into the Federal Chest, and I think our people ought to be told that because it is coming out of their pockets anyway.

Now then in addition to that national debt taken from us in 1949, and for which we jolly well paid, the Federal Government took over certain services which were weighing down the country financially. The upkeep of the railway and its yearly deficits were no longer a burden to us, the Customs was taken over, the postal telegraph ceased to be a charge on the treasury, the care of veterans, the Newfoundland Hotel and various other expenses we were relieved of, and the coastal boats were taken over. And the coastal boats remind me of a certain gentleman in Canada, called Donald Gordon. He made some remarks the other day in connection with an interview, I believe,

he was having with our Newfoundland Liberal Federal Representative. Some of the things that Mr. Gordon said I deplore very much. I do not intend to make any caustic remarks about them, but I think any man in the position of Mr. Donald Gordon should girdle his tongue, so to speak, when it comes to referring to us in Newfoundland as a troublesome lot and as a bothersome lot. He should girdle his tongue, put a bit on it. It is unfortunate for him to have said that, I think. Probably Mr. Carter had agitated him a bit. I do hope Mr. Carter will agitate him very much more.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, when we recessed I was referring to the picture of Newfoundland when we entered into Confederation in 1949. I was doing that, I said, for the benefit of the honourable members who are sitting on the opposite side and on this side who are still young. And I was pointing out that our national debt was taken away, that the telegraphs and railway and various other services were taken care of by Ottawa; we had forty-two million dollars of a surplus in the bank and we had certain realized assets. And in case we want to refresh our memory with regard to our realizable assets; assets which were paid for by the Federal Government and which eventually brought our surplus up to fifty million dollars we have to refer to the statement issued by the Newfoundland Delegation where it states that the Federal Government would pay the Newfoundland cost of the "Springdale and Bar Haven;" Reimburse Newfoundland for the payment made under Article two of the agreement between the United King-

dom and Newfoundland for the building of an airport building at Gander Airport, taken over by the Royal Airforce and pay Newfoundland two thirds of the expenditure in respect of the expenditure made by Newfoundland for the conversions of buildings to civil use and the value of the consumable goods and supplies determined by physical inventory as at March thirty-first, 1949 in respect of postal telegraph services and Gander Airport. Canada took over the fixed assets of the Newfoundland Railway and Canada assumed responsibility for payment of railway equipment on order at the date of this memorandum. Canada assumed responsibility for payment for telecommunication equipment, and she took over certain buildings and one or two other things for which we were paid, which, at any rate, brought the surplus in cash in the bank eventually up to forty-two plus approximately eight million dollars bringing the surplus to approximately fifty million dollars. That is a pretty picture for any Government in a small province. There was no national debt, no post office, no telegraph office, no customs, no railway to take care of and fifty million dollars in the pot. That, I say, was a very, very pleasant outlook for the Honourable the Premier and the men who joined him in that first Government. Then millions of that went of course, to Ottawa, and it should still be there. In addition to that, for the first three years we had a transitional grant from Canada of six and a half million. Now what happened to all this?

During that time and since that time and up to the present time that forty million dollars has been spent, the surplus, and our potential national debt has increased from three and a half millions to some forty-five million dollars. The Government of the

day, in 1951, went on a spending spree the like of which was never known, the sky was the limit, there were commissions here and commissions there and commissions everywhere—a Cost of Living Commission, Fishery, Forests, Agricultural and always costing anywhere from fifty to a hundred and fifty thousand dollars each. There were trips to Ottawa, to New York, to London, to Rome, a steady stream of Newfoundland Cabinet Ministers on a conducted tour of the world, Sir—a conducted tour of the world, conducted by none other than Dr. Alfred Valdmanis. I think that he can now be written off as a five hundred thousand dollar steal. Imagine he was paid twenty-five thousand dollars a year to steal from us some five hundred thousand dollars. But I do not want to say very much about it. It brings up sad memories.

And what have we got, Sir, after this orgy of spending, this spree of the Government? I am saying this for the benefit of every member of this House. What have we left? What have we got today? We have a national debt, as I pointed out, I take it around forty million and a potential debt of around fifty two or fifty four million. What else have we? The Premier will tell us, of course, our people were never better fed, never better clothed, never so prosperous, never so happy. What with unemployment insurance and monies paid out in Public Welfare, we are told, the people are as happy as they can possibly be. We do realize that figures talk, and we are told by the unemployment people that there are some eighteen to twenty-five thousand out of work here today in St. John's area. We fail to see where the prosperity exists at the present time. True a good many people are better off than ever they were, but there are a lot of people, Sir, from

Port aux Basques down the coast, around the coast and back to Port aux Basques again who today are very little better off than they were in 1949. It is true they get the family allowances and it is true they are going to get increases in family allowances, but it is also true, Sir, the cost of living has mounted since we went into Confederation and the paltry amount which they get for family allowances does not make up for the increase in the cost of living.

I was referring to the conducted tours, and I have a few notes here taken from the 1951 Speech From the Throne, and it starts out with the prosperity existing at that time and it talks about the economic development and about the cement mill and how that cement mill is now in operation and that cement in Newfoundland will be at least eight times as much as is needed will be produced by the cement mill. The Gypsum Plant was then in course of construction and the birch plant and tannery and the machine plant at that time, in 1951, stated it to be the largest single labour giving enterprise, apart from fisheries—in the next two years it was to take care of five thousand employees. I wonder how many are out there at the machinery plant today? Five thousand men—More than Grand Falls, Corner Brook, Buchans and St. Lawrence would be employed. Then the textile mill and the leather goods factory, and also coming into the country were several other industries as well. Then the Speech from the Throne referred to conducted tours around Europe and to the fact they have secured a further fifteen new industries. However, that is enough about the 1951 Speech from the Throne. I suppose one of the saddest things we have at the present time is our neglected fisheries—our neglected fisheries.

In my opinion, if the Government of the past, since 1949 have neglected anything they definitely have neglected the fisheries. Now I am not saying they did it deliberately, Mr. Speaker. Last year when I referred to the Fisheries Department as an inept department I was scorned and I was laughed at. But, Sir, I still maintain that we did have, for a number of years, since 1949, an inept department of Fisheries.

The only reference in the present Speech From the Throne is that we are going to weigh our fish differently. Instead of having it by quintals, one hundred and twelve pounds, we are now going to weigh fish by *avoirdu-pois*. This is the only reference made in the Speech From the Throne of 1957. How many men today are engaged in the salt fish industry, Sir? Here I want to refer to the fish, in the salt fish industry, shipped to Nova Scotia, to Halifax and other places. It is a sore point, and I hope it is a sore point with the present Minister of Fisheries and the Government and the Department of Fisheries. I was in one of the stores in St. John's last fall and the people were packing this heavy salted fish and I was informed that last year they would have paid out two hundred thousand dollars alone in labour for the packing of fish in this one store in Water Street. And I thought of all the fish shipped out by salt bulk into Nova Scotia and I thought of all the two hundred thousand dollar amounts paid to workmen of Halifax, and I don't think I begrudge the fishermen of Halifax this money, but I do think our own long-shoremen are in need of the money they could earn from all the fish shipped in vessels to Halifax and there made ready for the markets and shipped to markets, when we should be supplying this very same fish. And

I hope, I offer the suggestion, that some extra effort will be made by the Department of Fisheries, through the Federation of Fisheries (I suppose it is the only way it could be done) but that some effort will be made to have the fish properly processed so that it may be shipped directly from here to the markets down in the West Indies.

I don't know if anybody knows how many men are engaged in the fisheries. We know how many were engaged in the fisheries in 1949. We do know that there is a very small number. I do hope that the honourable member for White Bay North (I believe he is the President Secretary General of the Federation of the Fishermen) I do hope that shortly he will be able to get to his feet and tell us exactly the position with regard to our fisheries, particularly our salt bulk fisheries. I am quite sure he will tell us that there cannot be any more than six to eight thousand men presently engaged in the fisheries. I believe when we became the tenth province we must have had somewhere around twenty-five or twenty-six thousand people in the salt fisheries. I dare say a good many of these people who were in the salt fish trade are now making a better living elsewhere. I am not sure of that, but I do hope they are.

Now, Sir, I am aware of the fact, of course I am aware of the fact, that the Government have contributed a good amount of our revenue to the fisheries, particularly to those who are developing the fisheries industry. They have made loans to a goodly number of firms. That, I believe, has enhanced the value of the fresh fish industry in Newfoundland. I am reminded here of a speech recently delivered by Mr. Arthur Monroe at the Board of Trade. I know it is a painful subject with the member on the opposite side to hear

that speech analyzed. But I feel that Mr. Monroe is a man who ought to know something about the fresh fish industry. Mr. Monroe definitely ought to be able to advise the Government on how the fresh fish industry should be run, particularly, Sir, ought he to be well able to do that in view of the fact he has received anywhere from four to five million dollars help from the Government to establish the various fish plants which he supervised. What did he say? I have the paper here but I do not intend to read all of the things that he said. He said that in recent months there has been considerable criticism of the fresh frozen fish industry in the daily press and the reference that the people who are directing the industry are a bunch of nitwits who spend their time unnecessarily studying prices and so have reduced the industry to the present depressed state. It has been stated or suggested more than once that another NAFEL or at least the guidance of Max Lane is required to save these nitwits. The industry has been called ailing. That is true, but the rest is not. The industry, said Mr. Monroe, is ailing, but the symptoms are quite clear, the diagnosis is straightforward. It may not be quite so easy to prescribe medicine that will bring about an immediate cure. I take it a few kind words from the other side of the House to Mr. Monroe, a few kind words in the way of silver dollars or guarantees.

Then it goes on to say that the industry in 1940 exported eleven million pounds of frozen fish to the United States, and last year the United States imported one hundred and thirty million pounds, and sixty-five million pounds of that came from Newfoundland. Now if the sixty five million pounds went from Newfoundland, and I note the value of that fish, what is the cost? It comes to about seventeen

cents per pound, all the fish that was shipped to the United States, according to figures which I have here. So I take it the fresh fish grossed seventeen cents a pound. And here I ought to refer, Sir, to the amounts which are received by the fresh fishermen particularly for frozen cod. Seldom if ever do they get over two cents and it is sometimes down to a cent and a half. For fresh haddock, I believe, in Halifax, they get at least two cents a pound more than our fishermen here. In Halifax they get a cent and a half to two cents more for cod than our fishermen are paid here. Now there is some reason for that. There is no question about it, there is some reason for that. There is no question about it, there is some reason for that, there is some extra cost which in all probability they do not have in Halifax or in Nova Scotia. I do know that they supply the whole market there in Nova Scotia and on the Mainland. Mr. Monroe, I believe, pointed out that when they have a surplus in Nova Scotia they dump it on the American market and so reduce our prices. How true that statement is I would not be able to say at this stage, but it is something for the Fisheries Authority to look into.

Mr. Monroe states, our production of fish in Newfoundland gives us the lowest direct cost for raw material and labour, and he attributes the big trouble to markets. Canada, he said, including Newfoundland increased the export of frozen fish to the United States from ten million pounds at the beginning of the war to sixty million pounds, and he goes on to give other figures. He says here that the Mainland of Canada sells most of its catch within Canada and when they have a surplus that surplus is shipped to the United States for what it may fetch. All of the Newfoundland catch must

go to the United States, hence in times of scarcity of fish in the United States market we prosper but when the market is flooded we must either stop production or sell at lower prices. And he refers to the tragedy of the closing of the plant at Fortune. And we all regret that tragedy. And I was very glad to see a statement coming, I believe, the other day from the present Minister of Fisheries that it was hoped that shortly this place would reopen and the people living there at Fortune would soon be earning a livelihood at the trade which they know best.

Mr. Monroe speaks of the various indirect costs. He says that our plants are new, practically new, and that they cost a lot of money to build. That is one of the things contributing to the high cost of production. And in many places, he says, the plants cannot be operated to capacity and the cost of operation of freezers for isolated localities are enormously high, facilities are bad, with no dockyard on the South Coast. I do not know who to blame. It must be the Government. There should be a dockyard in Burin, there is no doubt about it. If it is not there I blame the Government for it, because if it is rotten and falling down they should have a new one built there.

Then he talks about the scarcity of skilled labour. Now I wonder what skilled labour he is referring to in connection with fisheries. Surely we in Newfoundland can produce skilled labour to prosecute the fishery as well as they can in other provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia or anywhere else. The shortage of skilled labour—Perhaps the Minister would be able to tell me later on. Then he goes on to tell the sad story of the fish sticks. I do well remember the Honourable

the Premier getting up and telling about the revolution taking place in this country, fish sticks to be the saving of mankind in this country. Everybody liked them, was crazy for them, and all the skill and experience we had in Newfoundland was to be devoted to turning out fish sticks. It started in 1952, according to Mr. Monroe, and according to what he says he was sold on it and started planning, and now takes some of the blame himself. He said here that the idea set him on fire. If he had been here the day the Honourable the Premier explained about fish sticks he would have been on fire and would have been scorched before he came out. I do remember the Premier, and I do not blame the Premier for getting excited over it. Mr. Monroe said it went especially well at first and fish sticks became the second largest item in the entire fresh frozen industry, and plants sprung up like mushrooms and within a year fifty of them were in operation. He then goes on, it was perhaps an unfortunate coincidence that just about the time the fish sticks boom really was taking shape the Premier announced his fishery development programme, with plenty of money from the Government, almost a case of come and get it—He was referring to the Premier's invitation here in the House for our local merchants to come and get the money. This boom plus available money made a ready combination almost intoxicating.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Monroe was the one who was completely drunk.

MR. HOLLETT: When it comes to that he is not sober yet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is not, or if he is he has an awful hangover.

MR. HOLLETT: I understand he wants working capital from his statement. Anyway in a little over two years the thing went from nothing to sixty-five million pounds a year. He mentions actually the capital consumption of fish sticks very little, but it was not apparent for some considerable time what was largely a change in buying habit did deceive us, all our production of fish sticks resulted in cuttings (pardon me for quoting from this so extensively, Mr. Speaker).

MR. SPEAKER: I may say for the honourable member's guidance — A member may quote from a newspaper in debate but it is not in order to read articles from newspapers nor letters nor communications emanating from persons outside the House or referring to or commenting on anything said by any member of the House nor reflecting on procedure in the House. But a member may read a newspaper in order to use it as part of his own speech, part of his own debate.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am reading from what I have in my own notes taken from this paper and I will table the paper.

MR. SPEAKER: I was just thinking a few moments ago, that the honourable member came very close to reading a communication by a person outside the House on a thing that happened in the House.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes. I don't think I referred to anybody outside the House making a comment on anything done in here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member referred to an announcement by the Premier.

MR. HOLLETT: I am always doing that. As a matter of fact he

is about the only one making announcements here.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Monroe's comments.

MR. HOLLETT: Oh, Mr. Monroe's comments. Anyway, Mr. Monroe states we are squeezed between the necessity of working the plants and inability to find markets at a profitable price, consequently we are selling below cost. He says we are selling our fresh fish below cost. Now how can I take that down when I do know, and I have relatives working in the fisheries and who have been fishing all their lives. I do know that people landing their fish at Halifax and Sydney are getting anywhere from a cent and a half to two cents more for their fish than our fishermen here get. Mr. Monroe states that they are selling below cost. He says we are also short of working capital. That must be a mistake of the Government. They supplied Mr. Monroe all the money he wanted since 1952, I think. I think the Government must be blamed for not supplying all the working capital he wanted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All he wanted? If we had supplied all he wanted we would have needed the Bank of England and the Bank of Canada and the Federal Reserve Board of Washington, all three.

MR. HOLLETT: Does he want more than he needs?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would say his eyes are even bigger than his belly.

MR. HOLLETT: I advise the honourable the Premier ought not to say too much.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Monroe said too much.

MR. HOLLETT: He said too much, there is no question about it. But I can refer to certain statements made by the Honourable the Premier in this House about Mr. Monroe on previous occasions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If my honourable friend would allow me, I have in this House on more than one occasion spoken very highly of Arthur Monroe's energy and drive, but I have come to the conclusion that Arthur Monroe looked upon every one on this side of the House as a peasant whom he has honoured by accepting loans from us. We ought to be very grateful to him for doing us the honour of accepting these loans. Now the peasant can talk back, you see.

MR. HOLLETT: I did not expect to get the reaction so soon. I was quite sure it was coming some time. Mr. Speaker, and I think it is right. But the Honourable the Premier will have to remember that Mr. Monroe also said this: He said: I am personally responsible for leading the industry into what is now shown to be the unwarranted construction of new plants, but in self defence, he said, by the summer of 1955 it was apparent (I suppose to him) that all was not well and now shown to be the unwarranted construction of new plants but in self defence he knew all about it by the summer of 1955, he knew by that time—and at that time remember he urged the Government that was the summer of 1955—to enable all plants possible to be equipped with facilities for salting.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What he did was to come to us and ask for another couple of millions for him to put salt fish plants in his fish plants. That was his urging—urging us to give him another couple of million so

that he could put in each of these frozen fish plants a branch where he could salt the fish. That was farsighted—urging for another couple of million from us.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words his warning was a request for more money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes for him.

MR. HOLLETT: The warning was ignored.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We refused him the two millions.

MR. HOLLETT: When you refused him the money in fact, he said it was at that time the plant in LaScie went into construction for salt fish. Mr. Monroe said it was unfortunate that the selection of that part of the Authority which deals with the trade—The Fishery Authority, I take it, he is referring to. The Fishery Authority is composed of three men. I do not know which part of that Authority deals with the trade. Anyway it was unfortunate, he said, the selection of that part of the Authority which deals with the trade. Mind you this is a Government appointed fishery authority, and this criticism, is coming from Mr. Arthur Monroe who received anywhere from four to five million dollars from the Fisheries Development. And I take it the Government would not grant such loans to Mr. Monroe unless sold on the idea. I might here also interject that the Government was also sold on Valdemanis, but he disappointed them too, and Mr. Planta and Mr. Koch and all the other bunch of them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And Braun Wogau.

MR. HOLLETT: Anyway, the Fishery Authority is damned by Mr. Mon-

roe. It was unfortunate, he said, the selection of these men, their background and experience qualified them admirably for the job of policing the agreements between the Government and the trade. In other words to sit in an office and look through agreements and see that they are all right and file them away. But to expect them, he said, to be able to advise and guide the fish trade was unreasonable.

Now on whose part was it unreasonable to expect them to be able to advise the fish trade? In other words, it was the Government's fault. He said they would never be able to help the trade in any way in facing up to the main problem. "They have never been able in any way to help the trade in facing up to the main problem." Is not that terrible. I take it the main problem was the development of the fisheries. The main problem was mostly the trade and marketing.

He said, as the majority of the plants were built by my company, the growth was so rapid and enabled almost entirely by loans from the Government—Development should be made to conform to some sensible pattern.

He is a man who sets himself to be an expert, and was set up by the Government, who represent the people, as a man who knew all about what he was talking about in the fish trade and development of the fishery industry, and who had connections all over the world and in the United States. He is a man on whom everybody placed confidence. And he says now that the development should have been made to conform to some sensible pattern. There was never any such sensible pattern. There never was any advice sought from those who might know. He says there was simply no guidance of any kind.

Now I cannot say the Fisheries Department was inept, but he said there was simply no guidance of any kind. And mind you, that man got five million dollars, good or bad, largely because—and this is the sad part and I would not dare say it myself—Largely, he said, because there was no one in Government circles, (and that includes the whole works) who could give no such advice or who could take it. And so the growth continued without pattern or plan and virtually without contact between the Government and the trade.

Then he goes on to make some very kind remarks about the new minister. If I were the new minister I would take any compliment from such an individual as that and look at it askance, I am afraid. Here is a man who has been dealing with the Government for four or five years, receiving loans upward of five million dollars and coming back, as the Honourable the Premier just said, and asking for more loans, and then goes to work and damns the Government because there was nobody within the circle of Government to give advice or to take it. And now he goes on to say the new minister is a fine fellow and hopes he will get along all right with him. I hope he does. I hope he does, but I know the new minister as well as he does.

It all returns, he says to ordinary marketing. He should have known that all along. He recommends production control. All those of you who remember production control, I think, have to smile. I think I see the present Minister of Fisheries smiling. Now all we have to do is set up a certain amount. Everything now has to be frozen. We are going to get so much money, and as the fish comes in fifty per cent has to be salted and the other

fifty per cent is going to be frozen, or seventy-five per cent. He is going to work it out nicely so that a man who catches, salts and freezes fish gets the same price for the fish. It is just as easy as that, Sir. And all these years the fishery has been such a problem. I expect Mr. Monroe is a little bit sore—because I look upon Mr. Monroe also as a member of the Government during the last four years and I was certainly disillusioned when I found he had so little confidence in the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't forget he is a very able and energetic and progressive man. He is just a bit arrogant, but he is a very able man.

MR. HOLLETT: He goes on and tells how to do it. I will not trouble with that. But he says the Government has to contribute considerably to this fund. There is to be a fund set up, he tells the Government, and no new plants are to be constructed—remember that—no new plants are to be constructed—the scheme will need a good man to direct it. But I notice he does not recommend the fisheries authority. Now that is something the Government will have to take into consideration. You have set up a Fisheries Authority of three men and you have saddled the people of this country with their salaries, twenty-five thousand dollars a year. You voted them, I think, about two a half million dollars every year to carry on the Fisheries Authority work, and here you have Mr. Monroe, who is in debt to the Government for four or five million dollars, a director of many companies, who says he cannot depend on the Fisheries Authority. Don't let them do it.

He says the Government can do the industry no greater dis-service today

than to enable it to acquire any new expansion, any additional new boats or any new plants, any new plate freezers or anything else that will produce any more fish, than they are completely satisfied they really have a market for, and incidentally have the money to put up. So Mr. Monroe won't be able to be dealt with any more and he wants anybody else to be sure they got the money. In other words—Don't give anybody else any money. I am in to you for five millions. If you give anybody else any money they will be in competition and I will not be able to pay back. If I were on the other side of the House I would be watching Mr. Monroe carefully.

However Mr. Speaker, I see it is six o'clock. May I return to the debate on tomorrow?

On motion debate adjourned until tomorrow.

On motion of Mr. Smallwood all further orders of the day do stand deferred and the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at three of the clock.

TUESDAY, March 26th, 1957

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

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Presenting Petitions

MR. W. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a number of petitions from the people of King's Point, Silverdale, Harry's Harbour and Jacksons Cove. These petitions are largely signed by the petitioners and they all deal with one subject, i.e. the construction of a highroad from King's Point to Harry's Harbour. This road is without a doubt of great import-

ance to the people concerned. I am familiar with the territory having travelled over it during the recent election, last fall. I can personally vouch for the importance of this road to the petitioners and to the people generally on the north shore of Green Bay.

I strongly recommend the prayer of the petitioners and I ask that these petitions be received by this House and they be referred to the department to which they relate.

On motion petitions received for reference to the department concerned.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Supply): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the citizens of Markland praying that electricity be extended to that area.

At the present time the people of Whitbourne enjoy the advantages of electricity and it extends as far as the hospital, and is only confined to that town. Now the people scattered further along throughout the settlement of Markland petition that the extension might be carried on so that they too may enjoy the advantages of electric power.

The petition is signed by practically all the settlers of this area. I give it my keen support, beg leave to have the petition tabled in this House and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices 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 Respecting Notaries Public," and also a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Fire Department Act;" a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Bulk Sales Act" and in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Health, a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Dental Act."

MR. HEFFERTON: I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled A Bill, "An Act to Amend the St. John's Housing Corporation Act."

Notice of Questions

HON. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask the following questions:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask the following questions:

Answers to Questions

HON. J. H. CHEESEMAN (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table the answers to five questions asked in the House yesterday by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Questions Number 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14. (See appendix.)

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to Question No. 14. (See appendix.)

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to questions that were on the Order Paper yesterday but not to the new ones which were put on the Order Paper today. There are no answers coming from my department up

to now. When the proper time comes I would be glad to answer two of the questions formerly asked, that is, No. 3, asked by the honourable member for one of the sections of St. John's, Centre, I believe, amounts charged to travelling expenses by each department of Government since April 1st, 1956 to March 31st, 1957. There are sufficient copies to go around.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the Table of the House copies of the Minutes of Council in accordance with Section thirty-seven of the Revenue and Audit Act. There are three copies (See Appendix.)

QUESTION NO. 15

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister has left the Chamber for a moment. I asked him just before we assembled if he had any answers. He said that none has come from his department. So that I think I can say he has no answer today. They are all in the course of preparation.

QUESTION NO. 16:

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Premier is a Minister of the Government who is more familiar with the matter raised in this question. I have asked him to answer it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I say that in the first place I don't think this question was a proper question. I don't think we are required in any sense to answer it. I make both of these statements for the reason that all of this has been asked and answered before, and for that reason I don't think it is a proper question nor that I should answer it. However I will answer it. I do not mind giving the answer. (See Appendix),

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a sub-question with regard to NALCO? Are there any people who are holding options on shares in NALCO; in other words have any people an option to buy at any particular figure?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. There was a time when there were options, when these shares were sold at five dollars the old shareholders who had bought them at one dollar were permitted, under the Act, to get copies on the purchase of the five dollar shares. Only two of them did so, and the time I think has expired. Certainly there were no options held by anyone.

Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before we go on to the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Fisheries?

Is he in a position to state whether an agreement has been arrived at with Blue Fisheries Limited regarding the question of the plant in Fortune?

MR. CHEESEMAN: No agreement has as yet been entered into.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if I may—We had hoped at this point into today's proceedings to go into Committee on Resolutions. My honourable friend, the Minister of Finance, is not ready at the moment. We hope that later in the day he will have the necessary documents and be able to move the House into committee. In the meantime it might suit the conveniences of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to proceed with the Address in Reply.

MR. SPEAKER: This debate was adjourned by the Honourable Leader

of the Opposition who now has the floor.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I attempted to portray to the House some idea of the Newfoundland as we knew it in 1949 and our position today. I pointed out that our finances were in excellent shape: We had very little debt, about three and a half million dollars, I believe; some fifty million dollars cash and realizable assets; the railway was off our hands, and the postoffice was taken away from us and many other services; we were getting a transitional grant of six and a half million dollars and we had cash in the bank of anywhere from forty to fifty million dollars. I pointed out that the fifty million dollars are probably all gone at the present time and where we had no debt or a debt of only three and a half million, today we have a potential debt of fifty-five million dollars.

I then went on to the fisheries, and in portraying a picture of Newfoundland, of course, what is important is that some idea be had relative to the state of our various industries, and naturally I choose the fisheries because I, myself, was a fisherman, I was born a fisherman's son and I fished in my young days in the Labrador, trapping and so on around our own shores. Naturally, I, like a good many people here in this House, have a great interest in the survival of the oldest industry known to mankind and certainly the oldest industry known to anybody who ever set foot in Newfoundland.

It was important, therefore, that we get more or less a picture or some sort of a picture of the present stand, with the hope that whatever the picture may be today that it would be much better that it was in 1949. Well

all, I am quite sure, hoped that would come about.

I referred briefly to the salt fish and I deplored the fact that a good lot of our catch of salt fish was being taken to Nova Scotia and processed for shipment to the West Indies and other places in the world and that, on that account, we were losing a certain amount with regard to longshoremen and labour and freight, etc.

I turned then to the fresh fishery, and I quoted extensively, and I was criticized very much, Sir, by possibly some members of the House and probably members of my own district or the people of Newfoundland for quoting so extensively. I give as my excuse that Mr. Arthur Monroe was a man who entered into the confidence of the present Liberal aggregation as a Government away back early in its first acquiring office. He was trusted by the Government, depended on by the Government for his opinion and advice and he was very largely and liberally helped by the Government to set up various fresh fish plants, which we hoped would modernize the fisheries. As far as we are concerned, how else therefore should I go on to see the present state of the fresh fishery? In quoting from his address to the Board of Trade, I think I portrayed to this House his opinion, at any rate, of the present state of the fresh fish industry and of the relationship between the Government and Mr. Monroe, and particularly of the present Fisheries Authority and Fisheries Department. We have to remember, Sir, that this Government, like, I suppose, nearly every Government that sat in this House since its erection, has promised to do all they could to rejuvenate and put new blood into the fisheries. Thus the Liberal Government in Newfoundland, I believe, it

was in 1950 or 1951 attempted to do something. They brought in Icelanders who were going to teach us how to catch fish—teach us how to catch fish—That was terminated to the great loss of the Government and the people. Nothing came of it, except a sad experience. The Government then set up, eventually, a Royal Commission. I believe they did right in setting up a Royal Commission, composed of men who were very able men, and who after about two or three years did bring in a report, Sir, which in my opinion was a very fine report with regard to the fisheries. I think it was last year that the Government set up an organization called the Fisheries Authority. Its duty was to carry out some of the recommendations made by this Royal Commission, and I believe practically to implement that report. Mr. Monroe himself benefited largely from some of these loans and he wanted to benefit more, according to the statement made by the Honourable the Premier yesterday. We had the sad experience in the fresh fish plant in Fortune. I am sure we all deplore that. My colleague asked a question this evening relative to that and I regret that I heard the answer that I did, from the Honourable Minister of Fisheries. We do hope something will soon be done to straighten out that situation there in Fortune, and that the people who live there and have lived there all their lives and the people who have come there recently will be able to gain a decent livelihood from the operations of that plant. I do not know just how much that plant has cost this Government, but I believe it is somewhere in the vicinity of four hundred and fifty thousand dollars. It is important, therefore that we should endeavour—

MR. SMALLWOOD: The plant with the boats cost over six hundred thousand dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you! The plant and boats cost over six hundred thousand dollars. So that there is a branch of the fishery industry in which we who represent the people have an interest and one we should endeavour by all means in our power to reinstate, to reestablish and rehire and set to work these men and these people there in that particular area. I want to say now we on the Opposite side of the House will endeavour to assist and implement any offer made by the Government to reestablish that fishery industry there, and not only there but anywhere in the country.

I do not want to say anything further about Mr. Monroe. He said there never was any sensible pattern, there was simply no guidance of any kind, good or bad, largely, he said, because there was no one in the Government circles who could give or who could take advice. He goes on then to make the sad confession that he himself was largely responsible for that. I am not saying he was largely responsible for the fact that nobody in Government circles could give proper advice. Perhaps he was, and the Honourable the Premier intimated, so far above the present status of the members of the Government, so highly placed above them that he did not get down to ask for information —

MR. SMALLWOOD: He asked—Yes—He is excellent at asking. He is a past master, highly accomplished in asking. He is the best asker, I think, we have in Newfoundland to day.

MR. HOLLETT: In that case I fail to see why the Government and Mr. Monroe could not get together and work out some definite plan where—

by the fresh fish industry would not reach the stalemate which it supposedly has in this last year. Anyway it is a terrible indictment by Mr. Monroe, this man who was thoroughly trusted, who was lauded to the skies by the honourable members opposite, and who was handed out loans totalling approximately five million dollars — It is a terrible indictment that that man should stand up in a public building composed of members of the trade, of business, in Newfoundland —

MR. SMALLWOOD: On the air—

MR. HOLLETT: On the air and condemn the very people to whom he went to look for information— I may say he went to look for a lot.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was possible because we started to say no. He never condemned us until we first said no.

MR. HOLLETT: Now I am quite sure the Honourable the Premier has much experience with people of that like, that type, who have been coming to him ever since they knew that he had fifty million dollars. They have been coming in droves and knocking at his door, his front door and his back door and side door and every other door.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not talk about doors—It is not a subject for this House—Doors—front doors nor back doors.

MR. HOLLETT: Is the Honourable the Premier insinuating there is a back door in this House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not insinuate it.

MR. HOLLETT: I think my honourable friend should be proud to enter into this building by either back door or front door or even from the

basement to represent this Government, or come down through the ceiling if necessary. At any rate, as I said, they came through every door through which the Honourable the Premier ever made an exit, I think, and they have asked for loans and in a good many cases they got them—they got them—heavy loans too—in addition to Mr. Monroe I could name here today various other people who have gotten their loans and having gone out and establishing what they called industries and in every case made a mess and muddle of them, and who then turned on the Premier and bit the hand that fed them. He has had lots of experience. Therefore I would say he is in a very good position to judge either Mr. Monroe or you, Sir, or me, Sir if we went again looking for money to build a fish plant or a tavern. I had a fellow come to me last year for a loan from the Government to build a tavern. The Premier was no good at all because this fellow had gone broke and the Government would not give him any more money — So the Government was no good—I can appreciate that very much—but he went out the same door he came in— There are lots of people like that, I am sure. It is probably the only shadow that more or less darkens or dulls the Premier's pathway as he marches along through this life, this political life which he has chosen. I should think it has been the only shadow that crosses his mind, when he thinks of those people including Mr. Monroe, who came and begged and prayed and did everything else—They told how they could make rubber, superior rubber—I have memories of Koch and of Koch Shoes; and I shall refer to that a little bit later; and I have memories of many others—There is no point in mentioning them all now. I do not want to make the evening unpleasant

for either the Premier or anybody on the opposite side of the House. I do say that the Premier is in a better position than anybody else in the country today to pass judgment on account of Mr. Monroe, although Mr. Monroe undoubtedly knows a lot about fish. He tells us in his story to the Board of Trade if he had a little more working capital everything would be organized. But he goes to the Government and does not get it, therefore he does not say things that would tend to raise the estimate of the Fisheries Department in the opinion of anyone in this country. However, it is no wonder that nothing was said in the Speech from the Throne about fishery except that a different method of weighing would be introduced. I do hope the Honourable the Premier and the members on the opposite side of the House will set up some different sort of machinery to weigh the people who come to look for loans and cash handouts. I think that would save Newfoundlanders an awful lot of money in the future.

Now I cut out a clipping here, and before I finish with that branch of the fishery—I think it is taken from the Evening Telegram. It refers to the present Minister of Fisheries, and he states too what should be done, badly needed improvements. This is a recent quote from the Newfoundland Fishermen's Federation, the organization of the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen—Honourable Mr. Cheeseman said badly needed improvements in Newfoundland Fisheries include an expanded and more efficient bait service; more assistance to fishermen in the acquiring of boats and gear, more aid to navigation, the development of more profitable markets for fish; improved transportation and experimental work leading to a greater and more expedient implementation of the

fisheries. Yes, that would take some analysis, I think, with regard to that statement, and just how it is going to be worked. But there is just one thing that strikes me, and that is the development of more profitable markets for fish. We have machinery in our hands, or should have, and the Federal Government has promised they will put the experience of their department up there; Trade and Commerce; at the request of the Government here, and they will make all sorts of enquiries into the various markets all across the world for the export of our fish. I do hope the Honourable Minister pursues that idea. We can catch fish. We do not want Icelanders or anybody to show us. If fishermen want boats they know how to get them. If the Honourable the Premier and others would make an investigation around the country they would find the best boats were those acquired by fishermen themselves without any help or aid from the Government or anybody else. A person who goes and gets something for himself certainly appreciates what he has, Sir, and he looks after it in the proper manner.

Now there is one other aspect of the fisheries to which I would like to refer, that is the Lobster Fisheries. Now I remember I caught lobsters when I was a boy, a little fellow going to catch lobsters, and it did not matter how big, how long or how heavy, they got four cents a piece for them, four cents a piece, per lobster. Today they sell, I believe, at twenty to twenty-five cents a pound—a pound mind you, Sir. As I say, we could get them in the old days and we got four cents for them, and that is all. We thought we were doing fine, and we did not have any problem catching them. They were more plentiful then than

they are today. But, Sir, the live lobster business has grown to a great extent very largely by the efforts made by people on the West Coast and out on the Northeast Coast. Hundreds of thousands of pounds of lobster each year, live lobsters, were being sent to the United States and prices ran from thirty-eight to forty-five cents a pound up there, and the fishermen got twenty-five and twenty-six cents and probably more in some cases. That was a great industry, and it was pursuing along its normal course, competition, free trade, free enterprise, doing a grand job in this lobster business until last year when somebody stepped in and made a mess of it. I refer to O'Brien Fisheries Limited and the mess which was made by that concern, and I won't say so much by that concern as the people who leveled with that concern. Now I have a list of various loans here—April 22, 1955 when O'Brien Fisheries Limited were given a loan of one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. I suppose, like most people who suddenly find themselves rich, with one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, this concern decided they would expand their business. So they expanded right from the West Coast of Newfoundland down into Notre Dame Bay area. They decided they would go into the live lobster business. They knew nothing about it or very little about it. They went down. But here is the sad part of it, Sir—We have in this country a branch of the Government, the Co-Operative Branch of the Department of Fisheries or it was up to last year. I am informed reliably that this branch of the Government sent three of their men down into Notre Dame Bay Area—and the names have been given me—they were sent down there by the Co-operative Society, and they were instructed (so I am

informed) to advise the fishermen in that area, by the Co-operative Division, to advise the fishermen in that area that they ought definitely to sell their live lobsters to O'Brien Fisheries, Limited. Well you know our fishermen—somebody like the Co-operative field workers come and advise them what to do, and they suddenly decide they will do it. The other three or four people, shippers of the lobster, who had been shipping them for years and making a very good thing for themselves and the lobster fishermen were left out in the cold, and the fishermen brought all their live lobster, to the extent of something over half a million pounds to the O'Brien Fisheries, who put them in boxes unsuitable to receive them, because the boxes were too tight and there was not sufficient ventilation of water and air and what not in the boxes. They put them into these boxes—and then O'Brien Fisheries suddenly went bankrupt, and they did not have enough connections in the United States to ship the lobster there and they certainly did not have the money to pay for the lobsters, and hundreds of thousands of pounds of these lobsters Sir, were not paid for, and I take it a good many of them are not paid for yet. There are some paid for because the Government paid for them.

Now I want to know, Sir, is not that bearing out what Mr. Monroe said?—Does not that bear out what Mr. Monroe said? Nobody knew what he was doing in that particular department of Co-operation at this particular time, or certainly they would not have sent field workers out to advise fishermen in this country of free enterprise to sell their lobster to O'Brien Fisheries Limited. They brought in their lobsters and most of them did not get paid for them from O'Brien and most

of the lobsters spoiled. Just imagine, a half a million pounds of live lobsters and practically all of them spoiled simply because one man of a department of Government instructed the fishermen to take them to one man who did not know how to handle live lobster or ship them or anything else. I think, Sir, that also is a terrible indictment on this Government. Did the Co-operative Division advise them to sell to O'Brien? Would you call that free enterprise, Mr. Speaker? Is it right and proper for Co-operative field men to sponsor one only lobster dealer, one only lobster buyer? Does this Government agree that that is the right procedure in any industry not to speak only of the lobster industry? Is that correct? I say, Sir, that is a terrible indictment. I hope we will hear more about this later, from the Government side of the House, as to what the trouble was. I take it there will be a vote for the Co-operative Division of the Department, and we shall have more to say about it then, and probably we shall get an explanation. But to my mind, Sir, Officials of the Government have interfered in private enterprise to such an extent that they have crippled the general economy of this country in a good many instances. Take the case of Arthur Monroe—He practically had a monopoly on the fresh fish industry in Newfoundland. You know that when anybody gets a monopoly, Sir, on anything he is very likely to damage the whole industry, drives the other people out of business, and then come to the party who gave him the loan and say—Look you either got to do this or else—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Monroe never had anything even faintly approaching or resembling a monopoly. Last year for instance he produced about

one-third of all fresh frozen fish produced and exported from the Province—That is far from a monopoly.

MR. HOLLETT: That is pretty near it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: When there are two-thirds he does not handle?

MR. HOLLETT: I say it is pretty near a monopoly when one person handles one-third of the fish in any country, he certainly has control over a good many other people handling fish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He does not control anybody else that handles fresh frozen fish.

MR. HOLLETT: Well at any rate, the Honourable the Premier knows that Mr. Monroe supplied a lot of frozen fish to the United States of America and had a lot of contracts up there. All these contracts set the price up there and his contracts are powerful enough to prevent any better price being given anybody else up there.

There is one answer I would like to have with regard to these fishermen on the Northeast Coast; have the fishermen been paid and have the various people who handled the lobster been paid? I leave it at that for the moment, Sir.

Now I want to go on, Sir—I seem to have lost one page of my notes, I suppose it will turn up eventually.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Just pass on to the next one.

MR. HOLLETT: No it is important. As a matter of fact it is very important. It refers to the Honourable the Premier and the fascination which he has had for the resources of this country from away back. I was referring to his Book of Newfoundland a

night or two ago, and in that I find a quotation which I want to read to this House. After all he has a fine crowd of new men, some seventeen, and it is only right that they should be impressed with, shall I say the dreams of their leader on that side of the House. Anybody who is a leader and has not dreamed is not a leader at all. In Mr. Smallwood's book (as he was then) he wrote this. I can see optimism shining through even that stage—and I quote:—

"I make this further prophecy" (he had made several before) "namely Newfoundland within the next half dozen years will have blossomed fourth as a mining country whose importance will challenge the attention of the world. We shall be the third largest producer of newsprint paper in the world. We shall not have an unemployed man but will need new immigrants. Our fisheries will have been completely transformed."—"Our fisheries will have been completely transformed." That in a half dozen years after 1931 — "and made vastly more important and profitable by the introduction of considerable sums of new-capital. Newfoundland possesses more than a generous share of God-given wealth. The combination is irresistible."

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was written just before the great depression hit everybody. The depression began in the late fall of 1929 but it really hit us about 1931, just a few months after this book was written.

MR. HOLLETT: And it ends up—"Newfoundland deserves greatness," I believe I remember seeing the same words in the Budget Speech of the Honourable Minister of Finance either last year or the year before. He must have copied out of that book. At

any rate we see that the Leader of the Government was even in 1931 having visions of prosperity in Newfoundland. I am very thankful to say that some of these dreams, although they did not come true within six years, after the statement was made, have come true. They have come true and there are people in this country who would give the Premier the credit for the realization of some of these dreams. Let us admit that the Premier has been a force in this country for some years. I want you to know this, particularly you young men who come into the House, that your Leader dreams dreams. I think the poet said; "See visions and dream dreams" I do not know whether he saw visions or not. He had dreams at any rate. That was his idea of Newfoundland in 1931. From all our dreams of course, we are very rudely awakened, or from most of our dreams; and the Premier now admits that in that same year, or in the year after, he was rudely awakened from the dream which he had at that particular time.

Now, Sir, I want to say a word too about mines. First let me refer to mining in Canada, to show that we are not the only ones who have mines. In the "Financial Post of March 9th. I see that the total value of mining plus oil in Canada last year was two billion sixty-seven millions. Getting back to iron ore the production in 1955 was sixteen million tons and in 1956 it was twenty-two and a half million tons, a total of one hundred and fifty-six millions of dollars. With regard to lead and zinc the figures are comparatively small. Lead produced last year, three hundred and seventy-three million pounds whereas in the year before it was four hundred and forty-seven million and in the year before eight hundred and sixty-six. Now

iron ore and lead and zinc are probably the biggest revenue producers as far as our people are concerned in Newfoundland. What I want to say about mining chiefly is that we have been told all the time that we are about to begin a new era. We have been told that for a long time. I too remember, I think it was in 1950 that the Honourable the Premier told us that the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company, which was a company which got a grant from the Newfoundland Government in 1938, I think, and then it was revised in 1944. They are a big concern and had a lot of money. I do remember the Premier saying in 1950 that that great company would within a very short time, within two years, have fifteen thousand people employed on Labrador and that they would have agents going all across Newfoundland looking for Newfoundlanders to go to work down there. I don't know whether the Honourable the Premier would like a recess.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes, after which Mr. Speaker returned to the chair:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about mining. We do believe, of course, that the prosperity of this country depends on a number of things, many natural resources and not only the fishery and mining. We have been led to believe and we do hope that it is true or will be in the future as it has been in the past to a great extent, one of the props of our prosperity. I am one of those who believe that these mining corporations are not by any means paying sufficient revenues into the country which gave them the concessions which they have. I want, for that purpose, to refer to the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company. This company has some twenty-

five thousand square miles from Newfoundland for a thirty year period or for three periods up to a total of ninety years. In February 1953 the present Government, at least the present Liberal Government, granted the company a lease in addition to the twenty-five thousand square miles, which was later sub-leased to the Iron Ore Company of Canada; and they were to pay us (that is the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company) five per cent on any profits which they might have had out of it. The Labrador Mining and Exploration Company, as I say, made a regrant over to the Iron Ore Company of Canada and in return were given some two hundred thousand shares in the Iron Ore Company of Canada for the mineral rights given to that company in 1949 in a Labrador Concession.

The Labrador Mining and Exploration Company will also receive royalties from the Iron Ore Company of Canada on all ore mined, and has retained sixteen and two-third million tons, or one-eighth of the first and one hundred and thirty three and one third million tons or one third of all other iron ore mined in its property, and twenty-seven per cent of all specialty minerals mined on the property. The Iron Ore Company has given permission to go ahead and to further explore.

The position, as I see it, is this: This Government (and I can take it this Government was back to 1949) — In 1944 this agreement was made and confirmed in 1953 by the present Government. The Labrador Mining and Exploration Company were given a grant of twenty-five thousand square miles. They go to work and sub-let some of that territory to the Iron Ore Company of Canada, as everybody knows has been a going concern and cost

some three hundred million dollars, I believe—They started production about two and a half years ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two hundred and fifty million.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you very much! In the first year, I believe, they exported less than two million tons and in the next year they exported some seven million tons and in this past year just ended they have exported some twelve million tons (That is the Iron Ore Company of Canada).

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the twelve million is for them and the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company, the two together and the seven millions and the two before were for the two of them together.

MR. HOLLETT: I was about to come to that. They got from the Iron Ore Company of Canada two million tons of that twelve million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No that was exported, to the account of the Labrador Mining and Exploration. The Iron Ore Company of Canada were the miners of it on behalf of the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company.

MR. HOLLETT: Under the agreement they were to turn over so much to the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company, and last year, as per the agreement, they turned over some two million, as the Honourable the Premier pointed out, to the account of the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company.

I asked a question a couple of days ago as to what revenue the Newfoundland Government got from the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company altogether and I was told there were some sixty-one thousand dollars.

I believe that was the amount. That is all this Government has received from the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, since then another large amount has arrived. No, that is from another company, the Iron Ore Company. There are two companies to pay.

MR. HOLLETT: They must have heard we were requiring. I wonder would the Honourable the Premier be in a position to say what has been received from the Iron Ore Company of Canada?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Over one hundred and eighty thousand received yesterday, and a lot more to come yet.

MR. HOLLETT: That is on account of ore shipped last year, or altogether?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Altogether.

MR. KEOUGH: For 1955.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not the year just passed but the year before.

MR. HOLLETT: What I am trying to point out is that the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company were in a position pursuant to their agreement to make substantial concessions of a concession which was given to them by the Newfoundland Government and by the Quebec Government too, I believe, to other companies, and in that case gave the Iron Ore Company of Canada, who gave them two hundred thousand shares in the Iron Ore Company; and they in turn profited of course by the mineral which is mined and exported by the Iron Ore Company of Canada. I maintain that we are not getting enough from the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company, not one-fifth,

put it that way, of the revenues which we should get from the revenues which go into this Labrador Mining and Exploration Company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the honourable gentleman mean we are not entitled under the legislation or what normally we ought to get?

MR. HOLLETT: What we normally should get, what the people of this country should get.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are getting what the law requires.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, that is true. That is the reason I raised this point. I think the Honourable the Premier will admit, will he not, that we are not getting sufficient morally from this company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The law was passed even before the National Convention was set up. We debated here in the National Convention.

MR. HOLLETT: I know that.

DR. ROWE: Would you have us break the agreement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have to carry out the law.

MR. HOLLETT: I ask, will the Honourable the Premier admit we are not getting our moral right with regard to the revenues of that company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would say, having recently gotten from the Government of Ontario and having recently asked the Government of British Columbia to tell me what their collection are on iron ore, I would say that we are not very much out of line in getting five per cent of the profits of the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company and five per cent of the profits of the Iron Ore Company of Can-

ada. That is not much out of line. But legally we are getting the full amount, according to law.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, did the Honourable the Premier—and I know he did—take the trouble to look up what is meant by "net profit" in the Act? They pay for everything first. If a miner cuts his finger the Newfoundland people have to pay for it before they can get anything back. In other words, everything is paid for. I have a list of the things. I do not want to delay the House—but the "net profit"—Well we can see the paltry amount of money which has come into this Government in the last few days, compared with the earnings of that company during the past year or two. I think we will all admit that we as a country are not getting sufficient revenue.

But I only raised the point to warn us people that we ought to be more careful when we make deals with mining concerns. I was referring to the Iron Ore Company of Canada, and I have particulars of this company here. I think it would be a mistake to delay the House, but I would like to refer to their production and shipments of ore. I think it commenced during 1954 when one million seven hundred and eighty-four thousand tons were shipped and a total of seven and three-quarter millions in 1955, with five hundred and eighty-seven thousand tons, and five hundred and forty-five thousand two hundred and forty-six tons for the Labrador Mining and Exploration. So for five hundred and forty-four thousand tons, according to the information which I have been given, this country has received sixty-one thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the honourable gentleman please be fair.

The Government has received on account—on account—a certain amount of money that is due us. But he must not take that amount which we have received on account, and not the final payment, and by dividing it into the total number of tons say—all we got is so much a ton—that is all—we got on account.

MR. HOLLETT: This is the first time we ever heard "on account" in connection with the answer to that question.

MR. KEOUGH: Would the honourable gentleman allow me. Yesterday I said we had received sixty-one thousand dollars as of that date and this is not the final settlement.

MR. HOLLETT: Which year was that for?

MR. KEOUGH: 1955.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the year the company got five hundred and forty thousand tons and they got at least an offset price of about ten dollars a ton for this ore. That is well over five million dollars. In other words we did not get very much. We will be interested in knowing just what the final settlement is.

I raised the point because I wanted these companies to know that we as a Government and an Opposition are alive to the fact that we are not as a Government getting enough money coming into the Treasury from the terrific amounts of profits which are being made by these various companies. For instance, this company the Iron Ore Company of Canada expects an eventual production of twenty million tons a year after the St. Lawrence Seaway is completed. Twenty million tons a year will give the Newfoundland and Labrador and Exploration

Company huge amounts of ore, and we are going to allow them to do all sorts of things, explore, pay for everything which they can finally arrive at and arrive at a very small net profit and give us a very small return. But I use this as an example for us to be more careful in the way in which we dish out, if you like, the natural resources of this country.

I have before me the particulars with regard to Canadian Javelin Limited. That company got ninety-nine years lease with the Newfoundland Labrador Corporation. Again you have the Canadian Javelin in the same position as you have the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How? In what way?

MR. HOLLETT: The Newfoundland Labrador Corporation are really lessors of the concessions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There would be no Iron Ore Company if there had not been a Labrador Mining and Exploration Company and no Pickands-Mather if there had been no Canadian Javelin.

MR. HOLLETT: I would have some doubt about the Iron Ore Company of Canada. I think they would do it anyway. In any case is it not an easy way to avoid paying Newfoundland?

MR. SMALLWOOD: How so?

MR. HOLLETT: It is easy enough for me to see—Set up all sorts of subsidiary companies which have all sorts of expenses.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The exemptions are as set forth in the Act. They cannot create others.

MR. HOLLETT: They have been creating a lot.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They might try.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Act allows for the creation and recreation before they arrive at a net profit. They hold an option from Canadian Javelin on forty-seven hundred square miles, mineral concessions in the Wabush Lake Area of the Labrador where there is a very large tonnage of low grade ore indicated. In 1955 the company announced financial arrangements had been completed to bring the company into production by 1957 at a total estimated cost of approximately twenty-three million; plants to be built; the importation of two units with a rate of capacity of twenty-five hundred tons per day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has gone into a much bigger thing since that.

MR. HOLLETT: What I want to know is why this concession came from the Newfoundland Labrador Corporation. The Honourable the Premier has said that they are promoters of these various companies. Why is that? Why is it that we as a small little province had to guarantee the loan of sixteen and a half million dollars? I wonder would the Honourable the Premier explain why that has happened?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. I think I took three or four hours to do that in the session when I asked the House to guarantee the bonds. I gave the House a pretty thorough, and an explanation at great length, on the occasion when the House was asked to guarantee the bond issue.

MR. HOLLETT: But why did not the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation? You said there would be no Iron Ore Company of Canada who spent two hundred and fifty million

dollars without the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, and I will add not that because of Canadian Javelin, who in this case takes the place of the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company, because of them the amounts spent by those who go in there will be much more than has been spent by the Iron Ore Company.

MR. HOLLETT: That is guess work, I am afraid.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: It is like the sixteen and a half million bond issue. I think the Honourable the Premier will admit that we on this side did state there would be no such bond issue raised and pointed out why it would not be raised. The facts prove we were correct. I do not want to go into that now. I believe the Government has some legislation coming up. What I am anxious to insist upon from this side of the House is that more care should be given to the framing of legislation relative to concessions. Every inch of land, practically, in Newfoundland today has been made over to such people. Take BRINCO.

BRINCO has fifty thousand square miles and twelve hundred square miles, ten thousand square miles and one hundred and forty square miles and one hundred and eighty square miles, twenty-one hundred square miles and seven hundred and sixty-five square miles and eleven hundred and forty thousand square miles this BRINCO has sixty-three thousand one hundred and eighty-five thousand square miles of concessions. It is very little use for anybody else to go in there. If they do so this concern takes the profit, they get the gravy and Newfoundland gets the residue. The

only reason I raise the point at the moment is to suggest that in any new legislation which is coming up that we ought to be very careful before we give away any more concessions without making sure that the Treasury of Newfoundland, which is never over flush, not since 1950 or around there, which never has lots of money. Take out in Alberta today, look at the prosperity in that province and look at the state of the Treasury of the province in Alberta. The only reason it is so is because the Government of the day at that particular time when they discovered the oil there made sure that the Treasury would receive its just deserts from this particular natural resource. We in Newfoundland have been (I have the word) too Liberal—just too Liberal with these natural resources, a Liberal Government, too Liberal with concessions. There is no question about that. If anybody charges that the Commission of Government gave away some of this land I would say they were very liberal too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just a word about the paper mills: We have been told time and again that we are going to get all sorts of papermills. We do know that the prosperity of this country is greatly enhanced by the greater paper mills of Grand Falls and Corner Brook, and we do hope that the Government will be able to bring about the building of another paper mill, at least the third one if not the fourth and fifth. You will remember that the Premier promised the people in his manifesto of a few months ago and almost guaranteed that the third paper mill would be built. I am afraid it is a pity that no mention of that has been made in the Speech from the Throne.

I shall have to say something about NALCO, but as I take it the legisla-

tion which is to be brought in will have some reference to NALCO there is no reason why I should say very much about it at the present time. There are just one or two little points, but they are not little because anything which we bring up here in this House is not little. I do remember certain promises made to civil servants about two years ago by the Government. I believe the civil servants met the Government, and I am quite sure that they were promised that there would be an increase in their salaries. Nothing whatsoever has been done about that and two years have gone by.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Something has been done.

MR. HOLLETT: Nothing as far as their getting it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable colleague, the Minister of Education announced to the Civil Service Association at their convention and dinner that I would be making a statement in this House on that very matter. At the right moment I will be announcing a substantial increase in pay for the civil servants, police, fire department and including the staff of the penitentiary, including a great many people.

MR. HOLLETT: I am glad to hear that, and I am glad that I asked the question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman, I think, ought to get full credit.

MR. HOLETT: I don't need any credit thank you, if I need credit I go to the bank. I don't say they will give it to me yet. But I am not looking for a Government loan at the present time. But I am glad I did raise the

matter because I think the promise is two years old and had better implemented or else. I had better not say very much, I think, because I want to say something about the roads and snow-clearing and that sort of thing. But we will have other opportunities for that, and then there are the finances of the country. We will have an opportunity to deal with that when the budget comes down.

Now I will take agriculture. I think we had an agriculture commission a short time ago. They made certain recommendations. We the people do not as yet know what the Government has done to implement the recommendations made by the agriculture commission. We do know that no country can be truly prosperous without agriculture, and we do hope the Government will be able to arrange some way to make it possible for a farmer to live, particularly in certain parts of this country, as he is able to live in other parts of Canada.

There is one other thing—the Mink Industry—I am not quite familiar with what is happening in the mink industry. I know they had a very excellent show last fall. I attended it and was delighted to see the mink there. But recent rumours are not, shall I say, sufficient to still one's anxiety with regard to the present set-up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no reason for any anxiety.

MR. HOLLETT: I am very glad to hear that. I want it to be known there is no reason for anxiety in the mink industry. Mr. Ralston Kerr did not get away with all the minks, there is no question about that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He did not get away with any. The honourable

gentleman turned out to be a complete and utter alcoholic and very unfortunately lost everything he had in the world, and had to be shipped out by the Welfare because he had not even the price of his fare out, as a result of being completely alcoholic. The less said, I think, the better. He is a fine man, a good type, good character, a splendid fellow who became an alcoholic.

MR. HOLLETT: He did not feed it to his minks?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. It would have been better if he had fed it to the minks.

MR. HOLLETT: That brings up the matter of the Alcoholic Liquors Act—A man becomes an alcoholic.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): You are not going to blame us for that are you?

MR. HOLLETT: I think the honourable gentleman could take a little blame particularly in the way the Alcoholic Liquors Act is being administered in this country. I know of a tavern closed up simply because the owner did not agree with the politics of the party—I don't know—I do know certain taverns were closed because the politics of the owner did not agree with the politics of the people who went in at the time.

I think, as far as the Alcoholic Liquor Act is concerned, there might not be so many alcoholics in this country if it were properly administered. I could say a lot about the closing of these taverns and a lot about the kickbacks to the party.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It must be the Tory party, not the Liberal party. Not one nickel.

MR. HOLLETT: The Liberal party.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not one single nickel. Not only that but if anyone connected with this party ever did collect it I personally would kick him out of this party. I would kick him out. I would not have him. We do not have any kickbacks from liquor.

MR. HOLLETT: That is a very serious statement to make. Well we think we can prove it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two-thirds of the taverns' owners are Tory, and active Tories. One is the Treasurer of the Tory Party.

MR. HOLLETT: What are you trying to make out?—All taverns' keepers are Tory.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, but maybe all alcoholics are Tories.

MR. HOLLETT: There were kickbacks all right, about ten per cent—the usual amount. Ten per cent. There are people on the opposite side of the House who might know something about it. But I do hope that the Honourable the Premier will see to it that it does not happen again. I do not want him to kick anyone out of the party at all. I do think a good clean-up every once in a while in connection with alcoholic liquor is not going to hurt anybody at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I agree.

MR. HOLLETT: The disasters that happen all across Canada and all across the western world because of maladministration of the Alcoholic Liquors Act in every country in the world. It is terrific. I could give the Honourable the Premier facts and figures which would startle him in connection with the dire results that come to people, when there is practically an uncontrolled liquor system in any country. I do hope that some effort

will be made by the Government to do something about that.

Now, Sir, there is just one thing that I want to mention before I sit down—That is the matter of the new industries. I am not going to say very much about the new industries because the Government has taken our advice at last of last year and have set-up what is tantamount to a Royal Commission to look into the status and the financial standing of all these industries—and I think it is about time—I am delighted to know that they are doing it. I regret they did not set up a Royal Commission last year when we suggested it. Now they have done the next best thing. If this firm of Arthur D. Little is an honest firm it will give the Government and the people of this country a straight-forward answer to the economics of these various industries. We must know it. It is time the people knew something about it, Sir. In answer to a question yesterday, Sir, we had Adler's Chocolates, since April 1956, with one hundred and fifty thousand dollars cash and fifty-five thousand dollars bank loans. They had previously had three hundred and fifty thousand dollars, which makes a total of five hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars which the people of this country have put up for Mr. Adler to make chocolates. Now, Sir, it is about time that Arthur D. Little went in and found if that is the right thing to be doing with our money. We also had something about Atlantic Gloves—On February 12th, 1953, they were given a loan of three hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and on October 1st (the opening of the shooting season) 1954 they got another two hundred and sixty-nine thousand dollars and since April of last year they have received one hundred and seventy-five thousand

dollars, making a total to Atlantic Gloves of Carbonear of the people's money. Eckhardt's Mills, on September 30th, 1953 got a loan of sixty thousand dollars, October 26th, 1955, one hundred and ninety-five thousand and on September 15th, 1955, got three hundred and eighty-seven thousand and four hundred dollars and in January of this year they received thirty thousand dollars, or last year. I am sorry—and since April 1956 they received a further seventy thousand dollars, making a total of eight hundred and sixty-four thousand four hundred dollars. Gold Sail Leather Goods, Limited November 23rd, fifty thousand dollars and October 1st. (again the shooting season) 1954, one hundred and fifty-five thousand and since April of last year, fifteen thousand dollars, making a total of two hundred and twenty thousand dollars. Hanning Electric on October 21st, 1953, two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. I advise the Honourable the Premier and some members of the Cabinet to go shooting on October 1st, so that they would escape some of that. October 20th, 1955, one hundred and fifty thousand dollars and April 15th, one hundred and twenty thousand and since April 1956, last year, fifty thousand dollars, or a total of six hundred and forty-five thousand dollars to Hanning Electric.

We would like to know how many people some of these factories have employed. Koch Shoes in 1955, June 15th, one hundred and twenty thousand dollars, October 26th, 1955 two hundred and fifty thousand dollars; February 2nd, 1955, one hundred and twenty thousand dollars; February 25th, forty thousand dollars and since April of last year two hundred and forty, making for Koch Shoes seven hundred and eighty thousand dollars.

I am just quoting an answer received yesterday—Newfoundland Hardwoods May 15th, 1955, two hundred and seventy thousand dollars; September 7th, 1955, one hundred thousand dollars; October 20th, 1955, and September 1st, two hundred and twenty thousand dollars; February 24th., a further one hundred and thirty thousand dollars and since April last year three hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars, making a total of one million five hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars. In another answer given yesterday the total cost of the Hardwoods to date has been four million three hundred and forty-five thousand dollars, and three hundred and seventy-five to be added to that. In other words four million seven hundred and some odd thousand dollars, about the same as the cement plant. I recently read a decision given by His Lordship, the Chief Justice in connection with civil matters which came before him, where the Newfoundland Hardwoods was sued for wrongful dismissal or something of that kind. Mr. Baird, the Manager, won an award of fifteen thousand dollars. That judgment by the Chief Justice makes interesting reading, and I would suggest to every member of this House that he should read it. This man Baird, undoubtedly a good man, for two years prior to his engagement by Grant was receiving twenty-five thousand dollars a year as manager of the Hardwoods Plant—twenty-five thousand dollars a year. Grant said he was incompetent. The Chief Justice decided he was not. He also in his judgment described how Mr. Grant formed a company, or at least had his company, I believe in Montreal, act as agent for Newfoundland Hardwoods of which Grant was the Manager. We also have how Baird goes to work and forms a company, composed of him-

self and his wife and daughter, where-in they made an agreement with Newfoundland Hardwoods whereby he was to get a certain salary and a Commission of one and a half per cent on all the sales of hardwood. It tells in the judgment just what the sales were for a certain period. It makes no wonder that the Hardwoods Plant is not succeeding. At any rate the Hardwoods Plant cost the people—and I dare say it has given a good deal of employment, but it has cost the people about four million six hundred thousand dollars.

There is one other point I wish to mention, i.e.; the fact that acting upon the advice given to him by the Department of Mines and Resources the Manager of Newfoundland Hardwoods sent three groups of men into an area just off the Badger Road where there was supposed to be twelve million cords of suitable birch. The judgment discloses the fact that after cutting a very short time they cut the place out and they had to close down shop. That is something which I hope the Government will endeavour to rectify by giving correct reports with regard to stands of timber. These people went to all sorts of expense and sent men in there to cut this timber but when they got there they found no such thing as twelve million cords there or anything like it—there may have been twelve million feet. I just forget the correct amount. It does not make any difference. The point of this observation is that they had to give up and consequently they could not supply the Hardwoods Plant with a steady stream of birch logs and consequently Newfoundland Hardwoods got into trouble. When Newfoundland Hardwoods get into trouble they come to the Government and they ask for more money. As a result, since

April of last year they have been given three hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars, and I strongly suspect they have been given more than this.

Newfoundland Tannevies and United Cotton all got different amounts of money. I said, it is high time that the Government set up such an organization as they apparently have set up to look into the prospects and economics of these new industries.

While I am on my feet there is one other point I want to make, if I may go back to the Labrador and Mining Company—I asked a question the other day relative to the tabling of a sworn statement as to their earnings and mineral production etc. each year, and I was informed that no such thing as a sworn statement was necessary. I have searched the Act of 1944 and I find there is such a statement and there is such a section and that they are supposed to table sworn documents relative to these things.

MR. KEOUGH: If the honourable gentleman will allow me—I do not remember having said that no such documents as sworn statements were necessary. But I did say that the certified audit received by us had been accepted by the Auditor General for his purpose. However, I want to let the honourable and learned Leader of the Opposition know that I thought the point was well taken, and today I instructed the Deputy Minister of Mines to write the parties concerned indicating the matter has been brought to my attention in the House and ask for a sworn statement.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you very much! I am glad I raised the point. I think it is most important that it

should be tabled for the Government's purpose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out, I stated yesterday. I am very happy to have the privilege of saying a few words on this Speech from the Throne and very happy to be sitting in this House with so many men who undoubtedly each and every one of them has the country's interest at heart. I have taken the trouble to point out mistakes which have been made. Naturally it is the job of an Opposition to do that and when we do get the opportunity we do it, realizing we are all human, all Governments are composed of humans and mistakes will be made. The point I want to drive home is this; when a mistake is made admit it as quickly as possible and let us get on with the job of putting Newfoundland on her feet and making her a "has" province and not as "has not." I am quite sure that is the ambition of every man, particularly the Premier, every man on the opposite side of the House. That is the job we have to do. We are going to say some harsh things at times. We want them to be taken in the spirit in which they are given. I shall make no personal remarks if I can possibly do it against any person on the opposite side — I will make no personal remarks because the Government is to blame and not any one individual. If the back-benchers allow the Cabinet or allow any one person in it to get away with anything they believe not to be in the best interest of Newfoundland then it is the whole Government who is responsible. I want to guarantee the House, Sir, on behalf of the Opposition that whatever we may say and whatever we may do we are acting in the best interest of Newfoundland and we feel sure that every member on the opposite side will ap-

preciate that because we believe they too are acting in the best interest of Newfoundland. Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, we feel it is a little late to go on with the resolutions, so we might continue with the debate.

MR. HOLLETT: Do you have somebody to go on now?

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, it is our prerogative to do that. If the honourable gentleman would say briefly that he was not ready to go on we would move the adjournment of the debate. If he does not want to go now I would be glad to move the adjournment. The time of the House is in the hands of the Government.

On motion of Mr. Smallwood the debate was adjourned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the next order would be the Honourable the Minister of Finance to move the House into Committee of the Whole on Supply:

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Administrator.

(Message read by Mr. Speaker):

The Honourable the Minister of Finance:

I, the Administrator of the Province of Newfoundland, recommend that, pending the tabling of the Estimates for the financial year 1957-58, a vote on account of Six million dollars, calculated on the basis of approximately one-tenth of the total Vote

for the year 1956-57 to meet essential public services, be provided by the Provincial Legislature.

(Sgd.) A. J. Walsh,
Administrator.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move that the House now go into Committee of the Whole on Supply:

On Motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair:

The honourable member for Carbonar Bay-De-Verde took the Chair as Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, in reference to the resolutions here, the House will understand that these are interim resolutions. The budget is not yet ready and, as is the custom, we provide supply to Her Majesty. Hence these resolutions are now presented to the Committee for consideration.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I noticed when Mr. Speaker was reading the Address from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor he spoke of the amount set out here as being one-tenth of the amount voted for 1956-57. Does that mean to say that the amount here of six million dollars represents a tenth of the expenditure for 1956-57, not only the amount voted on current account but the amount voted on operating account will be all spent by the 31st. of this month?

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is for next year.

MR. BROWNE: I know, but it says the amount is now one-tenth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Approximate.

MR. BROWNE: It is a matter of common knowledge that the Government did not get the loan for four-

teen million authorized to be raised, and I ask if that amount was spent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was.

MR. BROWNE: So that total expenditure on capital account and current account was about sixty million?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Roughly.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Premier said that all the money voted in the estimates last year was spent. I recall a statement made by the then Minister of Finance, I think around Christmas time, that alternative methods of financing has been employed. Would the Honourable Minister state what they were?

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is not the time.

MR. HOLLETT: I asked if you were prepared to state now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not now. Not on this order of business. Obviously we must and we will, but not on this order of business.

MR. BROWNE: Well surely that is not one-tenth of the amount.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think that in that the present session is being paid for.

MR. BROWNE: Out of last year's vote?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. It has got to come down in detail in the estimates, what is the difference.

MR. BROWNE: I was just wondering who made the calculation. It shows an increase for next year. That is what it amounts to. Finance is down here fore one hundred thousand. The expenditure voted last year was one

million eight hundred and fifty-nine thousand. One-tenth of that would be nearer two hundred thousand. Why is there a small vote for that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think it would be a mistake to try and read too much into this list. I think the Minister will probably have his budget ready in two or three weeks, and there is only a month roughly to keep going.

MR. SPENCER: I think I may say at this point to the House: As it is very well aware, these figures are provided for us by the Controller of the Treasury and the Department of Finance, over which, it is true, I at the moment preside. But it follows I do not know the details of these amounts and I do not think any honourable member in the House expects me to know the details. I do not think it necessary to know them at this time. These amounts are merely quoted by the Controller of the Treasury as being the amounts which in his opinion are required to carry on until such time as the budget is brought down.

MR. BROWNE: I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister is new in his position, but I would suggest to him that it is his information that we must go by and not only the Controller of the Treasury, and he should be in a position to explain to us what these votes are or should find out.

MR. SPENCER: When the budget comes down we will get that.

MR. BROWNE: He should have it now. That seems to be a very large sum for the Attorney General's Department. The total expenditure last year was one million seven hundred? I wonder if the Attorney General is in a position to say why they want

such a large sum if it is only for the month of April?

MR. CURTIS: I have only now seen the item, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I feel, Mr. Chairman, as the estimates must be brought down in great detail by my honourable colleague and he must also bring down the budget, this is purely interim. I think unless we are just looking for something to debate—this is purely interim and is all absorbed and cut up into the main estimates, some more and some may be less. Actually it is purely interim to carry on the Government until the House sees fit to vote the regular supply to Her Majesty.

MR. BROWNE: But, Mr. Chairman, there must be some way in which these figures are arrived at. A man does not close his eyes and write them down like a ouija board. There must be some reason for a million dollars for the Department of Education. I can understand education. That is much more reasonable than the other. Here is one that is one-sixth of last year's vote, and the one-tenth figure does not correspond with it by a long way.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact these estimates are both current and capital account?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would hardly think so. There is no capital account voted for next year. These are items which are voted ordinarily. As yet there is no capital account expenditure voted for next year. We would hardly ask the House to vote interim supply under that heading.

MR. HOLLETT: One-tenth only means four million two hundred and fifty-seven thousand on expenditure of current account and you are asking for

six million, that is why I thought capital must be included as well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is extremely doubtful. There is no capital account programme at the moment. We know the civil service has to be paid and other services of the Government, but there is no capital account approved yet by the Cabinet or by any one. So that this can hardly include the capital. If it is two million more than is necessary it will not be spent.

MR. HOLLETT: I have no objection but the letter from His Honour the Administrator called for one-tenth and this adds up to six millions. I wonder why the difference. It is interim in one sense. I wonder why? Did somebody just put his hand in his hat and take out a number? That is what it looks like. That is what my honourable colleague is trying to find out. Was there any reason?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, is there any Minister over there prepared to justify the expenditure that is to be voted here? Is there anyone who can explain it? Is there anyone with any knowledge of the amounts? While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister of Finance could tell us if we are going to have a Bill for Supplementary Supply because it appears the vote was over-spent last year and there was no loan raised? Is there a Supplementary Supply Bill to be brought in in the next day or so?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know if it will be in the next day or so. My honourable friend will certainly have to bring in a Supplementary Supply Bill, and it will run into millions, of course, because we did spend much more than we budgeted for. We did in the year not yet passed have an expenditure much greater than we

budgeted for. I am not revealing until the proper time.

MR. BROWNE: No. Everyone feels that is so.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add to the comment I made previously on this matter. Every year this resolution is brought in and an approximate amount is set forth. It is true that the letter which has just come in from His Honour the Administrator has set that figure at one-tenth approximately. In other years it might be one-sixth or one-quarter. I repeat it is merely an approximation and does not matter, as far as I am aware. These amounts are here. It is true that the Controller of the Treasury has advised me that these amounts are required as an interim supply until such time as the estimates are brought down. To that end I am prepared to offer them to the House. I have not any detailed explanation to give regarding them. If that be essential prior to the coming down of the budget then I would have to ask the Committee to rise and forget this thing until such time as the explanations are forthcoming. I don't think it will be essential. As I said before, it is merely interim supply and has no bearing really on the actual amount. I think the honourable gentleman opposite will understand this very clearly. I have no detailed explanation to give regarding these amounts this afternoon.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I have here the Bill for last year, not for interim supply but for the total of fifty-two thousand eight hundred and fifty-seven dollars, and one-tenth of that is five million etc. So with allowances for increased expenditures in the Department of Education it comes out, and

in some places it is not required. That is how I take it. It does not mean each department is to be one-tenth, but it means that the total vote—

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. HOLLETT: On the Department of Health, could the Government state what stage the Children's Health Programme in Newfoundland has approached or now reached?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think the honourable gentleman who is the Minister of Health will be most happy to do that. He is not here at the moment, and even if he were it would hardly be the place. When he brings in his estimates or when the budget of the Honourable Minister of Finance is brought down and the Honourable Minister of Health explains his own estimates I think he will be extremely happy to give an account of the Children's Health Scheme in operation up to the present time.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I think the Department of Public Welfare should have some explanation because the total amount voted last year was only seven million eight hundred thousand and here is one million four hundred thousand. It seems to me that there is a very large increase in relief been given out this year over what was given in previous years or over what was anticipated.

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable member I should like to say that this amount here includes social assistance and old age assistance and all other allowances. We do not receive anything from Ottawa on those amounts here, but, as you know, Ottawa shares about fifty per cent of the various allowances and within the next two or three months we cannot

expect to receive any amounts from Ottawa and we have to make a charge against that account for the amounts.

MR. BROWNE: There will be a credit coming from Ottawa against these?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes at the end of the first quarter of the new year. We have to finance it in the meantime.

MR. BROWNE: At the same time according to this Bill last year the total amount spent was eight million and there was revenue set down for two million three hundred and fifty thousand. This of course would be ten per cent of fourteen million. But perhaps the expenditure for the first month or two of the new year is much higher than the remainder of the year because we have to do all the financing and don't get anything back from Ottawa until the end of the first quarter. When we get the answer to the question the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked today we will know how much relief is being given out.

MR. HOLLETT: How much lag in time is there after the 31st. of March?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The end of the first quarter. Nearly all Ottawa amounts are payable quarterly and not in advance but in arrears. They all are.

MR. ROWE: I may say Mr. Chairman, my past knowledge of this department proved the month of April to be the most expensive month of the year for a variety of reasons which I think must be obvious. Unemployment is at its highest in that month and there are other factors. April is one of the bad months of the year, so I think it is right to ask for that amount.

MR. BROWNE: While on the Board of Liquor Control; it has been reported to us, Mr. Chairman, that bonds from the Board of Liquor Control are being paid directly, daily, into consolidated funds, is that correct?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. That is far from correct as far as anyone could imagine. The funds are handled by the Board and paid into the bank and from time to time withdrawals are made, surrendered I would say, trading profit made by the Board surrendered to the Treasury, probably two or three times a year.

MR. BROWNE: Any more loans to Mr. Monroe?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We cannot put it in interim supply. It will be put in the main supply in the budget. We do not put it in interim supply. We do not ask in this back-hand way for that approval of capital account programmes. We ask for that approval when we bring the programme in. We cannot bring it in this very indirect way. This does not contain capital it only contains current account.

On motion items carried; Resolutions carried:

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report having passed these resolutions, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. HOLLETT: I think it would be in order I take it to presume Mr. Chairman will be the Chairman of Committees from now on, and since it is the first time I have ever seen him—

MR. SMALLWOOD: If I may — The position is that under the Standing Orders the selection of Chairman cannot proceed until following the adoption of the Address in Reply. In

the meanwhile, until the Chairman is selected, Mr. Speaker may name any member of the House to preside in Committee of the Whole. Subsequently a Chairman will be elected by this House.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you!

On motion the Committee rose to report having passed certain resolutions.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply having met begs to report having adopted the following resolutions, and the Committee begs leave to sit again.

On motion report received. On motion resolutions read a first time, read a second time and read a third time.

On motion a Bill was introduced to give effect to these resolutions.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask, by leave of the House that the Bill be put through all the stages concerned.

On motion Bill read a first time, on motion and by leave of the House Bill read a second time.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, while we are on second reading of this Bill may I say that I have here the one passed for monies required for various departments, and I notice here in connection with Public Works two amounts of one hundred and two thousand eight hundred dollars for roads improved and one hundred thousand dollars for roads new. I cannot find the vote in the Department of Public Works for either of these expenditures, and I wonder if anybody could tell me whether it refers to the Trans-Canada Highway or what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable member is quoting from what?

MR. BROWNE: From Minutes of Council filed today, and in connection with Public Works there is three hundred odd thousand dollars for road maintenance and one hundred and fifty thousand to snow clearing and one hundred thousand for roads new.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is reconstruction and improvements of roads.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps when the Bill is read a second time that could be taken up.

MR. HOLLETT: That is capital account.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Public Works or someone could explain to me if the Government has a policy, where sums of money are voted on capital account by the House, to pass this sort of Minutes of Council and get the Government approval to an addition on capital expenditure?

MR. SMALLWOOD: On a new vote or an addition to an existing vote?

MR. BROWNE: An addition to an existing vote.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I imagine it is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is quite commonplace if the money is available. The authority comes from the Government and he authorizes the spending; he does not put his hand in his pocket, the Government must find it. That is quite commonplace. There is nothing new in that. A new vote is another matter.

On motion Bill read a second time, by leave of the House ordered now read a third time.

On motion and by leave of the House the Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

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 3:00 of the clock.

WEDNESDAY, March 27, 1957.

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

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

Presenting Petitions

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I rise to beg leave of this House to present a petition from the Residents of Coachman's Cove. I have a petition here which is signed by all the electors of the community of Coachman's Cove, which lies about nine miles beyond Baie Verte.

This petition prays for the extension of a road by some six miles to connect the people of Coachman's Cove with the Bowater's Road which now runs three miles beyond Baie Verte.

It will be of interest to this House, Mr. Speaker, to know it is on that road that the present asbestos development is located, and it is there within some five miles of Coachman's Cove that we confidently expect one of the great mining developments of Eastern Canada will take place.

The petition points out that this will enable the people of Coachman's Cove to have easy communication with the hospital and doctor and nurses at

Baie Verte and will at the same time make it possible for them to go to the scene of the asbestos development more easily than it is now. As I know from personal experience, they have to go through a wood path for six miles in order to reach that place where there will in a few weeks time be many hundreds of men employed including a great many of the male residents of Coachman's Cove.

Sir, I should like to point out also that this community of Coachman's Cove is only three miles south of the thriving and flourishing fishing and logging community of Fleur De Lys between Baie Verte and Partridge Point. To the northern extremity of that great Baie Verte Peninsula there are two communities, Fleur De Lys and Coachman's Cove comprising some nine hundred souls. So that by extending this road six miles and building another three miles, a total of nine miles, these two communities will then be connected up with Baie Verte, the Bowater's logging camp and any logging development which might take place in that area.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in connection with this petition it will be recalled that the Honourable the Premier stated here, I think it was yesterday, that he had invited the members of the various electoral districts to submit to him a four or five year plan covering, amongst other things and I should think covering principally, roads and road development over the next four or five years. I have, as the member for White Bay South, taken advantage of that request from the Honourable the Premier, and as it happened I have urged that one of the first road projects in that area should be this very thing which is requested here. It is my hope that if any road development takes place in White Bay

this year on the eastern side of White Bay that this road will be given priority.

I beg leave to table this petition and request that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion the petition received for reference to the department concerned.

Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. DR. J. MCGRATH (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, this is not a report of a standing nor a select committee, but I beg leave to table the departmental report for the Department of Health for the calendar year 1955 and also regulations passed under the Children's Health Act. Extra copies of these have been given to the Clerk of the House for any member of the House who may want them.

HON. J. T. CHEESEMAN (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the Table of the House the annual report of the financial statement of (1) The Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority for the year ending March 31st, 1956 and the other annual report and financial statement of The Fisheries Development Loan Board for the year ending the 31st of March, 1956.

Notices of Motion

None.

Notice of Questions

Notices of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Browne.

Notices of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett.

Answers to Questions

QUESTION No. 25: (See appendix).

HON. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): May I interject a supplementary question there, Mr. Speaker? Would the Honourable the Premier explain to me just what he means by a private company. How could Atlantic Gypsum in which we have some four million dollars invested be a private corporation? I wonder would the Honourable Minister explain?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Quite easily. Atlantic Gypsum is now a privately owned company. The property is owned by the Government of Newfoundland wholly.

MR. HOLLETT: Atlantic Gypsum is now purely an operating company. They are operating, producing, operating the plant and producing and selling the product, and as such are a purely private company in an ordinary and purely conventional sense of the word. A private company controlled utterly and wholly by Bellrock Gypsum Industries of London, England.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is highly out of order—highly out of order. He is permitted to ask questions but is not permitted to make speeches.

MR. SPEAKER: There should be no comment on an answer to a question.

MR. HOLLETT: I hope that is observed right through.

MR. BROWNE: The agreement with Atlantic Gypsum sold to Bellrock, has that been tabled?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I frankly do not remember. My honourable colleague, the Attorney General says it has.

QUESTION No. 30: (See appendix).

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask a supplementary question there? By what method did the government go about changing the Act whereby they could take back part of the concessions to BRINCO and pass it over to the Federal Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have no right to do that. We put the position to BRINCO and said: here we have an opportunity to get the Government of Canada to designate a great area in Clode Sound as the National Park. They want the lease. We cannot deliver free title to them of the area for the park. You have the rights. We are asking the others and now ask you will you give up the rights so that we can pass them to the Government of Canada? BRINCO said yes. In any case they must surrender it.

MR. HOLLETT: Does that have to come before the House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. To give them more. To give them what there is no law authorizing the Government to give we have to come before the House—But we are not giving them anything more than we are not authorized to give by law. This is not a case of giving, it is a case of receiving back from them. We do not need any law for that. We can ask BRINCO in a polite way and if they agree and if there is mutual consent they can pass it back and we are willing to receive it.

QUESTION No. 32: (See appendix).

MR. BROWNE: I want to know when he was paid.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable member for Bonavista South has never been employed by the Government. If he had been he would have

forfeited his seat in here. I think he values his seat too much to forfeit it.

QUESTION No. 34:

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer is here, and I have it in two copies. These are photostatic copies of all correspondence. We have a machine in our office which can turn out photostatic copies very rapidly, almost instantaneously, and I asked Mr. Pushue to get out all correspondence including the agreement between the Government and Arthur D. Little Incorporated. It is all here, what we have got. (See Appendix).

QUESTION No. 9:

(See appendix).

I think my honourable friend ought to offer his warmest congratulations to the Government for being so prompt in finding all this information and providing for the brilliant speeches which are yet to come from the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: I do, Mr. Speaker, take this opportunity to thank the Government for an excellent reply like that. I think it is an answer we all want to know. We want to know if we are going to enjoy our vacations in this location or that. I do not know what you can do with twenty thousand dollars towards accommodations, but I thank the Government, Mr. Speaker, for this reply.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 28 on today's Order Paper (See Appendix).

QUESTION No. 31:

(See appendix).

QUESTION No. 33:

(See appendix).

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister say whether that is for land clearing or is there an extra charge for development? Is it two different things?

MR. KEOUGH: Well, I would think that is for straight land clearing.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question with regard to Question No. 31? The Minister said the produce was feed to the flocks of sheep by the Department of Mines. Could he give the size of the flock approximately.

MR. KEOUGH: Well, it was approximately fifty last fall when I saw it last.

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, Question 27 on the Order Paper. I regret my staff was unable to have that information ready for this afternoon. I assure you it will be ready for the next sitting on tomorrow afternoon.

QUESTION No. 11:

(See appendix).

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table the answer to Question No. 18. (See Appendix).

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 35 on today's Order Paper: (See appendix).

QUESTION NO. 36:

(See appendix).

MR. SPEAKER: These are all the questions?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move now a brief recess for ten minutes which we can refresh ourselves with good tea and be back to resume the debate in ten minutes.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Orders of the Day

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, I should like first of all to join my colleagues and other honourable gentlemen who have spoken in offering my formal word of congratulations on the high and exalted office that you have been elected to. I feel that any honourable gentleman of this House would be very conscious of this extremely high honour, and I am sure, we all know, that you will fill this very high office with distinction to yourself and that it will redound to the glory of this House.

I should like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion which resulted from the Speech from the Throne. I should like to join with my colleagues in stating (this is purely conventional, of course) that they did the best they could with what little they had.

Now at this point I do not think it is inappropriate for me, at the risk of introducing a personal note, to say that I am here representing a St. John's District, the District of St. John's Centre, and I would like one of my first public utterances to be profound expression of appreciation for the extremely high honour.

My district has a number of firsts. First of all it is the largest numerically

and it is a district which is entirely within the boundaries of St. John's and for that reason has little need for direct services. A most casual examination of the election results would, I think, indicate it is also a most intelligent district.

MR. SPENCER: We cannot question that.

MR. DUFFY: There are fine people out around Grand Falls. I did not say "the most."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I bring that matter up for several reasons, not the least of which is to examine very briefly—I do not suggest that there is a personal element in this, but as the candidate for the party that is opposing the Government, I think a brief analysis would be most interesting—I suggest that the very emphatic vote that was given the member for St. John's Centre was largely a protest vote against the Government. I suggest that is clearly obvious beyond, in my opinion, any shadow of doubt. The people in my district, and I might add in other St. John's Districts, have not too much faith in the Government. Now this again is interesting because of the fact that my district and other districts in close proximity to the seat of Government, and for that reason they know and they see what is going on. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that was one of the main factors in the vote that my colleagues and I received in the last election.

Now without belabouring the personal element at all or wishing to continue at length on the personal element of my talk I would briefly mention that although I have been listed as a new member and that is so, I suppose, but I am not exactly brand

new. I was here some years ago, five exactly, with pay. At that time I came here under rather peculiar or in-peculiar circumstances. I was ordered in by the Court and I was ordered out by the Court—Blessed be the name of the Court.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, somewhat like the Premier, I developed a five year plan and this was the result: It was most successful.

With regard to the Speech from the Throne I think it will be agreed that the two important items here are the reference to the Royal Commission to review the financial consequences of union and the appointment of the Arthur D. Little Company of Boston to conduct an economic and commercial analysis of the new industries established by Government Loans.

With reference to the Royal Commission, I suppose that it is inevitable that many thinking people would express the thought today that had the original terms of union been negotiated at a proper level that this Commission would probably not have been necessary. Now recriminations are not to much purpose, and all that can be hoped for is that Newfoundland will get adequate financial assistance, although, of course, we are entirely at the mercy of the Federal Government in this respect.

Now with the Arthur D. Little survey (it is not an investigation I understand from what the Honourable the Premier said this afternoon. I think that is a fine distinction drawn there. I think the industries will have to be investigated to produce an analysis)—However, that is not too important. The thing that is important, and I think should be emphasized—A day or

two ago one of my colleagues asked a question as to how many employees are presently employed by these various industries and the answer was given—They are private companies—

Now that has come up several times during my short attendance in this House and I have been trying—without too much success—to understand what is meant by that. In view of the fact that large sums of public monies have been, I hope not dissipated, certainly expended in a highly speculative way. Well having that in mind it would indicate that since the monies were public that surely there should be a public and a Government control or interest to the point that any information that we, representing the people of this Island, should be justly entitled to. Now in connection with that I would like to read briefly a short editorial that appeared in today's "Evening Telegram."

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think that is permitted—tabling or not tabling has nothing to do with it, I think.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know the contents of the editorial but I think the Honourable member may incorporate it into his Speech without actually reading it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: It is important at the outset of any general assembly, I think—The rule is, is it not, that the House, Your Honour, is not interested in hearing the opinion of others than members of the House on matters of debate in this House, and that in fact it is not permitted.

MR. DUFFY: I will not labour the point.

MR. BROWNE: May I, Mr. Speaker, refer to Beauschene, 3rd. Edition, paragraph 262. "The practice of reading extracts from newspapers to support an argument in debate has been followed in the British House since 1840, when Speaker Peel, with the acquiescence of the House, allowed a member to proceed to read passages from a newspaper. In 1856, when a member was called to order for reading an extract from a newspaper, the Speaker stated that on former occasions when he had attempted to enforce this rule, he had been overruled by the House. A similar statement was made by the Chairman in Committee on the 9th March 1957. (May, 317-18).

MR. SPEAKER: I referred to this yesterday—I looked this up yesterday while the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition was speaking and the honourable member for St. John's South just referred to Section 262—Speaker Peel decided June 31st, 1878—a member is not out of order in reading a newspaper article on which he proposed to found a motion. But it is out of order—and I would like honourable members to take note of this very carefully—if they refer to other debates during the same session or to any question not under discussion and if it reflects upon any proceeding or any determination of a House; contains any unparliamentary expressions; refers to a comment on or denies anything said by a member; alludes to debates in other Houses of Parliament That would mean the Canadian Senate here or the House of Lords in England—refers to a matter pending a judicial decision; reflects upon the conduct of persons in authority. Brand says that a member may read extracts from documents, books or other printed publications as part of his speech (and this is important) provided in so do-

ing he does not infringe upon any point of order. Then Section 265: "It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the House and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House." Section 266 states that it is out of order to read newspapers in Committee. 267 states that relates to a member having made a speech. A member having made assertions in speeches out of doors, relative to other members, and having repeated them in the House; Decided that the proper way of proceeding with a view to ulterior measures was, for the newspaper containing the expressions in question to be read by the Clerk at the Table and for the admission by the member in question that he used them to be taken in a formal manner. That does not apply here. It is out of order to refer to anything said out of the House on the subject of what has taken place in the House. That has already been stated. Members cannot read a letter referring to anything that has taken place in a debate in the House.

I do not know what the honourable member who has the floor was about to read, because I cannot recollect having read it. But I take it he would be permitted to read it provided he does not violate any of the rules referred to in 264.

MR. DUFFY: I will read it "Malicious Damage"—No, that is not the one. It is another one I would like to talk about.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker: We are all very anxious to hear the honourable gentleman speak. We are not anxious

to hear editorials from newspapers on matters touching on the Speech from the Throne because such editorials are obviously comments on the matters in this House previously under debate. We are now debating the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne and the subject matter is the matter contained in the Speech from the Throne, one of which is the new industries. The editorial tonight in the "Evening Telegram" is on the new industries, which honourable members can read, but which is not proper, I hold, under the last section you just quoted. We are not interested in newspaper comments on anything in this present debate, on any matter that this debate deals with here, but in the opinion of members of this House this editorial comment on a matter which is contained in the Speech from the Throne and about which the honourable gentleman presumably is going to speak. What he has to say is important in this debate in this House. What a newspaper has to say on the same matter is not only irrelevant but not permitted here. It does not matter whether it supports his argument or not. It is not permissible, I hold, in the section Your Honour has just quoted from Beauchesne.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it has been done here often, reading newspapers. I am quite sure the Honourable the Premier himself has often read newspaper articles.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not commenting on matters under debate.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit the matter under debate is the Speech from the Throne. My colleague here, the honourable member for St. John's Centre is criticizing the new industries. That is not on the debate especially. The subject now

is an address in reply, and the question of the new industries is not of itself the question that we have to decide. We do not have to decide anything about the new industries, and that is what is meant. I suggest that is not the question under debate, therefore he would be entitled to read it. Otherwise I do not see how he would be entitled to read a newspaper any time if he cannot talk about something not under debate. I submit, Mr. Speaker, in this case, where the industries are not the subject of the debate principally, but a member may roam over the whole Public Affairs, that he is entitled to read it, otherwise he would not be entitled to read anything at all.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Speaker, may I at this time, as a new member, rise to speak, Sir, on the Standing Orders of the House? On page 38 here it says it is out of order to read extracts in debate if they refer to a comment on anything said by members. That is what the honourable member for St. John's Centre is trying to do, Sir.

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, to avoid any further waste of time I will waive the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is taking a sensible point of view. I think the honourable member can get across the idea.

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out this editorial mentions the number of vacant houses around many of the new industries; CMIC Topsail Road and wonders just what the situation is and trusts that the Opposition would have ample opportunity to enquire. Well now I trust that too, as a member of the Opposition. At least I know that we have ample opportunity to enquire, but there is not much point in en-

quiring if we do not get the answer. Already I have asked a question which received a very familiar answer, that was private and confidential—That was in relation to the correspondence about the paper mills, the papermaking mills. I make the distinction here—It is a paper mill and not a paper making mill. If the other questions that I propose to ask, and which I have a very great responsibility to ask on behalf of not alone my own constituents but on behalf of the people of Newfoundland, the thirty or forty thousand who voted against the Government. I think we four represent these people and it is our duty and our privilege to ask questions to which there should be replies given.

With further references to the Arthur D. Little Company, assignment, I certainly hope that the investigations or the analysis when it is completed will be made public and that the recommendations of this expert will be made public and that the Government will have the political courage, which they have lacked so far, to carry out the recommendation, that they would shut down businesses that are giving little promise of success and that have cost the people of Newfoundland millions of dollars. As a matter of fact I would say as a citizen and as a member of this Assembly that this Government has committed a great breach of faith with the people, a breach which the people may forgive but history, in my opinion will never forgive; not alone the complete waste of public money on highly speculative industries but absolute refusal to give pertinent information to the people about the expenditure of their money. So we can only hope—Remember we on this side can do little about it except express our opinion and the opinion of the people of Newfoundland on what

they and what we feel should be done in the interest of good Government. We certainly hope and pray that when this analysis has been completed that it will not be a further sixty thousand dollars poured down the sink but that it will represent a real desire on the part of the Government to keep faith with the people who put them in office.

Now I should like, too, to make a brief reference to the remarks of the Honourable the Premier on opening day.

MR. SPEAKER: That is another debate. I think the honourable member might say it has been said in this House but not refer specifically to what was said. That debate was closed when the motion was put, you see.

MR. DUFFY: Well, Mr. Speaker, may I refer to the concern of the Premier about the little Opposition over here. Again I say, like my district, the Opposition is small numerically, but my district is the largest numerically. The Premier expressed deep concern about the little Opposition, but at the same time as he was expressing this deep concern he seemed to be thoroughly enjoying the whole situation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am sorry I cannot shed any tears.

MR. DUFFY: The human I suppose is very versatile and when we express verbal expressions they do not always coincide or conform to the ideas of one's mind. But I am inclined to take the tender solicitude of the Premier not too seriously. But I can make one reservation there, but I will wait and see if this co-operation that he promised to this side of the House on behalf of the people and if he is gen-

uine in his expression of concern that he will at the very least supply the answers to the question which we propose to ask. I do not think that any question we will ask will be irrelevant. We are not going to ask about hockey games. We are here to discuss public affairs and public matters and it is public matters we propose to ask about and we hope we will get the answers to these questions.

Another matter too arises out of this concern of the Premier which does not coincide with the actions of the Government in the redistribution Bill, which in effect provided for more Liberal seats on the opposite side of the House. I am quite realistic and I think my colleagues are; it was not expected that the Conservatives would win the last election. I was not that, and I think nobody was more aware of this probability than the Honourable the Premier when the redistribution Bill was introduced which has resulted in increasing the number of seats for the Government and showed little hope of increasing the number of seats for the Opposition. However, I might join my colleague, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, in extending an invitation for any of you gentlemen who might suffer claustrophobia during the next few months. It is very spacious over here, and I think we are very happy. I know I am. I am far more proud of myself on the Opposition side with all the space then if I were over there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not sour grapes?

MR. DUFFY: No, I am quite sincere, Sir, when I say that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Like Abraham Lincoln you would rather be right in the minority than wrong in the majority?

MR. DUFFY: That is right! That is true! Thank you very much!

Another matter, again talking about the great concern of the Premier—He is going to assist the Opposition—He has already done that, as he said, by giving us quarters upstairs. Well that probably does increase somewhat our creature comforts but it is of no consequence really. You know the time we spend in this House is here. We do not spend it in the offices here in this building. We too have many meals, of course, but not necessarily in these quarters. Where we spend the time is here. So that that is not really any real contribution to our work in the House. I think it would not have been too much to expect a little more assistance from the Government than the Premier has so far indicated. He has said that will be allocated for secretarial purposes. I do not know what he considers a modest amount—that may be a few millions—I do not know. Anyway I think the very least, in view of all the conveniences of the members of the Government that we of the Opposition should have adequate and sufficient secretarial assistance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The members of this side have not got it except privately. They pay for a stenographer. The Government does not pay for one.

MR. DUFFY: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is quite different to provide assistance for thirty-odd—I do not mean that in a derogatory sense, than it is to provide for four, in view of the fact that that four have a bigger load to carry when it comes to work in this House. That is very obvious. If we are to hope to be able to do a job at all, four with one greenhorn who will probably take some time to find his feet here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is making a good beginning.

MR. DUFFY: So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, it would not be too much to expect. However, that is my opinion. If we do not get it, I will continue to do the best I can here.

Now, again with reference to the Opposition as compared with the opposing members opposite me the tremendous majority is not exactly—if you make again an analysis with the assistance of a "Little" company and if we analyze just exactly what the real position is. I think that if we can be subjective about it that on a more equable basis and from the standpoint of people, not districts—districts are inanimate and people are all that matters really—if there were an equable basis for distribution of seats we should have ten or twelve seats over here and the Government should have that many less.

MR. FORSEY: You will have to cut off the Avalon Peninsula from the rest of the island.

MR. DUFFY: I am now talking in a very general way—the equable—

MR. FORSEY: Where the Tory stronghold is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What Tory stronghold is on Avalon, just the little section of St. John's?

MR. DUFFY: As far as the Tory stronghold is concerned, as I pointed out before in my talk, I am not suggesting that the people of St. John's are more intelligent than the people of any other part of Newfoundland, but they are in close proximity to this Assembly, to the seat of Government, and it seems to me that they have very solidly and very emphatically voted against this Government. One reason

would be that they are better informed. As a matter of fact the newspapers reach the people of St. John's District in far greater number than many places throughout the country, and they see, obviously, what is going on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A lot of people would disagree with that—a lot of people in Newfoundland.

MR. DUFFY: On that point, too, Mr. Speaker, of equable distribution of seats, it was mentioned that the honourable member for Labrador has a complete total registered voting list of fourteen hundred and eighty-one whereas the District of St. John's Centre has a registered voting list of nearly ten thousand. There is one member for Labrador North and there is one member for St. John's Centre. Now despite all the talk about the geographical situation it does not make sense to me, except, of course, when I view it in the light of the intentions of the Government when they brought in the redistribution Bill—then it makes sense—In my opinion, and I think I am alone, of course, in that, what appeared to be the tremendous support and vote of confidence in the Government, the number of seats is not really so that the people of Newfoundland had been for many years—(and when I say many I mean in relation to the number of years this present administration had been in office) voting for federal benefits and not on the record of the Government. I think that is quite obvious. Of course the Government has been most fortunate in that times have been good and they take the credit for that. That again, of course, is purely fiction because times were even good before Confederation came about and they got better, as they got better all over North America. Then with the federal benefits

with which the Provincial Government has nothing to do except in this way that one Federal Benefit, the Family Allowances of twelve millions dollars, which in the Liberal Campaigns we heard a lot about, actually that Family Allowances of twelve million dollars come from Ottawa but the gentlemen on the opposite side took half that back in their celebrated sales talk of three per cent, which incidentally is far more than three per cent in many cases—it is five per cent. So, as I say, that is just one instance of my opinion of where the Government is getting the benefit of the good times which they d'd not bring about, and the people many of whom do not see the distinction between Federal and Provincial benefits the Government is capitalizing on. Maybe that is good politics, but I think it is a fact. So that when you take the whole picture into consideration I think it is quite clear that the Government is extremely fortunate, the most fortunate Government that ever came into office in Newfoundland. For that reason I think they should have been more aware of the great responsibility that was theirs when they came into office. When they came into office some years ago with a prosperous people, with a substantial surplus, more money than we ever had before, with benefits coming or accruing from Ottawa in Federal payments that was the time for this Government to sit down and plan sensibly and with caution.

It seemed to me at the time, some years ago, when the Premier made a statement, something about developing or perishing—"Develop or Perish," it seemed to be quite unnecessary because there was no urgency, at least there was not the urgency at all that the expression would appear to give. There was ample time to sit down sensibly like any good business people would do and plan. As I say, when the

people were prosperous and there were ample funds available there was no necessity at all for this mad policy.

The result was inevitable, that these millions of dollars that were frittered away on highly speculative industries—that was inevitable as a result of such a policy, and I think it is a great tragedy. As I say before, even if the people may forget, history will never forgive this present administration for that very act. That alone, in my opinion, is enough to damn this present Government, the complete lack of necessity of such a mad speculative scheme. That was bad enough but I think even worse was the great breach of faith with the people in completely refusing to tell them what was done with their money, and having found out that they had put the people's money into these highly speculative schemes, many of which at the beginning it was quite obvious to anyone who gave the most superficial survey of these industries could not hope to prosper. Then, as I say, the great act of betrayal was the political cowardice of the Government in not wiping them out and taking their first loss as any business man would do. How many people in business have done the same thing, but they have exercised ordinary precautions about it and when they did find themselves in a mess they took their first loss. The Government did not have the political courage to do that. Even now it is not too late, at least we hope it is not—after this report of this analysis comes in I hope that they will have the courage to face up to their obligations to do what any ordinary businessman would do, and that is to stop losing money when it is not necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose I could read this though—This is the Liberal Manifesto.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member will allow me—I think he may read the Manifesto. But just now a point of order arose, and I may say for the guidance of members many of whom are new and all of us could use some information about parliamentary procedure.

Our sources of Parliamentary Procedure are (1) Our own Standing Orders. I hope all members have a copy. If they have not a copy they may be obtained from the Clerk and (2) if the situation is not covered in our Standing Orders we go on to the Canadian Parliamentary Authority, and if we do not find anything to suit us or guide us there then we go to May who is the English Authority on Parliamentary Procedure. For the guidance of honourable members I would like to read what our standing orders have to say on the reading of speeches. I do not have a copy of the Standing Orders here, as I should have. It can be found on page thirty-eight or page thirteen, I do not know which.

"In order that debate may be a "live thing" members are not permitted to read their speeches. The rule is relaxed in the case of important ministerial statements such as explaining a highly technical Bill and in all cases where precision of statement is absolutely necessary. A member may read extracts from documents and may refresh his memory by reference to his notes. However, no member should attempt to influence the course of a debate by reading arguments or letters from outside persons of authority." I think that covers the situation very well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I take it the honourable gentleman would be allowed to quote hard facts that are contained in the document he now has before him?

MR. DUFFY: I want to read it, but there are not too many hard facts.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member continue?

MR. DUFFY: First of all I would like to say that I think it is an exceptional piece of work from the lithographic point of view. There are all the colours of the spectrum. I think it is black, red bound and a beautiful colour green and also there is a beautiful colour red, which oddly enough is most appropriate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Note the fish-erics are also in the red in here.

MR. DUFFY: I think there is a slight correction to be made here when it is said that in the past six years the Government have used twenty-five million dollars of their money. I take it that was a typographical error—That is the people's money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the Government's money.

MR. DUFFY: Well what are we talking about then.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is it not?

MR. BROWNE: No. It is the people's money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Government has custody. The Government has its use. The Government spends it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, one honourable member has the floor while two honourable members are talking to one another.

MR. DUFFY: If one is a custodian of a trust fund I do not think one can claim it is one's money. I personally think it is not the Government's money. It is the people's money, part of which is mine.

MR. CURTIS: We are the representatives of the people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman would allow me—I think it is the Government's money. It is the property of the general Government and not the property of J. R. Smallwood or L. R. Curtis. Properly it is the Queen's money and the Government are the Queen's Ministers and the Government spends the Queen's money which comes from the people and belongs to the Queen; and the Government, the Queen's Ministers spend the Queen's money.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I take exception to that. I think when His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor wants supply he comes and asks the House of Assembly for supply, and he does not come to ask the Government. Argued from that point it is the House of Assembly's money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. It is the Queen's money and the Queen's Minister's spend it.

MR. HOLLETT: We grant it to the Queen.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The honourable member for St. John's Centre has the floor.

MR. DUFFY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I might say I feel better pleased that the Queen has possession.

Now it is in red here, as I said, very appropriately printed in red—Regarding our twenty-five million dollars it lists the various plants. Up to the time there were seventeen—I have not taken any check, but at that point there were seventeen—and it says here that the money was invested. I will not quote if you do not want me to, Mr. Speaker—The money was invested on loan, every dollar.

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me—That is the opinion of a person who is in this House.

MR. DUFFY: I see. Yes—Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But every dollar of that will come back to the Government in coming years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think he means me.

MR. DUFFY: Now may I point out, Mr. Speaker, this very admirable piece of combined facts and fiction is dated September 20th, 1956—every dollar that comes back—including the rubber plant—Now at the risk of being factitious I think it looks too far when the Government talks about that money coming back, because at the present time it is a warehouse of some kind—I don't know—it is certainly not making rubber. There was quite a bonfire last year, I think—How the Government proposes or how they can hope to get every dollar back is beyond me, and I suppose largely depends on most of the others.

Now the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has referred to this in some detail, so that I do not propose to spend much time on it. But I do note at the end of the book that amongst the benefits that the people are deriving from this administration are one hundred and twelve pleasant picnic sites. Now that is very good. I have enjoyed some of these myself, but the few that I have sat at I would not boast about. The seats were not too comfortable and I do not think they represent a tremendous outlay—So if reference is made at this time to these trifling things there does not seem to be very much point to it. The important thing is the speculative activities of the Government, which, as far as I am concerned, are represented plainly in the Government industries.

As I pointed out before, we can only hope that even at this late date the Government will have the courage to take seriously the recommendations that will be brought in from this analysis.

I would like too, Mr. Speaker, to say briefly that whilst I have to be critical of the Government I hope to be able to be objective. I hope that I won't be unduly prejudiced. For one who is partisan it is difficult, I suppose, to be objective. But I am sincere when I say this—I hope that I will be successful as I can be and that any legislation that comes up (I think my colleagues feel the same way) that I do not feel competent to take an active part in or be competent to support or otherwise I propose to get what I feel will be competent advice on that—I would like to make that quite clear—I am an opponent of the Government and as such I will be as objective as I can.

Now I suppose the real important matter to discuss—and I do not profess to be an expert on this—is the financial position. I do not suggest as some people have that the credit of Newfoundland as a province has been taken up. I would even go as far as to say that the failure of the Government to sell its last bond issue is due to some extent to the conditions of the bond markets. But I will say this—Although the credit of Newfoundland has not been taken up, at the rate the Government has been borrowing in the very short period of five or six years, it would not be long before our credit would be jeopardized. I think that is just a matter of mathematics. If the Government borrows fifty or sixty million in five years and is looking to borrow at the rate of fourteen, sixteen and twenty million dollars a year—and from what I can hear I think they need the money badly—it is only

a matter of common sense. One does not have to be a very profound economist to realize it is only a matter of a short time when the Government will be in difficulties. They are in difficulties now but that does not involve the credit of the country, but the credit of the province will have been used up largely—So having that in mind I would certainly urge the Honourable the Premier and all his colleagues to be very aware of that. I think there are greater obligations than ever before to be aware of that situation, and that mathematically certainly if they continue to borrow. It is a more urgent matter now than it was five years ago because, despite the fact that conditions are certainly not bad yet in the opinion of many thinking people the honeymoon is over as far as good times is concerned.

Now I know that many honourable gentlemen might accuse me of being unduly pessimistic when I say that, but I would defend that position, that I am merely asking caution this present indication would demand. We have witnessed in recent weeks the unfortunate situation of some hundreds of employees, being laid off at Fort Pepperrell and other American bases. These are straws in the wind. We have at the present time over twenty thousand unemployed, the highest number in years. Even though this is the seasonal time of the year to expect it, it is recognized the figure today is very disturbing. So that these are two very obvious and very apparent conditions that would certainly make the Government pause before entering upon any further unsound legislation. Now one reason why I say that is because of the early policy of the Government, when the Honourable the Premier stated that borrowing was the curse of Newfoundland. I think that he stated that his Government

would not borrow. Well I will say this—I think that he made a mistake in the first place in saying his Government would not borrow. I am not questioning the soundness of borrowing but I am questioning very strongly the question of borrowing for un-sound expenditures. I would like to hear the Government say—My Government will not borrow further. The amount that Newfoundland is in the red for now may not certainly be as serious as it would have been twenty-five or thirty years ago, but the important thing now is for the Government to think very seriously before continuing its course, the course that it has entered upon and has been continuing for the past five or six years.

Another matter too arising out of the unwise financial policy is the necessity for extracting further money from an already overburdened and taxed people. I think if the Premier had stated five or six years ago when his Government assumed office that they would be taxing the people's food I am very much afraid they would not have been quite so popular as they appeared to be at that time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are more popular than ever now.

MR. DUFFY: I have already pointed out what I consider the fallacy of this extremely large number.

MR. CURTIS: We got a bigger per centage of the vote.

MR. DUFFY: So did we.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. Ours went up. Yours went down. Your percentage went down and ours went up.

MR. DUFFY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not too impressed by the emphasis of the remarks made by my friends across the way on the number

they have. I have my own view on that and they are based on mathematical certainty. But the reference to this tax on food, which I think is most unfortunate—it is the only province in Canada which is taxing food—to the best of my knowledge. We are the only province of Canada that has a tax on food, and as I said before—

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. That is not so.

MR. DUFFY: I think it is so. Well, can you tell me what other provinces are taxing food?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Province of Quebec. When I lived in New Brunswick there was a tax on milk. There are two or three taxes in Quebec, provincial and municipal.

MR. DUFFY: Well my authority is wrong there. It still does not remove.

MR. FORSEY: Does the honourable gentleman for St. John's Centre know the percentage, in Newfoundland compared with other provinces of Canada? Do you know?

MR. DUFFY: Taxes?

MR. FORSEY: On food. You don't even know other provinces are taxed.

MR. DUFFY: I am talking about the sales tax on food now. I am not talking about restaurant meals.

MR. FORSEY: No, I am talking—you are talking through your hat.

MR. DUFFY: May I ask you to enlighten my ignorance?

MR. FORSEY: I am not speaking on the Opposition side.

MR. DUFFY: You are making statements without backing them up. That is not unusual.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DUFFY: I think the tax is iniquitous. As I said before it is not three per cent—if you buy a loaf of bread you do not pay three per cent but five per cent. Many thousands of poor people buy one loaf at one time. So that, as I said before, the tax in many cases is five and not three. I think that is iniquitous particularly when we realize that the people who are getting twelve million dollars Family Allowances are milked of half of that by this very tax.

Now there is one matter, Mr. Speaker, which I think extremely important. It is fundamental, something that touches on our democratic way of life, and I am referring to the tactics that have been employed during the period of election campaigns. I think the actions of certain members of the Government, including the Premier, have resulted in grave disservice to our democratic way of life. I think that votes have been garnered by the Liberal party because of fear of reprisals. Fundamental democratic rights that people are entitled to they have been threatened they would be removed if they did not support this Government. I know people myself that since this election have been deprived of fundamental Government services that they were entitled to. I think that is criminal, but it is a fact. Now there will be more heard about that later. I am not suggesting that all the members have done that, the Government members, but I know it has been done—Of course it is public knowledge that the Premier made statements in public that were obviously designed to influence unduly the electorate of this island.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a pretty serious charge.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is now getting in to

rather deep water because he is accusing the Premier of trying to influence by fear.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Malpractice.

MR. DUFFY: Well I said the Premier made public statements designed to influence unduly the voters of Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a pretty serious statement to make.

MR. DUFFY: That is more serious for you to make I am merely repeating what I heard you say.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, he is not repeating what I said but attributing motives.

MR. DUFFY: I heard the Premier say, relative to one district—This is your last chance—

MR. ROWE: Chance to what?

MR. DUFFY: I think the implication is too obvious to comment on. Another matter —

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know whether it is worth getting mad about or not.

MR. DUFFY: That is not a very sound defence. Another matter I would refer to is the system of elections employed by the provincial Government and has obtained amongst the Federal field and is now also employed with the Provincial Elections, that is the method of counting ballots. It does not matter in a district like mine, which is the largest in Newfoundland, as I said before—the secrecy of the ballot is affected in places where there are a handful of people. It is quite obvious, although I am not suggesting that the Government did this deliberately, but in effect they have succeeded in violating the sec-

recy of the ballot for the simple reason that in polling stations where there are a handful of voters and there is a predominant majority it is quite clear that it would be public knowledge how these people voted. I think that is deplorable. I am not suggesting that the Government did it deliberately.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Government did not do it at all. The House of Assembly, including the gentlemen on the opposite side, voted for it.

MR. DUFFY: Well I would have voted against it if I had been here, but that would not have made any difference. I still think it is wrong.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not violate any ballot secrecy.

MR. DUFFY: Why not, if there are thirteen people in a polling station and two voted for the Opposition—it is quite clear.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does it say who they were? Can anyone be identified? How?

MR. DUFFY: Suppose they all vote the one way.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then you can, but what is wrong with that. If they all vote Liberal or Tory that is their way.

MR. DUFFY: Of course it is clear enough. It is clear that the right of the ballot is violated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is only in the case of unanimous vote.

MR. DUFFY: I think the system is wrong. It is deplorable. I might tell you, Mr. Speaker, it has been the subject of one district being deprived of its Government services, one Government service. I have evidence of that. That has happened since the election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is the service,

MR. DUFFY: I have evidence of that, but I will undertake to bring it before the House and make it quite clear.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are securely here we don't need if we have any desire to deprive any district or any Government services and certainly, consciously, we are not doing it. I would like to know what the service is.

MR. DUFFY: It has been done, deplorably.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Children's health or hospitals? What was the public service being denied?

MR. DUFFY: I will bring that up when I am prepared to furnish my proper proof but if I said it now I would be asked for proof that I have not at the moment. I can and I will see, Mr. Speaker, that the statements that I make here are not extravagant ones. I am not making any statement, consciously, that is not based on fact. Any question I bring in to the Government or any member thereof I am quite prepared to substantiate, otherwise I don't make it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is fair enough.

MR. DUFFY: Now the question of Government patronage is a very interesting question. I am not an idealist enough to think that the familiar slogan does not apply—"To the victor belong the spoils." But some years ago when I had the honour of sitting here for a short time I heard the Premier say on this very matter of Government contracts that he would award the Government contracts to his worst enemy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We do that. We are doing it every day.

MR. DUFFY: I have instances where that is not done.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are cases where it is our worst enemies and there may be cases where it is not—It is both. It may be to our best friends.

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know of any dyed in the wool Tory awarded any substantial contract although you are able to get better prices from—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not only dyed in the wool Tories, but they go out and nominate Tory Candidates. We don't mind in the least—millions of dollars worth of business—What do we mind. We do not do so badly in elections. We can afford to be generous in that case.

MR. DUFFY: As I said before, there are cases where that does not apply.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There would be cases.

MR. DUFFY: I know cases where quotations have been submitted on Government purchases and contracts have been awarded on the same material at a substantially higher quotation. I happen to know that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I wish the honourable gentleman instead of making these very general statements would insofar as necessary give me, if he gives no one else—if he will not give the public, which I would prefer, give to me privately and I will do something about it. I will do it publicly or privately which ever way the honourable gentleman wants.

MR. DUFFY: You don't know of any case of this kind?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not have cases brought to my attention, needless to say, demanding that all tenders be given to me.

MR. DUFFY: I take it if I do supply the Premier with the specific proof he will do something about it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly. That is what I am here for.

MR. DUFFY: That is fair enough.

At this late hour I am concerned about wearying the members too long. When one is the last speaker it is difficult to maintain interest.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has fifteen minutes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is not failing to maintain interest because he is getting very careful attention, and deservedly so.

MR. DUFFY: Thank you!

There are some matters that although they might rightly be termed Federal matters still the effect on the Provincial House and on the people of this Province is extremely important. After that statement I will mention the famous "William L. Carson." I don't know, perhaps the honourable the Premier and the honourable gentleman opposite have made overtures to the Federal Government with respect to the Carson plying between North Sydney and Argentina on a more sensible basis and to cater to the convenience of the public living at this end of the Island. It seems to me to be just brash stupidity on the part of the "C.N.R." and the Federal Government to be operating this costly ship without cars and passengers that are left on the pier, and to give scant thought, from what I hear, to the overtures of such bodies as the Board of Trade and responsible citizens who

are prepared to reduce this tremendous deficit by patronizing this luxury liner in travelling and bringing their cars. I have seen some correspondence coming from Mr. Donald Gordon stating that they did not have adequate loading facilities at Argentia and could not use the elevators on the ship with the facilities at Argentia. But notwithstanding that it does not make sense that there could not be something improvised some improvised method to place the Carson at the disposal of the travelling public of Newfoundland. Because despite the fact that the elevators cannot be used it would be a simple matter to load and unload cars. I would suggest that the Government take steps to try in some way to rectify this already stupid mistake. As a matter of fact we seem to be victimized by the ferry business. The ferry to Bell Island is not good enough and the one to Sydney is too good. I am sure the honourable member for Bell Island will certainly use his influence to see at least the Bell Island situation is rectified. But it seems to me whatever is done in the matter of the Bell Island ferry nothing will have justified the inconvenience these people were subjected to in the past year or so because of inadequate service. Now I do not profess to know all about this, but I do know this, that two responsible gentlemen of substantial worth financially had endeavoured to obtain the franchise from Public Utilities Board to put on this run a boat that would be adequate for the service. One of these gentlemen, as a matter of fact, told me that he had journeyed to Scotland, and came back with plans that were very suitable for a ship that would be adequate as a ferry between Portugal Cove and Bell Island. Despite the fact, as I said, that these two gentlemen were financially in a position to operate adequately the

service the Public Utilities Board awarded it to somebody else and who obviously could not fulfill the terms of the franchise. Now that is like the "Carson," brash stupidity. I hope that is all it is, stupid, but it certainly is stupid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks I cannot refrain from stating or from making reference to the fact that where our creature comforts are better taken care of than at any time in our lives, but unfortunately tends to dull our moral values, and we are probably not as highly exercised over matters of principle as when we were less or more ill fed than we are today. That is a bit of a paradox in human nature, the more we have in a material sense the less we are concerned with things that probably are more important. It has been said that it is a good thing to have money to buy the things that money will buy but it is a good thing also to check up once in a while and see that we do not lose the things that money will not buy. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks, that the Government just now entering on a new session, and the leader of the Government, the Premier, with a proud force (and I use that word not in a derogatory sense) in the sweeping majority that he has over there on the other side, I hope, will give some thought to values that are a little more important than political ones, and that during the next few years, the one year or four or five that the Government will have, they will do everything in their power to rectify the mistakes that have been made in the past six or seven years. I do not say that at the beginning there was any malice in making these mistakes. I am critical of the attitude of the Government after the mistakes were made. As I said before, they did not

have the political courage to try to offset or undo these mistakes. I do hope now that with the great strength of the Government numbers, where they simply control the House, and the new members—and I am sure many, of that I know personally, will in all consciousness act only in the best interest of Newfoundland.

I would close by saying that if there is evidence of that, as far as I am concerned, and I think I speak for my colleagues, I will do everything possible to assist in sound legislation and that we will do everything possible although it will probably be token opposition, but we will do everything possible to oppose what we think is ill for the country.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion of Mr. Smallwood all further orders of the day stand deferred—and the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 of the clock.

THURSDAY, March 28th, 1957.

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

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege. Yesterday when I was talking I was interrupted on several occasions when I mentioned that Newfoundland was the only Province in Canada who had a social security tax on food. Since then I have had occasion to check the Canadian taxes, and I find I was correct. This is the only province with a sales tax on food. I would like

to point out that when we get the Government we will remove that tax.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): If and when:

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): If, as and when.

MR. SPEAKER: I let the honourable member get away with it, but I think that was hardly a point of privilege.

MR. HIGGINS: Personal, say, Mr. Speaker.

HON. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, do you think an apology is owed yesterday's speaker from such honourable members?

MR. SPEAKER: An apology is due really to any member interrupted. If a member is interrupted and permits it he only does it from the standpoint of courtesy.

MR. FORSEY: I will apologize but it is good to find we are leading Canada in something, which Canada will have to adopt.

Presenting Petitions

MR. WHELAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Chapel's Cove. This petition is signed by a hundred and twenty-three people of that community. Their prayer is for a road, the widening and improving of a road known as Chapel's Cove Shore Road.

This road extends from the public wharf at Chapel's Cove to the junction of the road known as Myer's Land, a distance of about three-quarters of a mile. For a considerable distance travellers go along the shore which has steep cliffs which make

it considerably hazardous in winter-time. This community has for several years depended on motor traffic for most of its needs, provisions, fuel, doctors and so forth, and during the past winter were completely isolated because of the narrowness of the road and the ice and snow conditions.

I earnestly request, Sir, that consideration be given the prayer of this petition. I respectfully ask that the petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department concerned.

On motion, petition received for reference to the department concerned.

HON. P. J. LEWIS (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with my honourable colleague in supporting the prayer of this petition. For those who may not know, Chapel's Cove is one of the oldest established settlements in the Head of Conception Bay, and the road to which my honourable colleague referred is one that was built many, many years ago, and towards which very little has been done by way of improvement, certainly within recent years.

The road in question is an extension of the main road to the settlement, which links in with the high-road system. Within the past two years we were successful in inducing the Department to spend some money toward improvement on the road from the mainland to the public wharf, but from there on, I think nothing has been done, and I think my honourable colleague said this road is seriously in need of improvement. Conditions have changed within recent years in that practically every second man in Chapel's Cove now owns a

motor vehicle, and all these people who formerly obtained employment outside of Newfoundland are now almost without exception employed either at Argentia or Fort Pepperrell Airforce Base. This means they must have a means of transportation to and from their work.

The job envisaged by this petition would not call for very heavy expenditure, and I bespeak on behalf of the petition and ask the department for a most sympathetic consideration. I trust, Sir, that the policy which is being hinted at by the Honourable Leader of the Government, extension and improvement of roads, that this road will receive the consideration which it deserves.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry I put the motion so quickly. I should have realized the Honourable member for Harbour Main would rise in support of the petition.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees:

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the Table of the House the annual report for the Workmen's Compensation Board for the year 1956. I may say, I have copies here for all the honourable members.

Notices of Motion

None.

Notice of Questions

Notice of Questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Browne:

Answers to Questions

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Supply): Mr. Speaker, Question No.

25, Order Paper March 26th. asked by the honourable member for St. John's Center: Since the answer is somewhat lengthy I beg leave to table it. In subsection (4) of that particular question I have an idea the honourable member wanted a little bit more than he asked for. The question dealt with town councils. We have quite a number of other councils in addition, and these councils have received assistance in the past year—If he wishes that information I shall be glad to get it for him. (See appendix for answer).

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker I beg leave to table the answers to QUESTION NO. 19 and QUESTION NO. 20. (See appendix).

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to QUESTION NO. 27. Mr. Speaker that information is quite lengthy and copies have been prepared for each member of this House. I wish to lay on the Table that reply. (See appendix for answers).

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Economic Development): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to QUESTION NO. 40 and NO. 47 (See appendix).

QUESTION No. 40: MR. BROWNE: (See appendix).

QUESTION No. 47: MR. HOLLETT: (See appendix).

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to QUESTION NO. 17, Order Paper March 26th, in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. This table is not so very lengthy. I have the answers here all with the exception of (4). Honourable members are aware the

report has not yet been finalized. I beg leave to table the answers. (See appendix).

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

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

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Department of Mines and Resources Act."

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act further to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953."

MR. BALLAM: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to another question here, if it is in order:

QUESTION NO. 41:

I may say that we have an annual report which I tabled this afternoon But that is the whole year of 1956. We make our report annually during the calendar year and not for any part. I might say, the answers to all these questions are contained in the report that I tabled this afternoon. That report is up to the first of January of this year.

(See appendix for answers).

QUESTION NO. 37:

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the answers to these questions are in process of preparation. In fact I believe they are actually prepared but I did

not have time during lunch hour to go down to the Department. I regret not being able to table them today. I will have most of the answers tomorrow.

QUESTION NO. 38:

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, that question could, I have no doubt, be more properly answered by the Honourable the Premier. I beg leave to ask him to be good enough to attend to Question No. 38 on the order paper of today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have not got the answer with me. The fact of the matter is the Cabinet are meeting every forenoon now until 1:00 and 1:30 o'clock in the day, which really does not give us very much time to get in to our offices. It is a matter only of getting a copy of the contract brought in here, and I will do that Monday or tomorrow, Friday.

QUESTION NO. 39:

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, that question is in course of preparation.

QUESTION NO. 42:

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, that question is in course of preparation.

HON. J. T. CHEESEMAN (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to reply to questions asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in regard to expenditure by the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority to April 1st, 1956. (See appendix for answers).

QUESTION NO. 48:

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Honourable Minister will be back, if it might stand over for a moment.

QUESTION NO. 45:

MR. SPENCER: In connection with this question, Mr. Speaker, I think honourable members of the House will observe that this question is certainly directed to the wrong party. While we would undoubtedly in Finance have something to do with the cost of these things, these surveys and so on, I think the answer should be more properly directed to either the Department of Economic Development or the Department of Mines and Resources.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the appropriate Minister take the notice of that, or must we send in another question?

MR. SPEAKER: Number 45, would the Honourable member whose department is concerned take note of Question No. 45.

QUESTION NO.46:

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, that is the question to which I referred earlier in conjunction with the other one.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable members will have, I think an answer to Question No. 44 in a few minutes. As the Honourable the Minister of Public Works is not in his seat at the moment this question will stand.

Orders of the Day

Address in Reply:

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to join with former speakers in this House in extending to you very sincere congratulations on your election to the high office which you now hold.

I would also like, again joining with other speakers, to extend congratulations to the mover and seconder

of the address in reply. I regret that the honourable member for St. John's North has been taken seriously ill, so that I have to speak in his place. I would also like to express a vote of thanks to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition who so kindly spoke words which we appreciated, particularly towards the seventeen new members on this side of the House, and also to thank him for his kind invitation for us at any time to join him and his colleagues on the other side. Although we appreciate his invitation I think it would be in order if we told him now why it is that we have to decline that invitation.

We have been referred to here as a magistrate's convention, particularly in this corner of this side of the House, but I can say that the magistrates throughout the country have been very close to the people in the various districts in which they have served, and I feel they understand the people not only in the districts where they happened to be posted but also throughout most of the Island. We understand their feelings and we know that these people feel that the Liberal Party as it is constituted today and for the last eight years has something very definite to offer these people by way of bettering their lot and improving their living conditions in Newfoundland. We know there may be some difference of opinion, as there always is, but the record of the last eight years has been one of continuous progress. It has been put before everybody in book form and I am glad to see it is being used extensively as a reference. But in these last eight years, in moving amongst the people we know, we feel, that there has been a sincere effort made with results which we think are good in promoting the betterment of the people throughout this Island. There-

fore when we decided, or at least when I decided to go into the political arena, I had to make the choice as to which party I would support, what they had to offer—and I did.

As has been inferred before, there has been some compulsion shown. I can assure any member of the House on either side that as far as I was concerned personally, and knowing the other members formerly, I know there was none. It is painful to have to deny such a thing because I don't think it is in the best taste for anybody to infer that there was. I will speak of my own case personally. When they infer that such a thing as compulsion was used in any way or another—As I said we had to make a decision as to which party had the most to offer to Newfoundland—and make no mistake about it more than one party (again speaking personally) or persons connected with more than one party made overtures, as to which way we were going, in the last year, and quite a long while before that. The result was that those who are here on this side of the House now, when we decided to throw in our lot with the Liberal Party for this reason, we felt (I felt) that there was the required leadership, it was a party of drive of force, it was a party that had a vision of the future. For that reason, we, or I, decided to throw in my lot with the Liberal Party. The other parties never had anything very much to offer. The way I saw it they were just an echo of what the Liberal Party stood for and their main plea was what they are doing we will do, only we will do it better.

In the elections both Federal and Provincial the people in the Province were told that the other party would reduce taxation and increase allowances of every shape and form—And

still reduce taxes—Now when you tell that to ordinary Newfoundlanders they know it is impossible, and will reply to you or to anybody who tells them that they can increase expenditures while cutting down income that this is rubbish, trash, or words to that effect. (If they are possibly considered unparliamentary?)

The Tory Party had been noted—
They are now Progressive Conservatives—

MR. SPEAKER: I hate to interrupt the honourable member but this is the first time he has spoken in the House and he possibly does not realize how bad the acoustics are. I have difficulty in hearing and so I think the stenotypist has.

MR. CLARKE: I will try and do a little better—probably I am not addressing my words in the right direction.

MR. HOLLETT: There was just one part I did not hear. I think the honourable gentleman did say that the Progressive Conservative Party did promise to cut out waste and extravagance. That is the way they would do it. I did not hear him say that.

MR. CLARKE: What I did say was that there was a promise made of increasing the expenditure while cutting down the income. That is the gist of the thing, as I understood, Mr. Speaker, and as I said before, you cannot tell that to the people of Newfoundland. They may be uninformed in some respects but when you talk common sense to them I think most of them will agree with you, if you approach them with something that is reasonable and logical.

The "Progressive Conservative" Party as I was saying has on various occasions changed its title. I fail to find anything definite in the manifesto that

they have put forth other than to repeat that they would do the same thing, echo plans and schemes of the Liberal Party. As a matter of fact if we look back we see that in 1920 they called themselves the National Liberal and Conservative Party and were commonly known as the National Party. In 1921 they were the Liberal Conservative Party. In 1938 they changed again and again became the National Conservative Party and in 1940 the National Government Party and in 1942, they called themselves the Progressive Conservative Party. But, as I said before, they are more familiarly known to us here—and I think it is a good name—as the "Tories" and a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. Call the Conservative Party what you will I think they would still be known as the Tory Party.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the honourable member—We are in the House of Assembly not the House of Commons his reference to the "PC" Party in 1920—I don't think there was any Conservative Party at that time, unless the Honourable Premier led them.

MR. CLARKE: I still realize most of us are still in the House of Assembly here although some of us may be for a short duration, if what we hear is right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that brings me to the remarks that were made recently concerning—I feel sort of guilty about bringing up this and I do not want to lay too much stress on it—The remark was made yesterday concerning the superior intelligence of the people of a certain section in the country as compared with that of another. It was pointed out that a group of people—

MR. DUFFY: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Obviously the honour-

able member is referring to remarks I made. I did not make a comparison between the intelligence of any two groups of people. I merely said that the district to which I referred was obviously a most intelligent district—Not "the most" but a "most."

MR. SPEAKER: I think this might be a good point to settle something that is going to come up lots of times—If an honourable member is misquoted he does not rise to a point of order. He rises and says "will the honourable member allow me to correct him" or "will the honourable member allow me to put him straight." It is not a point of order.

MR. CLARKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker!

A most intelligent district and a most informed district.

MR. DUFFY: That is better.

MR. CLARKE: I certainly disagree with even that remark, because after all even if what has happened to the other people in the same district—We have heard that some of the districts here had greater numbers than any three or so—Any three members on this side could be named whose total vote was not as great as one. That is correct. It is so. But if we will look at the figures for a little while we find this, that in the three districts of St. John's where there was a contest—In St. John's West there was no contest—There, if you want to look at it that way the total voters who voted for the members sitting opposite—I will agree with that—But in the other three districts there was a contest and there was an election and if we are going to talk about comparative figures, the number of people voting for one or another, regardless of the size, let us look at the

figures in St. John's—the three districts which were contested—Well in three instances there were a total of ten thousand votes cast for the members who were elected but there were also fifteen thousand votes that were not cast for these same people. Are we to infer from the remarks that one group are informed while the other is not, or what happened to the fifteen thousand people who did not vote for the "PC" Party in that particular election? It is a point, I think, that has some significance. You can compile statistics for any district in the whole region and the fact still remains there were fifteen thousand people in St. John's District who did not vote for the "PC" candidates.

MR. HOLLETT: Why not vote for the Liberal?

MR. CLARKE: That brings up this point—in times when people are content with an administration I think it is generally an accepted fact the people who are content are not as likely to get to the polls as the people who are opposed and are determined that they want a change. Therefore the people who are opposed to the administration, who want a change, get to the polls while those who were content refrained from voting, or voting for the Liberal Party. I contend, you have fifteen thousand on the one hand and ten thousand who did vote for the "PC" Party on the other.

As far as being informed or uninformed is concerned I think, Mr. Speaker, that when you take into account the common sense of the ordinary Newfoundlander, the average Newfoundlander, it is not confined to any one particular region. On the things that matter you can say without fear of contradiction the people of Carbonear and Bay de Verde District were

just as informed as any other section in the country, as to what is going on in this country, and on the things that matter. There is also the point too that if possibly the people within these regions are not as informed as they should be then we should look around in our souls and take stock because most of the people who are educated and will have the problem come from districts other than here in St. John's. These people who live in the Districts of Carbonear and Bay de Verde would, I feel, if the matter came up, and I am afraid that it has—and I think it has been finally straightened out as to what the honourable member did say regarding that—they would resent it—They would resent any inference that they were not of the same intelligence or of the same degree of information if you want to put it that way, as any other section of the country. I have the honour to represent them, and I am quite happy, and I feel that these people have there amongst them the finest people in the country. I want to assure them, as well as this House, that anything that can be done by me for these people will be done. There is a lot to be done too—

MR. HOLLETT: After eight years?

MR. CLARKE: There is still a lot to be done, although a considerable amount has been done.

Now we had some reference to the amount of income tax that the people of Newfoundland were paying to the Federal Government, in all about twenty-five million dollars, I understand, last year. It was, it seemed to me, or I received the impression that they were just paying out all this money for which we received no return or very little return. At the same time I would like to point out, although we may have paid twenty-five, have paid twenty-five million dollars

in income tax last year we received in family allowances and old age pensions alone about twenty million dollars, and all the other Federal Aid brings the total to very very much more, considerably more than your twenty-five millions paid in income taxes.

There was also some reference to the fact that the rate of income tax per capita in Newfoundland was a bit higher than in some other provinces. Well, I think that is one of the finest things that could happen to any people. I know as an individual or a group everybody is looking forward to the day when we are placed in higher income bracket and have to pay a little more. The greater amount of income tax we have to pay, even on a per capita basis the greater is the earning power of the people. Therefore if we have a greater per capita payment of income tax than any other province in Canada it must mean that our average family earnings is a little better than in that particular province.

MR. HOLLETT: May I interrupt the honourable gentleman to ask him if the average family earnings in Newfoundland are away ahead of any other province—Is that what I understand?

MR. CLARKE: I did not state that. I said that if the income tax paid by anybody was greater on a comparable basis than anybody else then that must mean that the income they have is greater.

MR. HOLLETT: May I correct the honourable gentleman—I referred to not income tax but to the income tax and corporation tax which accounts for twenty-five point eight million dollars, and I also referred to excise taxes and customs duties, the amounts of which nobody knows at the moment—

I referred to these and not only income.

MR. CLARKE: This twenty-five million, I understand, does cover income tax and corporation taxes—At the same time although we had paid twenty-five million dollars in income tax and corporation tax we did receive an amount far in excess of that from the Federal Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to say I am filling in for the honourable member for St. John's North, and there are quite a number of speakers on this side of the House and on the other who are still to be heard, and I do not want to drag it out, and I do not want to use my time or anything like a quarter of it, but I would like to say that we come in here new to this political arena, I think as the term was politely applied—a group of babes in arms—which we are—and in time we will be able to find our feet, find out what everything is about. We have a fair idea now, but as time goes on we will be increasing our knowledge, and I sincerely trust that both to the Government and to districts that we represent will be able to make some worthwhile contribution.

(Applause).

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps as no one is ready at the moment to go on with the present debate, without any intention of claiming the first chance when the debate resumes, may I move its adjournment.

On motion the debate of the Address in Reply was adjourned.

First Readings:

The Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting Notaries Public"—On

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

The Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend the St. John's Fire Department Act"—On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Bulk Sales Act, 1955"—On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The Honourable the Minister of Health asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Dental Act." On motion Bill read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Introduced by the Honourable Attorney General in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Health).

The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the St. John's Housing Corporation Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Trade Union Act."

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, before we go a little further, could we turn this Bill into a sort of reading room and get newspapers and start reading. I think if we all read the paper first, you know, and then got down to business.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the second reading of this Bill, which is a simple Bill; in fact it is because it was a simple Bill that I gave notice the first thing. As the House knows, Mr. Speaker, it is the practice on opening of the session

before the Lieutenant - Governor's Speech is dealt with, to assert our independence, sort of, to introduce a Bill, and we do that every year. I understand in another Chamber they use a dud Bill which is dropped, but this is the practice here, Mr. Speaker, of introducing a noncontroversial Bill.

MR. BROWNE: You have so many noncontroversial Bills.

MR. CURTIS: A lot are, Mr. Speaker, as my honourable friend remarked, unfortunately they are very necessary too. What I meant was noncontroversial, I would not say nonconsequential.

The present Bill, Mr. Speaker, is a Bill to determine what is to be done with the records of the Trade Unions which were incorporated under the Chapter of the 1956 Statutes, dealing with Trade Unions. In these days there were trade unions incorporated under the Company's Act and certain returns were filed annually under the Company's Act. By the new Trade Unions Act, which is Chapter 202 of the Revised Statutes the administration of Trade Unions is in the Minister of Labour, and the former Act dealing with the registration of the Trade Unions under the Company's Act with the Registrar of Companies was repealed. When the new Act came into force the Registrar of Deeds found he had in his possession documents dealing with Trade Unions which were no use to him. As far as he was concerned the Act was repealed. The object of this amendment is to enable him to pass the records in connection with these Trade Unions, which are registered in the Registry of Companies, over to the Minister of Labour, to be filed by him with the other Trade Union papers which are registered from time to time under the existing legislation.

I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, which is purely to enable the Registrar of Companies to hand over to the Minister of Labour all documents he has in connection with the registering of Trade Unions.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable the Attorney General said, this is a noncontroversial Bill, and I only rise for the purpose of asking—and I believe the answer will be in the affirmative—with regard to public inspection of the documents it will be permitted when the documents are transferred to the Department of Labour, if there will be a Registry in the Department of Labour, whether members of the public may go in and pay twenty-five cents and see the documents now available to anyone who goes to the Registry of Deeds?

One other point is whether they have good vaults—I promise they have—or safes in which these documents should be preserved. If they have not got proper facilities for preserving these documents then they should not be removed until such time as they have.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate I might say that I could not at the moment give that assurance for the simple reason that I do not know. But before the papers are removed from the Registry of Companies naturally we will be quite sure that they have sufficient and safe accommodations for them in the Department of Labour.

As to the right to make a search I am not sure that is covered in the Act. If my honourable friend would like to refer to the Act Number 262 of the Revised Statutes he can see that. I do not believe there are any such provisions.

MR. BROWNE: Would you look it up and see?

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 Department of Highways."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I believe this Act has only recently been distributed and in moving second reading I do not expect that the honourable gentleman opposite will be ready to proceed with the debate—unless they are ready—

The principle is merely that there shall be a Department of Highways. The rest of the Bill is the mere ordinary departmental routine which exists in every departmental Bill, every Bill to create a department.

Now it may well be that in Committee of the Whole House the Committee would want to discuss the matter line by line and word for word, but here in this present debate we have one simple principle, to approve or disapprove or at all events to consider, and that is the principle of setting up a separate Department of Highroads and charging that department with the responsibility for and the jurisdiction in the whole field of roads and bridges in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for a great many years in Newfoundland the Department of Public Works has been responsible for the roads and bridges, indeed before confederation they were responsible also, I believe, for certain marine works which are presently done or carried out by the Department of Public Works, Marine Services Division of the Government of Canada. Certainly always in the past, I believe that roads were the responsibility of the Department of Public Works. The

Department of Public Works has also responsibility for all public buildings amounting in value to a great many million dollars. I think that these public buildings include public hospitals.

Now the proposal today is that the function as presently fulfilled by the Department of Public Works should be divided in two, certain of them remaining with the Department of Public Works and the remainder of them, that is to say, highways, roads and bridges be vested in a new department to be known as the Department of Highways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the tremendous increase in the volume of the work of the Department of Public Works in the last eight years, notwithstanding that—I don't think we would be asking the House to divide the Department into two or to create a new department of Highways if we contemplated that for the next eight years or for the next four years the amount of work in that Department was to be the same as in the last four years or the last eight years. That is to say, if the Department of Public Works were left as it is and as it has been in recent years and the volume of work it was to undertake was to remain as it has been and it is then probably we would not be asking the House to authorize the creation of a new department. Now when I say that I am not overlooking the fact that the Department of Public Works is a badly overworked Department and has been from the day we took office. From the day we took office my honourable colleague who sits beside me, behind me here, and every since Confederation has been in charge of that great Department of State. Just about eight years—and it has been almost cruelty to a human being to expect any one man—and I do not

care how able that man might be—it was nothing much short of cruelty to expect any one human being to bear personally the responsibility as the Minister in charge of the enormous ramifications of that great Department. Nevertheless, nevertheless and notwithstanding that fact, I doubt whether we would today or any day be asking the House to authorize the setting up of a brand new Department of Highways if the volume of work were to remain at about its present level in that same Department. The fact however is that the Government have in plans now a very great increase in one aspect of the work of the present Department of Public Works, I refer to highroads and roads and bridges in this province including the great peninsula of Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable accomplishments of the last eight years has undoubtedly been the increase in the mileage of roads built and rebuilt in Newfoundland and in Labrador. That has been quite astonishing. I think it is running somewhere of the order of fifteen hundred miles. But, Sir, the people of Newfoundland are not satisfied with what has been done in these eight years. I put it to yourself, Your Honour, that in the constituency that you represent in this House the people are not satisfied with what has been done in these eight years passed in connection with roads, new roads and the maintenance of existing roads and the repair and the reconstruction of old roads. I put it to any member in this House today on either side of the House, that the people of their constituencies are not satisfied, indeed not only are they not satisfied they are actually dissatisfied. I don't like to speak for my constituency. Quite a bit of road building has gone forward in the district of

Bonavista North, perhaps more in the last 8 years than the previous hundred. I know that in the district of Bonavista North there is a very definite dissatisfaction with the progress, with the rate of progress made, in the building of roads. Now I strongly suspect that that is the case in every part of Newfoundland, and, Mr. Speaker, for a very good reason, something has come over our Newfoundland people in these last few years. Our people who had been content to live in hundreds of settlements scattered along our coastline for decades, for generations even for centuries, satisfied with what they had in the way of public services, particularly in the way of roads and streets, have grown acutely dissatisfied. The clamour that has arisen in Newfoundland for roads and more roads is rather frightening. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there have been times in meetings of the Executive Government when we, all of us, felt rather full of despair that we could ever be able to satisfy their demands for improvements in their roads. I personally, sitting in my own office and meeting with some of those people from all parts of this Island who did me the honour of calling on me in my office, have felt more than full of despair at the quite reasonable requests which consisted separately or considered individually but imposing demands when considered together, considered collectively. I have been full of despair that any Government in Newfoundland would ever be able to satisfy the widespread public clamour that seems to have sprung up all of a sudden since Confederation.

Now I think that this House is perfectly well aware that the demand that has grown up in Newfoundland for great improvement in the public services is not a demand merely for roads

alone. It is a demand for better schools, I thank God, it is a demand for better hospitals, a demand for rural electrification in an astonishing number of places. It is in hundreds of places. Indeed where ten and twelve years ago people considered themselves lucky if they did not have to blow out the kerosene oil lamp at eight or nine at night, when they felt lucky if they could afford to keep it on until ten o'clock, today there is an insatiable demand for electricity. And without any doubt, without any doubt the Government must satisfy this demand, and if we do not then we will not remain here long. Then my honourable friends opposite will be given the chance to show what they can do. If we here do not satisfy the demands of the people someone else will. The most clamorous of all these demands is for roads.

I will say this, Mr. Speaker, for the first four or five years I was in this present office I heard with impatience the increasing demands of my colleagues in this party. There are honourable gentlemen who sit here today and have been the last eight years here and who in party caucus would annoy me considerably. They did not know it. They did not realize but they did annoy me very considerably by harping forever on roads. My mind was not on roads my mind was on industry, my mind was on the development of the fishery, my mind was on the discovery of minerals and the measurement of minerals and the measurement of timber and water power, these basic things are necessary if we are to have a sound economy. So I would only with impatience listen to these demands for roads. But I have been educated by my friends in this House and in this party in recent years, and I know as well as any of them what im-

portant matters roads have become to the people of Newfoundland.

So we have decided in this Government that with the support of our friends in the House and I believe with the support of the honourable gentlemen across the floor that with the general support of this House we will launch upon a great new programme of road building.

Now the House is well aware, Mr. Speaker, and I think that the Province is well aware, just as well as is this House, of the fact that I myself in the way that I am constituted and a person of considerable enthusiasm. Some people tell me I have more than enough enthusiasm. Some people tell me that it would be far better for me and for Newfoundland if I did not have so much enthusiasm as I have got. Now that may be well true, but it is as well to quarrel with the colour of my eyes or the shape of my nose as to quarrel with me for the fact that I am a person who has a lot of enthusiasm. So I curb my tongue to some extent when I say this: We have decided in our own ranks that we will in the next few years launch a very great road building and road rebuilding programme in this province. Now I will not ask my honourable friend here with me, who is perhaps of all Newfoundlanders today the veteran road builder we have in this province. I would not ask him in the present state of his health to launch on any great programme. So I suggested to him that we arrange a transfer, an exchange of portfolios between him and my other colleague, the present Minister of Public Works, and that when the House opened we would ask the House to separate, to divide, the department in two. As well known, I offered my honourable colleague the opportunity of taking the lighter of

the two, a very heavy job but one is rather lighter than the other, the one that will remain, the Department of Public Works as it will be if we create this new Department of Highways. I offered him the invitation to accept that portfolio if he will or to remain in Finance. I fancy—I have not discussed it with him—I have formed the feeling he rather likes the Department of Finance and will elect to remain there—Although I cannot say so—I have not discussed it with him. But we have decided to launch upon a very great road building programme.

I said—I think it was in Corner Brook—that we would need to spend something of the order of a hundred million dollars—a hundred million dollars—on roads in the next four or five years. Something of the order of a hundred million dollars—Mr. Speaker, I am not deceiving myself one minute with believing that a hundred million dollars is going to give Newfoundland the roads she needs. I am not because I don't think it, I think it is going to take far more than a hundred million dollars. Now I will say this, however, the other day I announced on behalf of all my colleagues in the Executive Government that a sub-committee of council has been appointed under the chairmanship of my colleagues, the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, a sub-committee of council to launch the beginnings at least of a study of this subject. What could be done in Newfoundland that is practical and that is within our reach by way of bringing about a much greater centralization of our people than exists at the present time. I believe that it is because I have been interested in the History of Newfoundland and because I have an awareness of the historic development of our population—It is because of that knowledge that I have the feeling now that history is

ready to reverse herself in the matter of population. The history of Newfoundland from the beginning down to about 1870 or 1880 was a history of settlements splitting, splitting, families pulling out of this settlement and moving along the coast to some little uninhabited place and the next thing a new settlement is born. Literally hundreds were born in Newfoundland between the year 1800 and 1880, in this seventy or eighty years. I believe the time has come when we will reverse that. The very reasons that lead people to do that a hundred years ago have ceased to exist and today the very force of the nature, the very logic of events encourages them to move from the smaller places to go into the larger places. I know that within it there are certain possibilities of danger. I realize that fully. I realize that there are certain advantages that may not be very great but there are certain advantages on the side of the little settlements. I also know you cannot any longer get teachers to go to these little settlements. You cannot bring a teacher from the Outports to St. John's and have her attend college or school in here and go to Memorial University and get a year's training as a teacher and then have that girl go back to some little, small outport school. She just won't do it nor will he. If you are going to have your Newfoundland children taught you somehow got to bring them out of hundreds of tiny settlements in Newfoundland where they live today.

Now that has a great bearing on this Bill now before the House because, obviously if they are going to have a great programme of road building we must not build roads to settlements that are in the nature of things settlements which may not be there in eight, ten, twelve or fifteen years from now. So that the two things will go on side

by side. My colleagues the Honourable Ministers of Welfare and Education and Municipal Affairs and Supply, these three, will study this question of the possibility of encouraging people to concentrate before my honourable colleague, the Minister of Public Works will just blindly lash out at building roads. Because we certainly do not want to build roads, six eight or ten miles to settlements which will probably not be there four or five years from now.

So as we have in fact decided to launch upon this great programme of road building I have proposed to my colleagues and they have gladly agreed, and I have proposed to my friends on this side and they have gladly agreed and I now propose to my honourable friends across the floor that we should create a new Department of Government, the Department of Highways, charged precisely and exclusively with the job of building roads in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether in fact this House is aware of the size of the present Department—I turned around and I asked my honourable friend here a few minutes ago how many projects did you have going on in Newfoundland last year at the height of the season. He did not have to hesitate, he knew the answer like that. He said three hundred and ninety-four projects. I asked him where. He said, everywhere. They were from St. Anthony up to Port aux Basques from Port aux Basques to Cape Race to Cape St. Francis and from Cape St. Francis to Baccalieu and from there to Cape St. John and from Cape St. John down to Cape Bauld, right clear around the Island, nearly four hundred separate road programmes going on and some more on the Peninsula of Labrador. Now

that is only roads. That is only new construction, that is the construction of roads which did not exist before, new road projects. Now in addition to that there were dozens and there were scores of other projects going on at the same time for the repair and the rebuilding for roads that already existed. In addition to these two there was in Newfoundland in progress, a tremendous number of repair jobs—excuse me—maintenance jobs, i.e. road maintenance and patching up and repair to thousands of miles of road that have to be patched up one way or another each year. Although altogether there were seven thousand men employed by my honourable friend in the Department of Public Works on road work alone.

Now then in addition to this road work there were all the public buildings in Newfoundland, dozens of them, literally dozens of them and the hospitals which were in the care of my honourable friend, over thirty million dollars worth of buildings with literally hundreds of people employed as firemen and engineers and carpenters and electricians and plumbers and painters and general utility and maintenance men, literally hundreds of them on hundreds of jobs.

Does the House realize that being the Minister of Public Works today is a far bigger job than being the general manager of Bowater's in Newfoundland. Except in salary that being Minister of Public Works in Newfoundland today is a bigger job than being general manager of the AND Company in Grand Falls.

MR. BROWNE: You are not going to raise the salary?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. But the job itself is far bigger and far more onerous. Now I will put this to you;

The paper industry in Newfoundland today has fourteen hundred persons employed full time receiving salaries of over five thousand dollars a year, and from five thousand to fifty thousand dollars a year. Now most of them, I admit, are around five thousand, much more than around fifty thousand. Over fourteen hundred persons in the paper industry in Newfoundland today are employed by the industry at a rate of over five thousand dollars a year, each man. Now what does that mean? That means that that industry the whole industry, putting the two together, that industry which is not by any means twice as big as the Department of Public Works, not by any means—Now I will admit that the value of the paper they produce is greater than there is higher value to the output, but in the number of jobs in the number of projects, in the widespread and scattered nature of these jobs they are not anything like twice as large as the Department of Public Works. Yet they have fourteen hundred men of the higher paid type. Now they have hundreds of others, of course, or they have thousands of others, but they have fourteen hundred who get from five thousand dollars a year and more per man.

MR. HOLLETT: How many in the service getting over five thousand?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the Department of Public Works or in the whole of the civil service of the Government?

MR. HOLLETT: No, in the seven thousand working last year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For the Minister of Public Works: A dozen maybe six or eight or maybe not a dozen—In the whole of the civil service of Newfoundland a hundred and eight getting five thousand dollars a year

and more, but in the Department of Public Works maybe a dozen getting that. What I am getting at is this: It is no use, it is just wasting time if the people of Newfoundland expect their Government to do a vast road building job, useless to expect and think the job can be done by one man, one Minister. You may say; this Minister, does he have to go out personally and build the roads, does he personally see every Bill? No, he hires men to do that. But if you do not have a very fine staff of men to do it you are going to have serious trouble in trying to spend a hundred million dollars on roads in the next four or five years.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the Premier permit a question: Does he know what is the permanent staff employed in the Department of Public Works? One hundred and ninety-six is given here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I cannot say exactly—It is a hundred and ninety-six that is everything in the building department, in the roads department, in the headquarters and administrative staff and for road divisions across the island, that is everything. These are established posts in the department. Then in addition to that they employ sometimes up to around seven thousand people, at the peak at one time, scattered all over this great Island in jobs. Now what I am saying is this: The work of the Public Works Department must go on. It will increase. We are all the time putting up new buildings. We have far more public buildings today than we had eight years ago, far more. We will have far more public buildings in the next eight years. One thing for example that may interest the House is this: We have been giving some very intensive thought lately to

the idea of a great new public building for the Government. At the present time our public services are scattered throughout St. John's in a great number of buildings. These buildings, some of them, were built during the war by the Canadian Government and are occupied today by different Governments. They are temporary buildings only. They are flimsily built, they are expensive to light, they are inconvenient to work in, they are expensive to heat, they are scattered north and south—We think if we are able to get up a great new public building, and we are thinking of a building that would be undoubtedly the largest building in Newfoundland. It would be a larger building than the Americans were building last summer up at Argentina—It will be a far larger building—and there will be other buildings going up in the next four or five years for the Department.

I was talking for the moment about the Department of Public Works and I was talking of the work that department would have to do after the Department of Highways was created to take over roads, bridges and highways. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that we wish the House to do this, we ask the House to do this; to authorize the setting up of this new Department of Highways, and if they do we will make an extra special effort in that Department of Highways, which is to undertake such a vast task in the next few years, to give Newfoundland exceedingly high value for the money that may be spent.

Now the only additional cost coming to the people of Newfoundland will be the cost of the ministerial salaries and his travelling. It will also be the cost of the Minister's private secretary and it will be the cost of any clerical help he may need in his

office. It will be an addition of perhaps four or five altogether in the whole Province of Newfoundland by creating the Department of Highways. It will not add much to the cost to the people to the Government. It will add enormously, I believe, in efficiency by dividing the labour between two separate Ministers, where one Minister himself is worked almost to death and could not even know where even half the jobs are going on—Give it to two Ministers with one concentrating on roads and the other on all other functions of Government. We think the increase in service and value to the people of Newfoundland will be worth many many times the cost of the new Department.

I am now through, Mr. Speaker, but I suggest a recess of ten minutes in the hope that my honourable friend will be ready then to offer some comment on this motion.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes, after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Premier had moved an adjournment of the debate on the second reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Highways."

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to review at any length this Bill this afternoon, because I have not had an opportunity to even look at the Bill.

I know there is the section referred to: There shall be a Department of Government of Newfoundland called the Department of Highways over which the Minister of Highways for the time being, etc. I take it therein lies the main principle of this Bill—There shall be a Department of Highways. I suspect that the Public

Works Bill says that there shall be a Department of Public Works—of course roads are public works.

Now on the principle of having a Department of Highways. I don't think anybody would disagree to any great extent. They have a Department of Highways in other provinces on the Mainland, and I take it we are following the example of some of these provinces. I do remember off-hand that we have a lot more Departments in this tenth Province—Departments of Government—than there are in most of the other provinces on the Mainland, i.e. the smaller Provinces. I am wondering if we ought not to remember that the more Departments we have the greater the cost to the taxpayer of this country.

I was greatly impressed with the introduction of the Bill by the Honourable the Premier. I have been here, I think, four or five years, and I have noticed in the past that at the drop of a hat the Premier can get up and talk for hours on end. All you need is to give him a text, just one word from a text and the Premier is off and he can speak for hours, and speak vigorously, articulatively, sometimes mystifying, if that word is allowed—But he had the ability, Sir—He should be a preacher. You know he has the ability—He should be a minister—there is no question about that. I was going to say something then. It was not rude—but he can elaborate any particular subject to such an extent that it makes it look very, very important on the face of it.

Now a new Department of Highways to me is not such a very important matter. The idea of setting up two departments in the Department of Public Works and calling one a Department of Highways does not mean

a very great thing except, as I said before, the setting up of another Department and appointing a few—increasing the civil service.

The Honourable the Premier referred to the former Minister of Public Works and he referred to the work that the Honourable Minister had been doing in the past. I want to say that I do believe that the Honourable Minister of Public Works in the former Government undoubtedly had to carry a burden. But the burden that he had to carry was undoubtedly more heavy than it should have been because of the fact that the Honourable Minister did not have the necessary funds to carry out the work which was allotted to the Department. I believe that the Honourable Minister was quite capable of doing anything in connection with Public Works whether it be highroads or public buildings. He has the experience and consequently I greatly regret his health has reached the stage where he could no longer carry that burden. The Honourable the Premier has given that making the work a little more light as one of the reasons at any rate of for the Honourable Mr. Spencer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hope I did not give the wrong impression—If the honourable gentleman were in poor health—I also went on to say that no man no matter how brilliant, how clever, how experienced could be expected to carry the full burden as it is going to be during the next few years even though he might have carried on during the last few years.

MR. HOLLETT: I am very happy to know that the health of the honourable gentleman has no bearing whatsoever on the work in the Department of Public Works because I would not be a bit surprised if the

onerous duties of the Minister had brought about that condition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have helped.

MR. HOLLETT: No, "The Best Eight Years Yet"—I was handed a book this afternoon called "The Canadian Liberal," and in it there is a quotation—Yes—"Canada's best eight years." I think it is by the Honourable Louis St. Laurent, Premier of Canada—"Canada's Best Eight Years"—I am wondering who stole whose thunder? I am just wondering. There is not very much difference between "Canada's Best Eight Years" and "The Best Eight Years Yet." At any rate I am getting off highroads—I am off on the side of the road now.

The Honourable Premier spoke of having built some fifteen hundred miles of new roads in the past eight years. I believe that was understood. I think I shall ask a question to find out just where some of these roads are because I am personally convinced some are in such locations that you can never reach these roads. To my mind it was probably a mistake to build a road located where you can not get at it—But fifteen hundred miles of road takes a lot of money, and if fifteen hundred miles of road were built then I say all the more credit to the former Minister of Public Works. The Honourable the Premier referred to that as an astounding achievement and yet he goes on to say that the people are still dissatisfied—still dissatisfied—I wonder, Sir, if all of us people are not mere children anyway—Would we always be dissatisfied? Give us the moon and we want the stars. For all that I am not accusing our people for wanting roads. I say give us the people all you may and we will not be satisfied and will

clamour for more. I do not think the Premier should take that, therefore, as an indication that he and his Government should go to work and overload this small province with debt which future generations will have to pay, and pay until it hurts. We know that people are going to clamour for roads, people are going to clamour for everything, but I maintain, Sir, that the principle of the Government of building roads should be whether it is in the best interest of the economy of Newfoundland as a Province of Canada where they should and whether they should build these roads there and not to be listening altogether to the clamour of we the people. I am not criticizing any particular area of Newfoundland, I am just saying we the people are a bunch of children when it comes to handouts when we come to getting things and getting them we always want some more. I am quite sure the Honourable the Premier is not going to take that as a standard by which he shall measure the standard with which he intends to saddle them—if he does intend to saddle this country.

The Honourable the Premier spoke of spending some one hundred million dollars in the next five years, twenty million dollars a year on roads. I have not any figures by me at the moment but I hope to have them by tomorrow. I expect if we built fifteen hundred miles of roads we must have spent almost that much during the past eight years. But I am not sure of that.

We have nothing whatsoever against setting up a new Department of Highways. I do believe that and I agreed with the people in clamouring, up to a point, for new roads and better roads. We need them. We need them here in the City of St. John's. I am

quite sure the Deputy Mayor, if he were here would agree with me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is here.

MR. HOLLETT: He is here, I see. I might say if he did not agree with me he might take a walk down Cochrane Street and have a look. Cochrane Street, I believe, is about the worst street I have gone over in this town for some time.

MR. HIGGINS: We do not practice nepotism.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman ought to go in Bannerman Road and see a bad road.

MR. HIGGINS: Yes, that is pretty good.

MR. HOLLETT: I was speaking about the one hundred million dollars in the next five years, spent on the idea the Honourable the Premier has set up with three Ministers, and they are to draw up a plan relative to a great new programme of road building and he estimates it is going to cost as much as twenty million dollars a year. Now has that same principle been adopted in relationship to the others such as the fisheries, for instance or health or education. There are all sorts of problems to which the Government will have to attend. They have already definitely decided they are going to spend in the next five years one hundred million dollars on roads. I would like to know how much they intend to spend in the next five years on education.

MR. SMALLWOOD: About the same.

MR. HOLLETT: The same, I suppose, on fisheries?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I doubt it. We and the Government of Canada be-

tween us and the Fishery Industry all three might spend that much.

MR. BROWNE: Any more loans to Arthur Monroe?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would not say never any more, but none for the moment.

MR. HOLLETT: I might point out too the Government of Canada, I take it, contributes quite a large slice to the hundred millions in the next five years for roads.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Because I suspect the Department of Highways will have a lot to do with the Trans Canada Highway, at least I hope they do, and the Federal Government will contribute about fifty per cent of the amount spent by the Government on highways. So that when the Honourable the Premier gets up here in this House and states he intends to spend a hundred million dollars in the next five years on roads in Newfoundland I take that with a little grain of salt because nearly half of that will be spent by the Federal Government. So that when I thought of that I was not so greatly scared, because if we have to find a hundred million dollars for roads and fifty or sixty for the fisheries and a hundred million dollars for education and a hundred million for this, that and the other thing in the next five years and carry on the Government as well, then I would say it is time for every member of this House to sit up and take notice and ask where we are going and whether tending. Where are we going and whether tending finally—The Honourable the Premier hopes to get some money under Term 29. I hope he does. I hope he gets a lot of it and I hope some of it will go on the roads. But I do say we

ought not to judge our expenditure in any branch of Government simply because there is a clamour from here or there or somewhere else, but let us do it in relationship to the whole economy of Newfoundland.

The Honourable the Premier spoke about the centralization. That is a very difficult subject to introduce at this stage, and I do not intend to say very much about it. I believe centralization particularly in this day and age has to be brought about by the people themselves and not the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: There is no question about that. The further the Government would keep from meddling in it the better for the people of this country. If I feel it is better for me to earn a living in Joe Batts Arm than Seldom Come By then I am going to move to Joe Batts Arm. That applies not only to me but to everybody. It is up to the people. It is no use moving John Jones to Fortune Bay if John Jones does not see a way to make a living in Fortune Bay. I am quite sure the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries agrees. Let the man move himself and he is likely to make good but if the Government moves him he is not likely to make good, I am afraid. So if the idea is to build these roads in order to assist people to centralized areas and the grass will grow over them because there is no point in building roads anywhere unless there are industries in that particular area where the road can be of certain benefit to that industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like time to look through the Act before concluding my few remarks and

if I may I would like to adjourn the debate until tomorrow.

On motion debate on second reading adjourned until tomorrow.

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

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is anything very much I can say in explanation of this Bill for the Bill is self-explanatory.

The Co-operative Development Loan Act now in force provides that the Board set up under the Act reports to the Minister of Co-operatives and Fisheries. This Bill proposes that for the future the Board will report to the Minister of Mines and Resources.

Mr. Speaker, I move 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 to make Further Provision Respecting the Supply of Water in the Town of Carbonear."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this Bill I would point out first of all that the preamble to the Bill to a certain extent anyhow explains the reason for its introduction today. The main purpose for the Bill itself, is however, contained in Section (4) where it enables the Municipal Council of Carbonear, or the Water Company of Carbonear to use the appraisalment of property which has been carried out under the Local Government Act as a basis on which to compute the water tax.

Now that is practically all that is contained in the Bill. The last sec-

tion merely refers to the repeal of the previous Act. In Committee of the Whole I would answer any questions that might come up.

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

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure that I understand that that is all that is involved in this Bill. It seems to me that the Government is taking over the water company, the operations of the Carbonear Water Company in the Town of Carbonear, and that they have the powers under the section to which the Minister referred of imposing taxes. Probably when we get into Committee I will have a good many questions to ask the Minister. For example: In regard to the shareholders and how they stand and what it cost the Government and so forth.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, there is just one matter. It does not affect the principle of the Bill in one way but in another it does. "The Minister shall, imposing and collecting taxes"—It seems to me that particular part of the principle is something which needs little explanation. Surely the Government is not going ahead and collecting taxes on property without having the proper assessment in the first instance. Surely they are not going to spend on some prior assessment. We may come to that in Committee or perhaps the Minister would say a word on that now.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to answer the questions in full, raised by the Honourable and learned member for St. John's South, and the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. But I might point out some of the matters to which they referred are already in existence

by the Act of 1952, which vested—if you like—in the Government itself the Carbonear Water Company. The only thing as I pointed out that this Act does is to allow them to use the appraisal of property that is being carried out under the Local Government Act as the basis of the taxes—That is the only thing that there is now.

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 Community Councils Act, 1956."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, under the "Community Councils Act" they are allowed a membership of anywhere from three to five members. Sometimes a Community Council sets itself up by having a council of three and then at a subsequent meeting it decides to increase their membership to five. That can only be done at a public meeting. Having taken that decision, they have to apply to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for approval to do so. The approval is formal to some extent, but that approval being given then they have to hold another public meeting in order that they may elect the additional two members they may require. This amendment allows them to increase their membership, according to the Act, and then merely submit the names for approval. In other words, expedite things by doing away with the necessity of a second meeting. That is the main purpose of the amendment. 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 to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act."

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the second reading of this Bill, and in doing so I would offer one or two brief comments.

The Memorial University (Pensions) Act is of course designed to give pensions to people who have worked beyond the ten year requirement and who because of the fulfillment of the total number of years or because of illness or other reason they have retired.

During the past year a defect was discovered in the Act. This Bill provides that if anyone resigns or dies before the ten years are up that the money paid in can then be refunded either to the person concerned or in the case of death to his relatives, heirs.

In this past year one of the professors at the University who had been up there something like thirty years died, but instead of retiring, as should have been done, worked right up until a few days before her money. Then it was discovered that the Act made no provision for the refund of money in that case. So that the Board of Regents of the University immediately applied to us to have this matter rectified. We got the advice of the Attorney General's Department and discovered the Act itself was defective in that it made no provision for the refund of money paid in in the case of people who worked beyond ten years but did for people who worked less than ten years. So that this amendment will simply rectify this omission. It was actually an omission of course. It will then enable the University not only in this particular case, where there is, according to advice received from the Board of Regents, a hard-

ship but will also have the happy result of anticipating any such thing in the future.

MR. BROWNE: Have you the old section there? Could you read it?

DR. ROWE: No, I do not have a copy of the Statutes. Chapter 110 of the Revised Statutes.

MR. HIGGINS: Was that Miss Lodge?

DR. ROWE: Yes.

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

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, there is just one point I would like to have clarified? Does the amending of this Act take care of this particular case?

DR. ROWE: Yes.

MR. CURTIS: Section 22 (1) says: "When an unmarried employee dies before completing ten years for service as such the Board shall pay to his executor or administrator the amount the employee has contributed to the fund together with simple interest at the rate of three per cent per annum." That apparently does not say what happens if a person stays more than ten years.

DR. ROWE: It was assumed that after ten years the person would apply for a pension or be married. In this case neither happened.

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

On motion of Mr. Smallwood all remaining orders of the Day stood deferred.

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

FRIDAY, March 29, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

None.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices of Motion

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Public Works."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow move for all books of Accounts including Ledgers, Bank Statements and Cheque Stubs and all Order Books and Receipts of the former Superior Rubber Company.

Notice of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett.

Answers to Questions

(See Appendix for questions and answers).

Answer to question No. 25—Tabled.

Answer to question No. 37—Tabled.

Answer to question No. 46—Tabled.

QUESTION NO. 39:

Mr. Baxter Morgan is general manager of Koch Shoes and Mr. Gordon Janes the general manager of Newfoundland Hardboards Industries, Ltd.

and I suggest that the question be directed to those two companies.

MR. BROWNE: Do you think we would get an answer?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I happen to know what their salaries are, as a matter of fact. They happen to be ten thousand dollars a year each. But I am not giving that officially. I happen to know what their salaries are, and I do not know that they would mind particularly the fact being known, but I have no official knowledge of it.

MR. HOLLETT: Have you any right to know?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think I have.

MR. HOLLETT: Why not we on this side of the House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, the Government as a Government have things the Opposition has no right to.

MR. HOLLETT: Nor the House of Assembly?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Government has a right—you know—we have a right to know things the Opposition has not a right to know nor the House either. That is the law. That was the Constitution, before I was born it was like that.

Answer to question No. 21—Tabled.

Answer to question No. 44—Tabled.

Answer to question No. 13—Tabled.

QUESTION No. 36: (See appendix).

QUESTION No. 48: (See appendix).

QUESTION No. 52: (See appendix).

MR. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): The Attorney General stated the money, thirteen thousand dollars in cash has been placed to the credit of Finance—I did not know Valdmanis was fined?

MR. CURTIS: Actually, Mr. Speaker, that is the only fund we have in the Department. The reason the money did not come to the consolidated revenue was that there might be some monies necessary to collect the assets. It is not in the courts. It is in the department of the Attorney General.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney General would permit a question arising out of his answer—In regard to the St. Andrew's Fisheries in which the Government has now all the shares, I believe, has the Government taken any steps to realize the value of that property?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, we have. For a while we rented it and up to the time paid the arrears in taxation.

MR. BROWNS: It is not of much value, I don't think.

MR. CURTIS: I am afraid it is not.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Premier could answer me this, with regard to the enquiry or investigation to be made into the new industries by Arthur D. Little. There were certain companies mentioned in correspondence. I noticed Newfoundland Hardwoods, Atlantic Gypsum, Gold Sail, Superior Rubber and Adler's Chocolate were not mentioned. Is there any intention—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly—Some have since been added and others undoubtedly will be.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do I hear the word "investigate"? The analysis will, I think, include all of them. They will all, I think, be included in the analysis. I may say my honourable colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, is presently giving serious thought, after discussion with his colleagues, to retain that or some other firm to make other analysis of other types of enterprises which have great importance in the economy of Newfoundland. And the Government feel that experienced as we are after eight years in office and able as we are some of us, nevertheless, it won't do Newfoundland any harm if we call on some of the best brains we can find or buy across Canada or in the United States to help us analyse our assets and appraise and come to final disposition in the matters affecting the economy of Newfoundland.

MR. HIGGINS: Does that include mines?

MR. SMALLWOOD: So far we have not seen any particular necessity; if the honourable gentleman is considering now the capital structure and market valuation of mining enterprises, that calls for great skill—which no member not possessing that skill would care to look at.

MR. HIGGINS: I subscribe entirely to that.

MR. BROWNE: Arising out of the answer of the Premier, would he have any objection to stating whether it is the fish companies he is referring to?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think when my honourable colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, is going to make a statement to the House he will do so, and I would not attempt to anticipate anything he would want to say.

MR. HOLLETT: Could the Honourable the Premier state which ones have been added?

Orders of the Day

Honourable the Premier asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Fisheries."

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

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Partnership Act."

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 to Amend the Department of Mines and Resources Act."

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

Honourable the Minister of Welfare asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act."

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. SPEAKER: The debate, I believe was adjourned by the honourable member for White Bay North, or by the honourable the Premier.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Speaker I must first of all apologize for what happened yesterday. But these things will happen in the best of families you know. First I would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your elevation

to the very high office and would also like to congratulate the honourable member for St. John's Centre on his excellent reply to the Speech from the Throne read by His Excellency the Administrator. Although during his address he was up and down so much my good friend from St. John's Centre reminded me very much of a wrestler.

I would at this time like to congratulate the Commission on the Revision of the Financial Terms on the excellent work done in the gathering of material to place before the Commission, which I am sure will give the case of Newfoundland the sympathetic hearing it so richly deserves, not forgetting, of course, the municipalities.

The honourable member for St. John's Centre tried to impress the House, but I say we have just passed through the best eight years in our political history and we welcome an economic analysis. In many cases it followed the people of this Island were well employed in the construction of these plants and certainly money which was badly needed in this time to vitalize the purchasing power of our people. I also have no doubt these plants are still there and while some of the equipment, while too heavy for the industry now carried on, is still valuable for the purpose originally intended. If when I look back on the years and see better living conditions and radios and televisions and washing machines and above all better housing conditions the money did not fall on stoney ground, and I feel sure the Minister of Education will back me that some of these plants did a little.

As far as the civil service is concerned it is in the hands of a capable commission which, I suppose, will in-

crease salaries shortly. We will have a new university on a beautiful spot, and I am glad this one will have a front door and not on the back like the present one. And I hope there will be lots of room for cars without running over the landscape as we have in this college. When they are building I think it is most important in these modern days for any place of gathering to have lots of parking space. They don't seem to have it. The vocational school is a great asset in planning for better tradesmen and fills a pressing need.

Now the honourable member for St. John's Centre made reference to the picnic sites. But on the sites of these places people on our roads will find garbage dumped from half ton trucks. And I think it is nearly time for our district to add a good method of dumping, and get some sort of dump for those localities instead of leaving refuse. That is against the law, so that all our districts must have some disposal of garbage. I am hoping some day this will happen.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member will forgive me—Honourable members are making quite a lot of noise and it is very difficult for me to hear what the honourable member who has the floor is saying. The acoustics in this Chamber are such that it makes it almost impossible to hear unless honourable members remember this fact and be as quiet as possible. The honourable member will please continue.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: The fishermen in Pouch Cove and St. Phillips need these dumps just outside their settlements on ground where they could take their garbage. They are not allowed to dump garbage in the sea today or anything like that nor

the rivers, the only water they have to use for drinking purposes. And I have seen people go into the country for picnics and dump a lot of garbage on the side of the road. Surely people going out of town to picnic and carry grub out should carry the empty tins back. I think the spots are spoiled all along the road and I think it is a shame the way these things are happening.

Now like the dumps, the roads, Mr. Speaker: I think the time has nearly come for toll roads. I know that these people will save hundreds of dollars by paying the toll every year by keeping their car springs and against depreciation on their automobiles or trucks. The time is coming when eventually we have to do it. We have at the present time twenty-five thousand cars registered in St. John's and thirty-five, possibly, in the whole island—twenty-five thousand in the City of St. John's going out every holiday and Sunday on one road, the Topsail Road, bumper to bumper. And I would like to see other places we could drive and roads we could drive over. And I do not think anybody driving an automobile in this country would mind paying a toll from here out Torbay Road in my learned friend's district as well as mine because I got to go through his district.

MR. HIGGINS: There is no road there to drive over.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: No. But instead of waiting fifty years with a toll road we could get it next year. I am sure the Premier would get enough money from a toll road. In other countries people are using them. Not only that, it is the only thing for the country. A fisherman catches his fish and drives over a beautiful smooth road in a half-ton pickup and drives

right out to the fish plant. What more do you want—Then we could go out for a holiday and get out on the side of the road in beautiful country with beautiful fishing. So I think it is time for us to get roads and transportation.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the honourable gentleman pardon me—Is that part of the policy of the present Government—tolls on roads?

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I hope so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LANE: Mr. Speaker, I would like, first of all, to offer you personally my heartiest congratulations on the high honour conferred on you by this House. I feel confident that Your Honour will be impartial and just in your dealings, and I pledge to you my honest support.

In second place I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The honourable member for Harbour Grace—I have come here to this House, I think over the past six years and I believe that that was one of the finest jobs that I have heard in coming here. I do want to congratulate him personally. The same thing applies to the honourable member for Bell Island. I may say perhaps, I have heard him in better fettle when he was in the military guard. That honourable and gallant gentleman I am sure he too will make a great contribution to this House of Assembly and for the district which he represents.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to steal the thunder perhaps—first of all I would like to say a word personally—in a maiden speech perhaps it is all right to say a word personally about myself. I hope I won't repeat it too often.

But before someone else comments on why I am here or just should not be here or how I got here I would like to answer the question: First of all, as an ex-magistrate, of course, I am amongst the chain gang, but I am also alone in that I am a member of an association which was non-political, non-partisan, and to make it quite clear and to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the House, that everything that I did was honest and honourable. I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when I received the invitation to enter politics I gave the matter due consideration. I want to say here and now to the honourable members of the Opposition that I accepted the invitation from the Liberal Party but I was courted extensively by the Social Credit, the "CCF", and the "PC" as well. And with due respect to all of them I felt that these parties in question were politically bankrupt and if I were to contribute anything to this Province I would have to contribute it through the Liberal Government. Because, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this Government has a long life before it.

MR. HOLLETT: That is why you joined it.

MR. LANE: And I feel personally now I have become a member of the Government, now I have entered politics, I am going to spend another twenty or twenty-five years as a politician with this great Liberal party on this side of the House.

MR. HOLLETT: I thought you were in an organization not political? It was mentioned a moment ago.

MR. LANE: Yes, it was mentioned, but in an honourable way I was given leave and you know that as well as I do. If I had had any scruples about the best eight years yet, and none of you could deny that—I would like to

take you with me to the district which I have the honour to represent. Mr. Speaker, going back over fifteen years to a district where when I visited it fifteen years ago the conditions which existed, the homes I as a magistrate, as a teacher and as a civil servant for twenty-seven years—not always too civil I might say but as a civil servant for twenty-seven years and saw the people going through the hardest times in their history—and then for me to go back after fifteen years to a district and find the changes that had been brought about that I had no scruples whatsoever about going into the field of politics, I felt that I could contribute something, that my years of experience gave me some knowledge of the people. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I will be able to contribute something. I hope that to be critical as well as constructive criticism—and I look forward—I aim—if one aims high enough I suppose at the stars he may get over the top of the highest trees. I am aiming at doing something statesmanlike in these hallowed walls with great men of the past—if they do not see us they are looking at us, and the gentlemen of the press as well.

I was getting around to that—I was going to end on that theme. The gentlemen of the press—because, as I said, with the best eight years—and if I had any scruples or qualms of conscience the grand old lady of eighty-one years of age—if I had any mistrust or distrust in the leadership of our party she put me at ease—in Conche—when she said to me: "I hope they will give Joe the Key to Heaven and we will all get in"—that was enough for me. And that came from a simple heart.

MR. BROWNE: Very simple.

MR. LANE: Yes, indeed—and it is the simple people who make this world.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it if the honourable leader gets in we will all get in.

MR. LANE: No, no, no. She was perfectly serious. I would like to refer briefly to the Speech from the Throne. I do not think I should take up too much time of this House. There is quite a bit of business to be done, and I feel all members would like to speak. Now in the first place I have every confidence that the Royal Commission which is set up and which has been set up and which is carrying on its work will be of great benefit and help. I feel that the great Canadian Parliament, the Federal Government of Canada, will see that we get a full share of what we should in this Province when our case has been placed before them. With the changed standards of living and income everything is changed, Sir, since Confederation. But I feel sure that our case will be clearly put to them, will be considered and I leave it to them. I know that we do need further help and I do feel that that help will be forthcoming.

In regard to the analysis of the new industries, this Arthur D. Little Analysis, I have heard so much about the new industries sitting in this House and reading the papers during the past eight years that I do think personally I should refer to them. Because if ever people got a sickening of new industries and the thought of new industries and salaries and wages and money spent and how it was spent I am sure that the people of Newfoundland have had it during the past eight years. But with the analysis of these industries I believe that that company will be able to let us know just where we stand with the new industries. And with the new indust-

ries I feel that we also should include the fishing industry.

Now I am very much concerned with this great fishing industry as much as I am with any other industry which has been brought in. All the Speakers from the Opposition have said that there is very little in the Speech from the Throne about the fisheries. All along when ever anything was said about the fisheries they always said "oh, that is politics" — "The fishermen were political foot-balls" and I was glad indeed to hear so little said about the fisheries because I feel there is quite a bit going on, and eventually the fisheries will come into their own.

I may say, in keeping with the past, in new industries and in fisheries the Governments of the past always pioneered and promoted. I think that has been true. I can recall the growing pains of the International Power and Paper Company and now we find this great Bowater Company. That company was sponsored by the Government. That company had its growing pains but now what it has done for this Province no one can deny. So that is what the Government is doing at the moment what this Liberal Government has done during the past few years and it is simply in keeping with the past. The Wabana Iron Ore, the railroad, fish plants —

In 1943 the Commission of Government started this programme of fish plants. They assisted. We could never depend on private enterprise wholly to supply the progressive forces in Newfoundland. They never had enough money or perhaps they were too tight over it, I think now that we have these figures we can truly say that somebody is too tight over their money. And I don't think there are

too many fishermen who share the amount of seventy-six millions which is tucked away in some of our banks at the present moment. So that we in Newfoundland have always been in the position of never having enough money, I will say, or were always too tight over it.

I recall too in our local industries all down through the years they received tariff protection and Government always took the lead. The Liberal Government always took the lead in giving protection. All of these industries had difficulties, all of them — the same as the new industries — and this fact was accepted by the present Government when it started its policy. No precedent was established — the same thing applies to fish plants. If the present management is not best I am sure that we will be able to find some one else. But if you do nothing you get nowhere — in other words — you are doomed — you are doomed if you do and you are doomed if you don't. The Government has always been that way — If you sit on the money, as has been done in years gone by, and do not spend it, what is the money there for? If you spend it and spend too much of it you are wasting, you are throwing it down the sewer — So where do we stand?

But I contend, in support of what has been done in the fishing industry, what has been done in the new industries that the Government have established is trying to build up something which will benefit not only the people of this day and age but the future generations. And why, after all, should we have ready cash to pay for everything in roads, schools, bridges, fish plants? Prosperity is going to enjoy them, prosperity is going to earn a living from them, and why should not our sons and our sons' sons pay for

them over a period of time rather than we having to find all the money to pay for them over a period of time rather than we having to find all the money to pay for them at one time? So that personally for the future I can see no way of carrying on other than for the Government to take the initiative in assisting and promoting the economic life of this country especially the fisheries. I see the need every day of something to be done, development, electric power, roads, fish plants, boats—I have it on my desk every day. Every day somebody looking for help. And with the high cost of living and the high cost of materials and with so little money, as has been stated, or those who have it so close fisted that we must as a Province look to the Government for the help—and I feel confident that we will get that.

As regards to the fisheries—St. John's is no longer the source of personnel or resources—Take the salt fish plant in Steers Cove, the fresh fish plant on the Southside and Fort Pepperrell out of the picture and St. John's is thriving on no new dollars except the bit of money spent by the Portuguese—Spanish fleets and trawlers—St. John's is producing not one new dollar. The new money that is being earned in St. John's is produced by a number of fishermen fishing out of the port of St. John's. But then the honourable members of the Opposition, they want St. John's to be represented. St. John's at the present moment is only a parasitical gossiping little city.

MR. BROWNE: You seem to be doing very well here.

MR. LANE: I have done very well here. What have you got today—take the Provincial and Federal servants out of St. John's, there are more dollars being produced in White Bay in one

year, in one month sometimes than is produced in St. John's in one year—Out of the fisheries—in new dollars they earn—the fishermen of the district.

MR. BROWNE: I put it to the honourable member that St. John's is a bigger fishing centre than the place he mentioned.

MR. LANE: How many fishermen have we in St. John's.

MR. BROWNE: How many down there?

MR. LANE: We have one hundred and fifty fishing out of St. John's—We have at least six hundred.

MR. HOLLETT: Also loggers.

MR. LANE: No, not also loggers. Most of these loggers are men that come from Trinity Bay and other parts of the country. Loggers and fishermen—The majority are fishermen. It is a fishing district. Here in St. John's—you asked for it—the people may be a little better informed—I don't think anybody would mean they are of higher calibre or a higher standard. They may be a little better informed if they take the paper and read the paper. But with the radio at the present moment most of our people are very well informed. Do you think because the district of White Bay North gave an overwhelming majority of its votes to—practically ninety per cent—that they were not all—some of these were very well informed.

MR. HOLLETT: May I be allowed: I want to take exception to one remark—I want to ask the honourable gentleman to be good enough to take it back. I do represent a district in St. John's as do my honourable colleagues, and St. John's is being charged with being parasitical, a parasite upon

the economy of Newfoundland. I wonder if the honourable gentleman would like to change that in some way or take it back.

MR. LANE: Well, I don't know. In years gone by and it is not so very long ago when one of the highest ranking governors of our day used a similar term.

MR. HOLLETT: Are you going to stick to it.

MR. LANE: I am sticking to that term, I have to stick to it unless it can be proven—I say this is a constructive term I am using I am not against using it. Where is the money coming from to keep St. John's ticking? Where is it earned other than the two fish plants and Pepperrell? Take the Civil Service out of St. John's and what do you find?

MR. HOLLETT: Your statement is ridiculous.

MR. LANE: It is not. I would say then that one of the real challenges to the Government in the years to come is the modernization of the Newfoundland industries. The pace at which scientific investigations have been accumulated has been tremendous. New techniques, technology, new ideas, new methods have been accumulated. We have a world of information. But the pace at which these things are being applied in some cases is slow. Slow because perhaps we are afraid. We are afraid to spend money we are afraid that we are not going to get back ninety-nine cents for every dollar that is spent. But if we still remain with that policy I can't see wherever we will be a live and equal and prominent part of this great dominion. In the fisheries I admit the responsibility lies with the Federal Department of Fisheries—

MR. BROWNE: Would the honourable member permit a question to clarify what he said there? Who does he say is fearful of spending, the people or the Government?

MR. LANE: Perhaps I should say the honourable members of the Opposition seem to be fearful of spending money. They are always commenting on what has been spent and how.

MR. HOLLETT: You said "we."

MR. LANE: I apologize—I should have said "you." It is not me.

MR. SPEAKER: This might be a good time for me to say that the pronoun "you" if applied by one honourable member to another honourable member is out of order. When speaking the honourable member should refer (if he has something to say to another honourable member) to another honourable member by the usual term used in this House. "The honourable member for the district which he represents"—and not look across the floor and say "You."

MR. LANE: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. But personally I really do not know the district the honourable member represents over there. I almost have to name them on times. I don't think I will ever learn.

I was just saying, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the responsibility lies with the Federal Department of Fisheries—and I am sorry that I have to say that after eight years I do not believe that they are yet alive to the basic problems of Newfoundland. There is a comparison. We all know the amount of money that is being spent on public works. Yes, it is a great thing, with great work done. We must appreciate it. But fisheries, (health and welfare we feel that the Federal Government is doing whatever it can) Fisheries—

I do not know exactly where the breakdown lies—I do not know whether it is in personnel or whether it is because the Department of Fisheries is weak and has been a weak department, a small department or whether it lies in a general fishery policy for the whole of Canada. Personally it does disturb me, the attitude of this great Federal Government, the Liberal Federal Government of Canada, which has done so much for Newfoundland, but it seems to be neglecting and we have been left on our own to do what we can without money which we need to get the fisheries once more on their feet.

I would say that in the main the performances of the other Federal Departments, such as those I have mentioned throws in sharp relief the failures of the Fisheries Department. Perhaps too this is not only in investigations and research I think that in this field alone we are far behind and lagging, and I would like to see so much done for this industry we know so little about—the most of it is guess work and there is so much money that could be spent in trying to find out. I am hopeful that during the next few years that the Federal Department of Fisheries, the Federal Government, will see fit to spend large sums of money, largely too in administration—there is the bait service. Here we have a plentiful supply of bait, six to seven million pounds being sold yearly to fleets of ships that come here to fish in our very doors, our very back doors, and French doors, for which our fishermen receive a cent and a cent and a half per pound—To be used to kill the markets which we once held. We do not seem to be getting anything from that surplus. And I feel that that service for which we are getting so little is providing a supply base for a few more dollars, for a

few fish handlers and a few of the stores, waffle iron dealers along Water Street—because as far as St. John's is concerned the words of Sir William Coaker will apply—the grass could easily apply as far as fish is concerned on Water Street—one salt fish firm, one fresh fish firm—We have to look outside in the Province for industry, for development in our fishing—And we must realize too that in these out-ports the men who make a living are men who have put their all into it, not only their money but their labour as well. A lot of these things are done, have been done and are still being done by remote control. But we have to get out—We have to work and we have to fight together for the common good.

I would say that to the sale of fish and fishery products the sale of bait is a crying example of a mismanaged service. I think that we should receive far more for this product, for which our fishermen receive so little.

MR. HOLLETT: You mean from Fishery Products? ?

MR. LANE: No, from the people who buy it. I suppose Fishery Products is to supply some of these squids too to the Portuguese fishermen.

MR. HOLLETT: The Head Office in St. John's?

MR. LANE: Yes, that is right. Perhaps a word too should not be amiss in regard to fishery development: I said before there has been a lot of money built up over the years—and perhaps a word generally—take the exporting, the marketing organizations of the trade, the NAFEL, the Max Lanes, whatever you wish to call it, or any other product, the NAFEL of Newfoundland. While we have not always agreed I feel personally that

they have done a very good job in marketing, but they too sat on their fannies too long and did too little while the industry was dying. It was only when we opened the market to Nova Scotia that they really opened their eyes to it, at the money they had. And the people they had as their directors should get moving and do something for this industry if we are going to save it. But that was too little and too late. I feel that a marketing organization would be a great thing not only for the salt fish but the fresh fish, but I still contend the fishermen should be represented on that organization, that the merchants should be represented, mind you, on the Board of Directors, the real men who are catching the product who are curing the product and who are shipping the product—the directors on that Board—Now the directorship of NAFEL at the moment consists of, the majority of the men there, have very little. They manage to get their five thousand quintals of fish to retain their membership. I think that organization should realize the truth—This again is constructive criticism—They have done an extremely good job but I think they should realize what we have been asking for. We can get a lot of information but we should have more, and the fishermen should have their representative on that Board as well as all who try and who are helping in the development of the fisheries.

I would like to refer briefly to the great benefits which will accrue to our fishermen from Unemployment Insurance. I think that perhaps the past session of this Assembly, when the Honourable the Premier threatened as it were that if something were not done for the fishermen of Newfoundland they would be obliged to do it. I believe that was no false threat.

That was a real honest endeavour—The time had come when everybody else was being insured, was receiving unemployment insurance—The man working in St. John's could go home and do the same work as the fishermen—Now I believe we have something which is going to induce the fishermen, the younger men, to come in to their boats, and when the year's work is finished—There is only a certain season—And from Cape St. Mary's along the Northeast Coast and along the Northwest Coast and along the Labrador Coast the fishery is over till the middle of June or the end of June—There will, I believe, be very few abuses in this great unemployment insurance scheme—And I do hope and I do think that it will be of immense benefit to the fishermen and the fishing industry as a whole. Instead of having to collect relief these men the vast majority of whom now range between fifty and sixty-five—that seems to be the hard period of life for most of our people—and these men will be able to look forward, as I see it, to an average of twenty to twenty-five dollars a week for fifteen weeks. And any man who gets three hundred dollars during the winter months it will be a great help to him when he starts outfitting in the spring, it will manage to give him, Mr. Speaker, a toehold on life—And I predict that within three years the credit system of Newfoundland will have almost disappeared—not that it has disappeared—because I suppose when we talk about the fishermen getting credit we despise them because they had to go and get credit in the Spring—But I suppose here in the City of St. John's, at the moment ninety-nine per cent of them are on credit, the motor car, the radio, the television, the washing machine, the electric range, the waffle iron, they all get it by paying one cent, five

cents, five dollars down—And your car is a little better than mine because you can afford the first installment and bigger monthly installments—That is all the difference—Then we have the credit system all over again. But I believe our fishermen now have something over the winter and are going to get away from that kind of system. The day is almost over now, because there is a better understanding between employer and employee. The fishermen and the little merchant, the man who lives with the fishermen trying to do his best for them, got to live with them and make his home with them, and we appreciate what these men have done without assistance of the Government. And Mr. Speaker, going back to this Royal Commission, I have to suggest that there must be some methods found whereby the problem of our province can be handled by our own people—And the Revisions of the Terms must take this into consideration—Ottawa is too far away to know exactly what we require. Therefore they should make available to us the necessary money so that we as Newfoundlanders can carry out what we know to be the best for our people. I am hopeful that this will be done. I think it will be.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up any more of the time, but I have prepared here the gist of what I feel, of how I feel, as a member of this great party, this great "Liberal" party, this party which I hope and which I feel of which I will be a member for the next twenty-five years—that will only make me a young man then —

MR. HOLLETT: Where are you going then?

MR. LANE: Oh, I will go to the Senate, I suppose.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is frank.

MR. LANE: But I am going to ask these questions—This is the way I have put it. What is the future for Newfoundland? There are those that hold that the chronic economic and social problems of Newfoundland must go on very much as they are. Many feel or act as if they feel that historical forces have caught up in a relentless critical and economical vice, some people think that we may be wiser, kinder and not less useful people despite such handicap. Others like the gentleman from Montreal, whom I flew across country with one time, who said to me: "I cannot see what you are going to do in Newfoundland unless you find oil or minerals." And I said: "Know very much about it?" He said, "Not very much but I have flown in and out four times." Now we have people still who think we have nothing for us and they believe that the poverty of resources condemn us to an economy of actual or relative poverty. Now I believe on the contrary, I am like-minded in that respect, I believe on the contrary that this province can have a future of achievement in material things, have progress in civic affairs and have creative say in things of the mind and the spirit; I believe that we can be more than an easterly point of landing for people from Europe; I believe that the real and even famous achievements of the past should be a spot to great achievements in the future; I believe that we are richly endowed in natural resources if we open our eyes to see them and above all in human resources if we bestir ourselves to realize our possibilities.

MR. HOLLETT: Outside St. John's?

MR. LANE: Yes, outside St. John's, that is true. We have, however, passed through generations of adversity result-

ing from man-made handicaps, economic changes to which we could not or did not adjust. The great test now is whether we will do great things or wait for new generations or the operations of blind materialistic to bring a better turn on the wheel of fortune. In short, have we today the will, the energy, the readiness to risk and too the public spirit, the good-will and ability to work together and the vision to get over the level of life offered by our natural recognition and the capacity of our people, or are we content with things as they are?

Mr. Speaker, we are not—I am not content with things as they are. We as a Government are not content with things as they are. And I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Honourable members of this House on both sides that, with faith in ourselves and in our country and with trust in the leadership which the Premier of this Government can give us and also with the motto to which we very seldom perhaps look, over your head, the pendulum now swings to sound out the first strokes of Newfoundland's great est hour.

On motion of Mr. Mercer the debate was adjourned until tomorrow.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes, after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Highways."

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I spoke a few words relative to this new act setting up a new department, yesterday. But since that time I have had an opportunity to go through the Bill very carefully and also to go through the Public Works Act Bill, and as far as the principle is concerned

I see nothing wrong with setting up a Department of Highways. There are only one or two qualifications that ought to be made—I think we ought not to set up a department, a new department, if it is going to cost the taxpayers of Newfoundland any great degree of money and further taxation. We have at the present time the Department of Public Works, which takes care of roads and bridges, and which takes care of ferries and other things as well as public buildings. The idea now, I believe, in this Act, is to separate the Public Works relative to roads and bridges from the Public Works relative to public buildings and a few other things.

Now I noticed in last year's estimates, and I said at the outset, we cannot judge the value or the need of the department by the amount of revenue it would take or either by the amount of money it expended, but I looked through the estimates of last year and found that for repair and maintenance of buildings last year we voted seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. There were some other incidentals, Government house cleaning and fuel and light and power, but the whole expenditure on current account came to one million four hundred and ninety-one dollars, out of a total expenditure for Public Works or at least a total estimate on current account of five million three hundred and fifty-six dollars. I went to Capital account and I found that there it was estimated that we would spend one million two hundred and thirty nine thousand, a third almost on public buildings. So that out of a total estimate for the Department of Public Works last year for ten millions of dollars the amount which was allocated for public buildings which from now on Public Works only will have to get, that and ferries and a few other

things. No, I believe ferries and landings go in with Highways as well. The total amount as per last year's estimates would be one million two hundred and thirty-nine thousand dollars out of a total of approximately fourteen million on current and capital account.

But, as I said before, you cannot judge the value of the need of the department by the amount of money which it spends, if so we could abolish the department, say, of Provincial Affairs altogether because I note they received last year or the expenditure was estimated at \$122,000. So we do know we need a Department of Provincial Affairs, not as much perhaps as we need a Department of Highways, but we do need it, and it is immaterial what the expenditure would be in one sense of the word as to its need.

I said at the outset that I feel there is nothing against the principle of setting up a new department provided it was not going to cost the people of this country a great amount of money, and I measured the offices and general expenses for every department and I find that it would cost anywhere from fifty to a hundred thousand dollars to set up this new department—if we are going to set up a new department and make two departments whereas before we only had the one. In other words, if we are to have a Department of Public Works and also a Department of Highways I find it is going to cost the people anywhere from fifty to one hundred thousand dollars to set up these new offices.

I don't know what the Government's intention is? I don't know whether it is the intention to keep the present Department of Public Works as it is as a department or whether it is to give the duties or the portion of the

duties which it now has, which is left, amongst the other departments. I would suggest they might very well apportion that particular part which the Department of Public Works will have to do relative to public buildings to Provincial Affairs or to one of the other departments, because there will be very little administration needed to take over the buildings owned by the Government. It is true we had a lot of departments but the honourable the Premier has already made a statement of policy or at least suggested or hinted that it is quite in the cards that the Government may do away or hire or rent or burn or do something with the present public buildings which we now have and build a huge building to house all the departments of Government. If that is part of the policy of the Government to erect a large building which will take care of all the public buildings necessary to house the various departments, then I take it we do not need an extra ministry to look after that—we don't need another department to look after that. That can very well be handled by the Department of Provincial Affairs or by a branch of one of the other departments. I think this is in all probability what the Government may have in mind. I should hope that. I would hate to think that this new department is made more as a political expedient than for any other purpose. It has been suggested to me by certain people—you know, people do suggest all sorts of things—but it has been suggested to me that this new department is being set up so there will be a cabinet award to another man out of the very large majority the Government now has.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I say at once, there is no intention whatsoever

to increase the members of Cabinet above the present number.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, I am very glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker, and I want to thank the Honourable the Premier for making that public statement, because there have been some misgivings relative to that—I merely mentioned it—And I am glad I did mention it because it clears the air. And now I can write this particular aspect off, as far as I am concerned at any rate.

I find we have at the present time twelve departments. I took the trouble to look at a couple of the other Provinces—In New Brunswick they have ten; in Nova Scotia they have thirteen. Well it has been pointed out to me by some of my colleagues that in Nova Scotia some of the ministers carry two of these departments—I am not familiar with it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If they do they get two salaries—all across Canada—in every Province. And if the Premier has a portfolio he gets the additional salary.

MR. HOLLETT: I know that to be a fact. At any rate there are thirteen departments of Government—I am only dealing with the principle of setting up a new department, and I am dealing with the ministers, and I just mentioned the fact it is going to cost the people of this country new money. If it is, then we are against it. If it is not going to cost any appreciable amount then, personally, I have nothing whatever against the principle of the Bill.

I do know that highways and roads are, and will be one of the biggest headaches not only of this Government but of our Government when we take over after (what was it the honourable

member for White Bay said) twenty-five years. Then I think he is going to the Senate.

MR. SPENCER: Most of the needs will be filled before then.

MR. HOLLETT: The needs of roads in this country or any other country will never be filled not to satisfaction, and that is why I say the Highways Department is going to have a big problem on its hands, as the minister of the Department of Public Works did have all down through the past eight years and all down through the years right from the time we first got Responsible Government. The question of roads, naturally, was one of the biggest questions for this country or any other country.

I would suggest while I am on my feet relative to that and the policy with regard to road building, I believe it is absolutely essential that the Government set up some sort of committee or commission to look into the needs for roads. You say everybody needs roads, every part of Newfoundland needs roads. That is true, I agree but there are places where roads are needed much more, so far as the economy of the country is concerned than other sections of the country. And I think if we are to build our economy on a sound basis it is essential, as in everything else so in roads, that we spend the money where it can do the most good for the greatest number in this Province. So I would suggest that it might be advisable—if I were on the other side of the House I would suggest to whoever might be the Premier that it is absolutely essential that a complete study be made of the road situation in Newfoundland, to discover where most is needed the expenditure of the limited funds (and I say "limited" ad-

visedly) which will be at the disposal of this Government or any other Government.

You have in this country to pour out money on roads, I suspect much more so and to a greater extent per capita than you would have to do in another country because our climate is such it is almost impossible — and I believe the former Minister of Public Works will agree with me — it is almost impossible to build roads in this country which are going to stand up to the vagaries of our weather.

MR. SPENCER: Except at a very high cost.

MR. HOLLETT: Incidentally, I have not got it here but I did take a clipping out of the Canadian papers — when I say “Canadian” I mean the Mainland part of Canada —

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is well put —

MR. HOLLETT: Where it gave the construction cost I think it was sixteen miles of road. The contract called for six hundred and ninety thousand dollars but the Government had to supply every bit of material which was used and had to supply some machinery used to build the road. And the contractor got six hundred odd thousand dollars for sixteen miles of road. I must bring that here and give it to the new Minister of Highways when he gets his commission.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How much a mile?

MR. HOLLETT: I forget what it was a mile—about sixty thousand dollars per mile. That is not heavy but when you remember all the asbestos all the gravel, crushed stone, machinery, water used, everything had to be supplied by the Government and put

on the spot you will find it came to much more—I would say it cost a hundred thousand dollars a mile.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, without wasting any more time of this House, that personally at any rate I am not against the principle of setting up a new Department of Highways if we can be assured by the Honourable the Premier that the extra cost to the people of this country is not going to be excessive. As a matter of fact if that is so it has my blessings, because I believe in the matter of administration of highways it should be the only thing that department would have to do. There should be nothing which would hamper the work of the Department of Highways because roads in Newfoundland today are of the greatest necessity. They are most essential if we are going to progress. And we know how backward we are with regard to roads. We are the worst province in the whole of Canada with regard to the state of the roads. I am not blaming the present Government. There are some people I might blame in the present Government for it, but I am not going to blame them for it because they have spent a good deal of money. I think I made a note of it somewhere — I think I have it here Yes. “The Best Eight Years Yet” from 1949 to 1956— they spent on capital and current account some sixty-five million dollars —Spent by the present Government in the seven or eight years —sixty-five million dollars—But fourteen millions of that money came from the Federal Government so that the people of Newfoundland actually at least the Treasury of Newfoundland actually spent fifty million dollars during the past seven or eight years on roads. Now fifty million dollars is a lot of money. We are told fifteen hundred miles have been built, how well built

we do not know. And I think the Minister would be the first to admit that some of these roads built by him, two, three and four and five years ago can scarcely be recognized today as roads, particularly after the hard winter we just had. That is not to my mind building roads, but just making a little thoroughfare through so people can get from one place to another. That is not roads, and I am sure it is not the idea of the Minister as to what a road should be. Yet fifty million dollars were spent. So I say, the Government is going to need during the next four or five years a hundred million dollars if they are going to make any impression with regard to the improvement of the situation.

Personally I am not against the principle of the Bill, Mr. Speaker:

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, at the moment, from the information that is available, while I agree with my honourable colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, I do not feel that I have sufficient information to resolve in my own mind the necessity for the provision for a Department of Public Works and a Department of Highways. But it seems to me from what I do know that it is largely a question of the financial ability of the Government of the Province to pay for this new department. I can quite see, and I think, frankly, I would be guided by the advice of the Honourable Minister of Finance, who certainly in my opinion is capable of deciding or expressing an opinion as to whether it is desirable to have a new Department of Highways. Then again I think it is largely a question of finances and, as I say, ability to pay. Then, arising out of that too, of course, is the fact that while a large programme is suggested by the Honourable the Premier

in connection with road building, and contingent upon that is the large financial obligations of maintaining roads that are built, the whole thing involves I imagine, a colossal amount of money. And there again it is a question of whether it can be afforded. There are things that we would all like to have but we can't afford to have them. It is most desirable if it can be done without serious economic setbacks. And when we visualize a large road programme I am mindful of the fact that a little while ago the Premier made a remark—the job of the Government is to build roads and not clear them. Well, if there is a big programme of road building in a province like Newfoundland where there is a heavy snow problem for maybe five or six months of the year, if there is not sufficient provisions made to maintain these roads and clear them—snow clearing—it seems to me a large road programme should be viewed very very cautiously at this moment.

As I say, I feel hardly in a position to make an intelligent comment on it, but for what I do know at the moment, with my colleague I do not object to the decision of creating this department. I think that the thing is very largely a question of finance.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I am very much in the position of my friend from St. John's Centre—There are just one or two questions that have occurred to me. I feel that the Premier, when he is closing this will probably resolve them. The first point is, whilst it is desirable perhaps to have this thing in practice there is no doubt at all first of all they have to get men to head up that department. I subscribe entirely to the tribute paid to the former Minister of Public Works. It is a matter of regret that he could not be available to head up

this particular department because he has achieved a reputation not only in Newfoundland but in other parts of the Dominion for his knowledge of road building techniques and the work that is actually done. That of course is a problem which I presume has already been solved by the Government insofar as the person who is going to take the position is concerned.

But the second and more pressing point, Sir, is the question of how this is going to be paid for. It is all very fine to talk about a vast network of roads—that is fine—but that presumes vast sums of money—We have not as yet been told where they are coming from. We know that the head of the Government envisages huge sums coming in which can be capitalized, but these are still eggs that have not yet been laid—and going on past performances we must bear in mind that it is easy to talk about building roads but we have not been doing so well on maintaining the roads that we have. Only Monday night I was going out on the train and there was a gentleman sitting in the smoker as everybody does in our trains, and he was remarking very bitterly about the conditions of the roads in Bonavista North, of all places. Indeed he said it would be better if our member were not the Premier and did not have so much on his mind. Then I rode over the road from Clarendville to Bonavista—and that is no boulevard Sir, I could speak freely on that subject.

So we can visualize what it is going to mean if we enlarge the scope and extent of our roads. I am not saying we should not, mind you. I am not sufficiently informed to express an intelligent opinion it. But the minute we start building new roads, Sir, the problem of maintenance comes up.

As my honourable colleague said; there is the problem of keeping these roads open. We had a rather disheartening experience a few weeks ago when members of the Government had to advise their constituents—Well, we are sorry there is no more money left for snow clearing or for road clearing.

Now, Sir, these are the questions I think call for serious consideration. There is nobody but is going to say we should have a separate Department of Highways. I think the case made by the Honourable the Premier in introducing this Bill does not admit of too much dispute. The opinion is sound, the practical thing, Sir, is where is the money coming from to pay for it? If these questions are satisfactorily answered, I think, Sir, that this Bill is entitled to our support.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put I would like to add a few words to what has been said. I listened to what the Premier said and I must say that I remained unconvinced. I have here the estimates for the Legislature of Nova Scotia. I have here the Public Accounts of New Brunswick and the Public Accounts for New Brunswick show expenditure by the Department of Public Works that was over twenty-five million dollars—and they have only one minister.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Notoriously the most inefficient and extravagant road department from one end of Canada to another.

MR. BROWNE: It may be as the honourable minister says, but nevertheless it is a province with very fine roads.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The worst roads on the Mainland of Canada.

MR. BROWNE: In my opinion, some of the best roads in Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On balance the worst. Nova Scotia is notorious for bad roads.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the roads built in New Brunswick last five or six years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, their whole system of roads is fantastic.

MR. BROWNE: Well what do we see when we come to Newfoundland and ride over our roads.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have not got roads at all.

MR. BROWNE: That is the answer, Mr. Speaker. Now I have here a clipping from the "Daily News," February 15, an interview given by the Premier when requested for clearing snow:

Premier Smallwood said Thursday, "His Government has spent more than \$500,000 (Five hundred thousand dollars) on snow clearing so far this year and no more funds will be available until after the Legislature can pass another allocation." The Legislature is not expected to sit until mid March at the earliest.

That was not correct—four hundred thousand dollars was all that was voted, including the one hundred and fifty thousand for which there was a special warrant," there is no more money available until the Legislature passes the allocation. "The Minister of Public Works and I have at least five hundred demands for at least five hundred communities for snow clearing work. There is nothing to do about it until the money is voted. It would take a million dollars to take care of these demands." He added, "the Government wants to build new roads not shovel snow off." "We have continuous snow."

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is generally true.

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the common sense of the people in this House today to look at it this way: What is the purpose of building roads in communities if people can't use them. It is the winter-time that people find their motor car the best asset they have, they can walk in the summer time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman surely would agree it would be a little tough for the people of anywhere you like with no roads at all to think that while they have no roads in other parts of the country not only have they got the roads but these roads are kept open for them all the year round. That is a little tough surely. The first thing is to give them roads and then have the plowing of roads.

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Speaker, let us look at this calmly and not get excited and carried away. I am not a bit carried away myself, and when we talk about a hundred million and twenty million a year it is like water off a duck's back. Where is he going to get a hundred million dollars. Let us be practical and sensible. He could not get a loan last year when looking for fourteen million, and could not borrow a cent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not so.

MR. BROWNE: The Government could not borrow a cent, and went to the Bank of Montreal and had to get an overdraft of nearly ten million dollars—Nearly ten million dollars overdraft at the Bank of Montreal. Now then, he told the people in that article that he could not shovel snow off the roads. I came across Blackler

Avenue this morning and my car went right down to the axle, right here within a half mile of the Highway Headquarters—my car was down to the axles going through a pool of water I suppose thirty feet long. As it happened I met the grader coming along and pulled in. They said they were going to break it down so that the traffic could go through. That is right here—and how many roads around the city right near where all your headquarters are, are neglected. They have been neglected. And what is the sense, I say, of building more roads if you cannot look after what you got at the present time?

This idea of setting up a new department does not seem to me justified by the arguments that have been used. The Premier says the former Minister of Public Works, it was cruel to treat him the way he was treated, to give him so much work to do; he is a physical wreck. It was unkind to leave him there and he had to take him out of it. Well now, he does not look a wreck—looking at him today he does not look a wreck. He looks anything but a wreck. He looks better, I think, than he did when he came in here. He certainly does not carry the weight today either in the Government nor on himself that he did. Nevertheless, he is a fine looking man today, despite the best eight years in spending money on the roads.

Now, Sir, the Government depends on this: The Government is going to look to either the Government of Canada to build roads or to go to the loan market to borrow money to build roads. Now, Sir, the first road programme in this country of any consequence—I am not referring to early days but as a Tourist Development Programme—was in 1924-25 under Mr. Monroe. Mr. Monroe started the

Highroads Commission which started in building roads. And that was carried on by the Government of Sir Richard Squires between 1928 and 1931 when we went broke. And we can go broke again building roads if they are beyond our means. Sure the people are clamouring for roads. People are clamouring for everything. There was an investigation made in the United States the other day. I suppose it took longer than a day to make it. But the investigation was between people getting thirty dollars a week as an income and people getting a hundred a week as an income—not a very high income in the United States. And when they went to sum up the results they found everybody said, if we could only get ten dollars a week more. Everybody wanted more—and that is the way it is with everybody and will be. Nobody is satisfied in this world because the only place we can be satisfied is in the next world.

MR. HIGGINS: That depends on where you are going.

MR. BROWNE: And the members of the Liberal Party, according to the honourable member for White Bay North, may feel their leader holds the key to the next world. But certainly he has no guarantee about this one, and he has no guarantee of getting all that money to satisfy all the demands.

Now I believe with this distinguished group of men here, Little & Company, analysing our industries I think he had better analyze the road situation before going into a road programme. I really believe it would be a good idea if it were within their province to have that company—they have a good reputation. They have done work for other provinces—and it

might be a good idea to get their opinion before embarking on another road programme that may land us really into the soup. The bond market I know is difficult because of high rates of interest that people are getting elsewhere, and nobody is tempted to buy Government bonds unless the interest is up above five per cent. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario are having that difficulty, and Newfoundland is going to have at least that difficulty. You have to think of that difficulty in obtaining money and the rate of interest.

So it seems to me it is not wise for the Government to talk about this, about a road programme twice as great as anything we have ever done here before.

Now, Sir, there is one word lacking in the Government's policy and that is the word "Economy." I suppose I should not refer to the Speech From the Throne Debate—I will forget about that. But it is felt by some we are too fearful about spending money. I do not think a Government can be reckless—in spending money. They must have regard for the future. They must weigh the thing properly and fit in into the whole picture, and the whole pattern—what the revenue is likely to be—and see that we can afford to do these things. It is all very fine to want good roads. We all want them. It is our argument that the Government made the initial blunder, the terrible blunder of going into state socialism in industries instead of building roads in the first place. If the Government had gone into the building of roads in the first place we might have a decent road across the country. We hear every now and then from the Tourist Director that he is not inviting people to come to Newfoundland because we have no roads

here. And he is wise in my opinion. Nobody coming here and bringing his car is going to put up with potholes and mud and dust from one end of Newfoundland to another. And when he goes back to the Mainland he says: "Thank God I am back on a good road." But he won't find it in Newfoundland because the roads are not here. And I think it is a disgrace for the Government that after their eight best years that they talk about they have not a decent road to drive over.

Now, Sir, the idea of having a separate minister, if it is not going to be any extra expense to the country can not be opposed to any great extent. Let us hope that it is not going to cost too much. But there has to be a deputy minister and staff and officers and messengers and all that goes with it, and it is certainly going to cost, as my colleague says, between fifty and a hundred thousand dollars a year, and that is a lot of money to set up a new department when we do not need it. I would like to see the Government reduce the number of ministers. As has been pointed out here today, the Minister of Provincial Affairs has practically nothing to do. Then again, that reminds me, he is away now on a trip. How many trips do the Government take? If the departmental work is so great how is it they can afford to spend such long holidays abroad. Take the past minister of Public Works and the present Minister of Public Works and the Premier and the Tourist Department Director, they spend a month in Jamaica in January—a whole month at least away, or six weeks away. Can the work of the department be so onerous that they can spend that length of time away? I do not think it is. No private businessman would leave his business if it were so very busy,

requiring his attention. The fact must be that they do not need the attention of the ministers. Then if they do not need the attention of the ministers it takes all the force out of the argument used by the Premier, that the minister was overworked, that he was broken down in health. I am sure he did not go down to Jamaica for the good of his health. I believe there was something else behind it. I am very curious to know why the congregation of ministers in Jamaica annually. Then the Minister of Public Works has been over to England inspecting roads made of clay. We have not seen anything else in this country only roads made of clay, and they are not very successful. So, Mr. Speaker, I really do not believe that this is a necessity that is being urged by the minister at all. And I hope—I know this thing is going to go through. There is not much we can do to stop it. But I hope that the Minister will give attention to the roads around St. John's that need attention. Here is the capital. It may or may not be as popular with some members who live here and get their living here as it might be or as other places might be. But it is the capital. It is the seat of the Government. It is the central business place for the country. It is the biggest city we have in the country. And to many of us it is our home. We were born and brought up here and we have some regard for it. We do not criticize other people's homes.

MR. SPENCER: You don't want to build roads to some of the other people's homes—No.

MR. BROWNE: We want this at least to be considered: That if this is the capital of the country the roads around it should be kept in good condition. And that is not being done.

It has been completely neglected. The Federal Government is taking the money of the fishermen of this country to improve the roads around Ottawa. They have a Federal Commission looking after the roads around Ottawa and the beautification. And the fishermen in St. Mary's Bay and St. Anthony and anywhere else contribute to making Ottawa the most beautiful city in Canada. Well, is there anything unreasonable that here around St. John's there should be good roads?

MR. SPENCER: Might I ask the honourable gentleman one little question? I appreciate his knowledge and ability to discuss this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I would like him to deal a little, before he closed the discussion, with the matter of roads in other sections of Newfoundland than St. John's alone. I am not at all against roads in St. John's and never have been, but quite the reverse. I have recognized certain things that I have been unable or we have been unable to do, but I am very certain that every time the honourable and learned gentleman wishes to discuss this question he says: "Why build more roads if we can't maintain them. I submit I would like it very much if the honourable and learned gentleman would discuss the roads around the country as well.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that that is a question. But I will draw the Minister's attention just to the roads in St. John's South, which is a very small district. Part of it is within the city. And we have the road to Cape Spear. I know there are not many people living there but in the section of the Blackhead Road it is terrible. Every time there is a rainstorm I have to phone Mr. Crummev and have this conversation. "Is Mr. Crummev there?" "No he is not"—"Is Mr. Cron there?" "No he is not."

—"Well then, let me speak to Mr. Lockyer he is always there" — Tell Mr. Crummey to send a grader or something to the Southside Hill"—

That goes on every time a rain-storm comes—people ringing up and complaining about the condition of the road? Now that should not be necessary. I know the road is very steep, and the Government will have to put a new road there, that is all there is to it, because it is costing too much money the way it is at the present time. Then Old Petty Harbour Road has been abandoned. It was there seventy-five years ago. I know that I went over it over thirty years ago. And it is impassable today.

MR. SPENCER: That was the only way you could get there at that time.

MR. BROWNE: That is the shortest way to Petty Harbour. The roads from the Goulds to Petty Harbour are a disgrace. Cars cannot pass, and all the time there are accidents. I do not want to get into a discussion of roads too much, but the Minister challenged me to start about others, and I am talking about the roads in my district which are neglected. There must be such roads in other districts. I am quite sure everybody got complaints. I do not think this is necessary but it is going to go ahead. And when the Minister is appointed let him consider wisely before embarking on any programme; that he will be able to maintain the roads that he plans to build.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said he had looked over all the departments and found that they ran between fifty and one hundred thousand dollars a year to operate. He was thinking, of course, of the cost of the salaries of the Minister and of

the Deputy Minister and possibly an Assistant-Deputy Minister and his own Private Secretary and the straight departmental headquarters staff, running to an annual cost of something between fifty thousand and one hundred thousand dollars a year. I think that is an accurate estimate that he has made. It is a simple matter of adding up the figures in the estimates.

Now, let us take the top figure of the two, being one hundred thousand dollars as the cost of the new department. That is to say whether we leave the Department of Public Works as it is now with one Minister responsible for buildings and roads or set up a new department the cost of setting up the new department, taking the top figure of one hundred thousand dollars a year. Now the expenditure will be about sixty-five million dollars expenditure during a year, and a new department costing a hundred thousand dollars will not be one per cent of the cost of running the Province. The cost of running Newfoundland is about sixty-five millions a year.

MR. HOLLETT: That is what we gather over here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The cost of one department, taking the top figure of one hundred thousand dollars—the cost of that out of sixty-five millions is not one per cent. It is not one half of one per cent. It is fifteen quarter of one percent. It is fifteen one hundreds of one percent. So that my answer to the honourable gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition when he said—if this is not going to cost much I will not oppose it. From that I take it he will vote for it, and I take it also his party will vote for this new department—if the cost is not too great. The cost will not ex-

ceed sixteen one hundreds of one per cent. It should not cost anything like one hundred thousand dollars for the Minister of Highways, a Deputy, two or three headquarters staff and private Secretary. That is all the additional cost there can be for that new department.

Now the honourable and learned member for St. John's East spoke very sensibly of maintenance. The question of maintenance, I am prepared to admit and I must admit, becomes almost as important if not as important as the question of building roads in the first instance. If you spend large sums of money to build roads and do not maintain them, more or less after the rate, it won't be many years before the money spent to build the roads has gone down the drain because the roads will just blow away, and you will find them scattered half a mile each side of the right-of-way in the shape of discoloured foliage on the trees. The roads will just blow away into dust and finally if there are not repairs and no maintenance there will be no roads left. So that obviously something must be done in the matter of maintenance. And obviously if a great programme of road building is to be embarked upon that must be accompanied at the same time by a programme of intensified maintenance—and that will be done because it must be done.

Then the honourable gentlemen, the member for St. John's Centre spoke about the question of snow-clearing. On the subject of snow-clearing obviously there is a limit to clearing obviously there has got to be snow-clearing. And equally obviously there is a limit to the amount of snow-clearing that can be done or at all events there is a limit to the amount of money that can be spent

on snow-clearing. It is equally obvious that the Government must build all the roads it can build, the Government must maintain, and maintain well all the roads it can maintain, and equally obviously must clear of snow for as many months as it falls for all the miles of road it can find the money to do it. But that again must form part of a great programme in Newfoundland, all three things, the building of roads, the maintenance of roads and if the roads are to be of value to people for the twelve months of the year then for so many months of the twelve the Government must clear the snow off the roads. If it is not done the roads become impassable and thereby slow down the economy of the Province to that extent. So clearly, obviously you must clear the snow. But all of it will cost an enormous sum of money and either we will find the money and spend it and provide this service to the people or we will admit to the people they are not worthy of it or we can't afford to give them the service that they get in nearby New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. Either they are as good as the people of Nova Scotia and are entitled to these services as they are or they are not or if they are we cannot afford the money. If so I think they will find a Government that will find the money for the purpose.

MR. DUFFY: I would be very glad to see that happen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Find a Government to do it: First we must fail to do it. Until we fail to do it I don't think the people will worry too much about putting us out and putting them in. Now the honourable member for St. John's South said a lot of things which were sensible and

practical but he said one or two things which were not, I think, as reasonable. He said that a tourist coming down here and driving across Newfoundland and running into mud and into dust and into potholes, and the roads are in a terrible condition—then he added—I took down his words—"It is a disgrace if after eight years we have not got better roads." Now in a sense that is true—that is in a sense that is true. It is disgraceful. It is scandalous perhaps. Perhaps it is not quite a scandalous matter. Perhaps it is not quite a matter of disgrace but a matter of deep regret that after eight years and after eighty years and after four hundred years we are still so lamentably behind the times. I was nearly killed in this very room in the National Convention for saying ten years ago that Newfoundland was fifty years behind the times in some things and in others even more than fifty years behind the times. Certainly it is regrettable. But now then the honourable gentleman is forgetting something. He is forgetting that in the past eight years literally hundreds of Newfoundland settlements have been connected up by roads. For the first time in the history many many hundreds of our Newfoundland settlements, which up to eight years ago you could not get to—in or out except by water, by boat, by helicopter—but now you can drive into or out of them by car or bus or truck. There are literally hundreds of such settlements which have been connected up by road. Take the St. Barbe Coast down there. Today you can get aboard a car at Corner Brook and drive on down to Bonne Bay. You could not do that years ago, but beyond Bonne Bay you can drive right on. And I drove down to Portland Creek and it is now another number of miles beyond Portland Creek.

MR. BROWNE: How many settlements are there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not now talking about the number of settlements. Now you can go down to the tip of the Peninsula and again you see quite a stretch of road building across the Strait of Belle Isle on the Southern Shore of Labrador and you can see the beginning of a new highway linking up settlements down there. Come down into Green Bay and you will find new stretches of road—not enough yet but still roads have been built. Come down to Notre Dame Bay and you will find scores and even hundreds of miles of new roads that have been built. Then come into Bonavista Bay and you will find the whole of the North Side of Bonavista Bay, except the section between Indian Bay and Hare Bay, and they will be connected this summer. The whole of the north side of Bonavista Bay for the first time in history has been connected up by road. Then go on beyond Cape Freels down the Straight shore and to Musgrave Harbour. Then there is a gap there to Carmanville. But that gap will be bridged this summer. In the meanwhile a road has been started from Carmanville up to Gander. So that in another year or so it will be possible to drive in that great circle. It has all been done in eight years. In nine or ten years that great circle, that vast Peninsula of all Bonavista North, the straight shore of all Fogo District, except for the islands of course, and coming up into the districts of Gander will be completed. Then again in Green Bay a large section of Notre Dame Bay a large section of roads have been built. Then again come into Trinity Bay. You got all Random Island. Today you can drive across a causeway on to Random Island and

make the great circle right around the island. Come up into Placentia Bay on the east side of Placentia Bay and you will find several roads have been built. I am coming to the west side in a moment. On the east side of Placentia Bay a number of roads have been built. I can think immediately of one that goes to Fox Harbour—a brand new road and another goes to North Harbour. I can think of several on the east side of the Bay.

MR. BROWNE: This Government built it in the last eight years?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, are we on the principle of the Bill or are we on the history of road building?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a little too late to ask that now after your honourable colleague spoke on the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I have allowed considerable latitude, I believe, to everybody.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes indeed, Mr. Speaker. Then go on to the west side of Placentia Bay, as the honourable member would tell you, virtually every settlement is connected to the highway which runs up through—and incidentally we have completed the circle of the highway on the tip of the Burin Peninsula. The Honourable the Speaker could tell you of the great sections of Fortune Bay connected by road. So as you go clear around this island you will find hundreds of settlements that have been linked together for the first time. Now go to these people and complain that their roads in stormy weather are muddy and in dry weather are dusty and in the busy season have some potholes and you will not get so much sympathy for another year or two, because they are so happy, they are so pleased to get the roads. They are not good

surfaces, certainly they are not hard surfaces, certainly not excellent roads but they are roads they can drive over, they can get back and forth over them. And they are not complaining. And I hold, I may be wrong, but I hold that in Newfoundland our first job in the matter of roads is to tend to this terrible isolation of the centuries which has left hundreds of settlements living there alone, unconnected with each other, I might say almost unconnected with Newfoundland. Their only road they had was the Atlantic Ocean. To break down that isolation, to connect, to make them part of our community of Newfoundland, that is our first job.

Now I am not saying for one moment that the Trans-Canada Highway is not important. I have never felt for one moment that the Trans-Canada Highway was not important. From the standpoint of timely necessity I know it is important. But from the standpoint of first things first, from the standpoint of "what shall the Government do first with its money in the matter of road building I have always felt that to link up these settlements, and I have never forgotten, there are our friends, there are the people who gave us Confederation, there are the people who put us where we are, and I think our first return, our gratitude, is to the little people in the little settlements all over this island. And I say, let St. John's wait—and she is waiting and she is going to go on waiting until we first link up the outports and give them a break for the first time in all their long history.

Now this department is going to cost, over and above what it now costs, the wages of an extra minister of the Crown, it will cost the wages

of an additional deputy minister and it will cost the wages of an additional private secretary to the minister and it will cost the wages of two or three or four more of headquarters staff that would not be needed if you just let things stay as they are in the Department of Public Works. And the cost for a great programme of road building will be, I think, admittedly—and I do not want to fall into the trap that Howe fell into when talking about a matter of scores of hundreds of million dollars when he said to somebody across the floor, impatiently "What is a million dollars." I do not want to say that and say, "What is a hundred thousand dollars." But I do say in an expenditure of sixty-five million a year if the Government proposed to spend another one hundred thousand dollars to set up what we hope will be a better programme of road building. I don't think we should pay too much attention to that small additional cost.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House 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 three of the clock. I must advise that His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, will be coming at 3.15 P.M. to assent to Supply.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Monday, at three of the clock.

WEDNESDAY, April 1, 1957.

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

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that it is expected that His Honour the Administrator will arrive at 3:15 of the clock to assent to the Supply Bill.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the Members of this House, and the people of Newfoundland, would want me to take special note of the eighth anniversary of the union of Newfoundland and Canada.

It would be a travesty on the truth not to acknowledge that this union has been a great and successful one. It is obviously one of the happiest unions seen anywhere for many a day. With scarcely an exception the people of Newfoundland are deeply pleased with Confederation. If they had to vote again on this subject their vote for union would be all but unanimous. I cannot imagine any other issue on which there would be such universal agreement amongst our people. There may be a few dozen in this Province today—I doubt that they would number a hundred persons—who would vote against Confederation.

This union, on the purely financial side, has been a blessing for the people of Newfoundland. In these past eight years the Government of Canada have spent in Newfoundland, according to my estimate, about six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000). A very large part of this great amount has been distributed directly amongst our people by the Canadian Government in social welfare and similar payments. For example, something over ninety million dollars (\$90,000,000) has been paid out in Family Allowance. Slightly more than thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000) has been paid out in Old Age Pensions, slight-

ly more than fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) has been paid out in Old Age Assistance, pensions to the blind, and so forth. These three direct payments to the people total the impressive amount of one hundred and thirty-five million dollars, and no tongue can tell the happiness that this spending has brought to thousands of our families in this Province.

In the same eight years during which, according to my estimate, the Government of Canada have paid six hundred million dollars into Newfoundland they have taken out of Newfoundland, in taxes and the like, according to my estimate, something like three hundred and fifty million dollars (\$350,000,000). They have thus paid out to the Government and people of Newfoundland an amount of at least two hundred and fifty millions (\$250,000,000) more than they have taken from us. It will be clear to every Member of this House that the distribution of this vast sum has played a great part in raising the living standards of our people, for it must be remembered that a very large part of what Canada has paid into Newfoundland has been paid to the neediest part of our population and has been very widely distributed throughout the hundreds of settlements along our coastline; whereas the money that Canada has collected from Newfoundland has, in very large part, been collected from those who are best able to pay.

Confederation has not solved all of Newfoundland's problems, and it never will. The most that Confederation can be expected to do for Newfoundland is to help create for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders an opportunity for self-improvement; an opportunity for Newfoundlanders themself-

ves, as new Canadians, to solve their own personal and provincial problems. Great strides have been taken along this road of self-help and self-improvement. Greater strides will yet be taken.

These have been eight fateful years, Mr. Speaker, "the best eight years yet." But these eight years past have been but a prelude to what is coming. The best is yet to be. With the resources that Providence has bestowed upon us and the indomitable ambition of our people, nothing but world disaster can hold us back. We are destined to be one of the great Provinces of Canada. Let us all work to achieve that destiny.

Presenting Petitions

MR. SHEPPARD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of the people of Bristol Hope in the electoral district of Harbour Grace that electric services be extended to that settlement as well as a telephone pay station.

That main transmission lines of the United Towns Electric Company pass within one mile and a half of this settlement, and likewise the communication lines of the Avalon Telephone Company.

This, Mr. Speaker, is one of the oldest and historic settlements in our country, and it is my opinion that they at least deserve electricity and telephone services.

In presenting this petition, Sir, it is my hope that the prayer of the petition will be granted. I ask that the petition be tabled in this House and referred to the appropriate department.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

MR. SHEPPARD: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to present a petition on behalf of certain residents of the settlement of Spaniard's Bay in the electoral district of Harbour Grace, praying that improvements and rebuilding be carried out on the road leading from Spaniard's Bay to New Harbour.

That, Sir, is a very important road link between Conception and Trinity Bays.

In presenting this petition I ask that the prayer of the petitioners be granted and that it be referred to the appropriate authorities. I understand that the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs will also support this petition.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Supply): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure indeed to support the petition presented by the honourable member for Harbour Grace.

I happen to know the road in question, very, very well and have known it for a long time and have travelled it frequently for the last twenty years. But apart from the importance of the road, during recent years it has become increasingly more so for economic reasons, habilitation if you like, of the people around New Harbour. Dildo and Chapel Arm, especially since the increase in importance of the factories in that district.

This road is one of the great arterial roads, if you like, connecting up the south side of Trinity Bay with Conception Bay. I support very heartily indeed any step that may be taken to put this road into the best possible condition, so that the people may be furthered in carrying on their work.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

His Honour, the Administrator, arrived in the Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: Your Honour, it is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty dutiful and loyal subjects, Her faithful Commoners in Newfoundland, to present Your Honour a Bill for the appropriation of Supply; granted in the present Session.

HIS HONOUR, THE ADMINISTRATOR: In Her Majesty's name I thank Her loyal subjects, accept their benevolence and I assent to this Bill.

His Honour, the Administrator, left the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

MR. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Department of Public Welfare for the year ending March 31st, 1956.

HON. C. H. BELLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table of the House the Report of the Matters Transacted by the Minister of Labour during 1956, under the provisions of the Labour Relations Act and also the Report of the Newfoundland Labour Relations Board for the year 1956 and also a report of the Proceedings of the Minimum Wage Board established under the Minimum Wage Act, covering the year 1956.

Notices of Motion

None.

Notice of Questions

Notice of Questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Browne and Mr. Hollett.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (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 Act."

I give further notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education (Teacher's Training) Act."

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

HON. M. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies Licencing Act."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: On the last day of sitting I gave notice of motion, and I was notified that instead of appearing as it should appear now it appears almost at the entire end of the Orders of the Day. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this should be proceeded with at this particular time. This was a motion for the production of the books and accounts, including ledgers, bank statements and cheque stubs and order books and reserve books of Superior Rubber Company. Mr. Speaker, I did not know whether the Minister of Economic Development would supply those books and documents and so I put it in the form of a motion. If he will supply them I will be satisfied to let it go without any debate. But I submit first of all, Your Honour, that it should come first because I have here a copy of the House of Commons Debate for March 31st, where four similar motions are given at the first of the sitting, after questions are asked. I will send this to Your Honour to inspect.

MR. SPEAKER: Would that be on private members day? Yes that is on Wednesday. The honourable member's motion will receive precedent and be the first to be called.

MR. BROWNE: Well, perhaps the Honourable Minister of Economic Development could tell us.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: He asks for an explanation.

MR. CURTIS: He had an explanation and has now no right to ask anything further.

MR. HIGGINS: That is rather hard-hearted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Just trying to keep order.

Answers to Questions

QUESTION No. 53: Mr. Hollett (See Appendix).

MR. HOLLETT: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker; May I ask the Honourable Minister of Labour, is the Government proceeding with a review of the Logging Act as suggested in the answer I just received?

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, yes, the whole matter is being studied now at the departmental level. We decided, after considering the recommendations passed to us by the Woods Labour Board that all legislation as it presently stands to be revamped. I have written the Woods Labour Board in time for their last meeting and suggested that next year we would be bringing forward different legislation or revamping the legislation. I said to the Board: "If you can give any

pressing reason why the amendment they recommended should come forward this year I would bring the matter before the Cabinet and see if it can be felt agreeable or would the Board reply if the matter were important to stand over for further study by the three departments concerned."

HON. J. T. CHEESEMAN (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table the answer to QUESTION NO. 54 and also the answer to QUESTION NO. 55. If I may I should like to give the answer to QUESTION NO. 49, Standing over on Friday. (See Appendix).

QUESTION NO. 51: (See appendix).

MR. CHEESEMAN: That document is by far too long for me to read so that I will be glad to pass it along to you. (See appendix).

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Public Works has the answer to

QUESTION NO. 22?

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table the answers to Questions No. 15 and 22. (See appendix).

QUESTION NO. 56.

MR. CURTIS: I would ask that that question stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other answers to questions?

Orders of The Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before entering on the Orders of the Day I wonder if the Premier would like to make a statement whether we will get legislation brought down this year in connection with Javelin? I understand Mr. Doyle has issued a

circular saying the Government is preparing—

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Government is not preparing—the legislation has been more or less prepared at least in draft form by lawyers of Canadian Javelin and Pickands and Mathers and they have been here and have been in consultation with the lawyers of the Attorney General's office in an attempt to have agreed legislation. They have now returned, bringing it to Cleveland with them to Javelin's offices with our suggestions and suggested changes and amendments. If they are agreed they will come back. So the negotiations will flow back and forth. Whether that will all be done in time for this session is really more than I know. I think the onus is on them to have their legislation ready before this House closes. It is up to them to have it ready. We will be anxious to expedite them, but I would not feel like asking all the members of this House just to stay open longer than otherwise necessary if they have not the legislation ready for the attention of the House. On the other hand I would hesitate to have a long adjournment and bring members back perhaps in the midst of a Federal Election or perhaps in the summer. After an extremely hard winter we are all looking forward to a little more sunshine. I had ten or twelve days in Jamaica, but that seems like years ago. I have gone through a couple of winters here in St. John's since I got back from Jamaica. I do not think any of us would want to come back for a special session. These are the alternatives—Keep the House open for a long session or have a long adjournment and bring the members back—or else prorogue the House and have a session in the summer. I do not think any one of these three would be very desirable.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, on that, does the Honourable the Premier mean by that that no action will be taken by the Government to the up and coming legislation of Javelin before the companies—before the House—What I mean to say is—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would like to know what the honourable gentleman means.

MR. HOLLETT: It is no trouble to know: What I want to know is will the Bill first be okayed by the House before any action is taken by the Government to implement the provisions in the up and coming legislation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can't understand that—I only say there is only one way laid down by the Constitution for enactment of legislation. All legislation is enacted by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor by and with the consent of the Legislature Assembly. I do not know any other way for legislation to be enacted when it is enacted. The Governor gives the Royal assent. What the Government does, the Queen's Ministers is subject to the confirmation of this House.

MR. BROWNE: Arising out of that explanation, may I ask the Premier if any agreement has been made or contemplated between Javelin and Pickands Mathers which would come here for confirmation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The matters that are under negotiation between Pickand Mathers on the one hand and Javelin on the other hand and the Government on the other hand and the Government of Newfoundland are matters of legislation. These matters are not yet brought to a point where they can be brought before this House. In the meantime nothing is happen-

ing other than that negotiations are being carried on.

First Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Department of Public Works."

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

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, is that in order, to introduce that now—I have here just brought to my attention a few minutes ago procedure for the Orders of the Day—and the Standing Orders say begin with third readings, Committee of the Whole, Second reading and motion to which notice had been given by the Government.

MR. CURTIS: We can change that order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Premier or some person in the Government designated as Leader of the House, I believe this year being done by the Attorney General, has to my knowledge always, after the Orders of the Day are called, called any item on the Order Paper which he wishes. That was the procedure during the past eight years in this House, and it has not been questioned here before.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to question it now. Why have we got Standing Orders unless they are adhered to. Unless there is agreement to a change in the order here it seems to me we should follow what is here.

MR. SPEAKER: Normally—But the Government does have the right, after the Orders of the Day have been called to call the items—the Honourable the Attorney General has this day been calling the items. I presume he is doing so as Leader of the House.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter this debate, and I sincerely hope it is not a bad omen that I happen to be speaking in the debate on the first of April. There are some disadvantages to be derived from the old name adhering to the first of April, but if there are some disadvantages I am quite sure they will be outdone by the advantages which must arise in our thoughts when we think of the day being the anniversary of our Confederation with Canada.

Sir, it gives me very much pleasure indeed to align myself with previous speakers in offering sincere congratulation to you on your appointment as Speaker of this House. I have sat with you for the past five years at the lower end of the Chamber, and I think I learned enough about your habits and your ability during that time to feel quite satisfied that you will acquit yourself well of the honour which has been bestowed upon you.

I would like also to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. It is a very great honour to be requested to move and second the Address in Reply. It is not only an honour to the individual concerned but it is also a signal honour to the districts they represent. We all know both the Honourable member for Harbour Grace and the Honourable member for Bell Island did an excellent job in moving and seconding the Address in Reply.

With some regret, Mr. Speaker, I find on coming into this House again this year, Mr. Speaker, the same old question being brought to the floor of the House, particularly the Debate on the Address in Reply, the question

of the same old cleavage between St. John's and the rest of Newfoundland.

MR. HIGGINS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MERCER: I regret it has been brought in. As far as I am concerned the people living in St. John's originated from the same places as the people living in the other parts of Newfoundland whether it was in Wales, Scotland or Ireland. As far as I am concerned, I have a great pride in the city of St. John's, and when any of my friends come here from abroad I am very glad to show them the pride I have in the City by taking them to various parts of the City where they can have a full view.

Now with regard to the Speech from the Throne itself, I noticed that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition spent some time in discussing the Speech from two points of view really; one that there was nothing of any importance in the Speech—In fact I think he said that he felt that the mover of the Address in Reply must have done a wonderful job on it because of the fact that he made such a great speech on the Throne Speech in which there was nothing. The Honourable Leader mentioned the fact that there was nothing there about the new industries apart from the economic analysis; nothing about economic development, nothing there about agriculture, nothing there about forests and particularly, as he said nothing there about the very important industry, the fisheries. Well, he was very sorry to see that, in fact he was absolutely disgusted. I presume that only members of the Cabinet can give the true reasons as to why these industries are not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne this year, but as a back bencher, as an ordinary representative of the people and as hav-

ing been a member of this House for the past five years, or has it been six, I feel there is a very simple explanation for its being not there. These various industries have been the subject of discussion and debate here in this House every year for the five years I have been here, and I believe they have been mentioned in every Throne Speech during that period. They were mentioned and debated here for a very good reason—and I am going to point out in a moment or two the equally good reason why it is not mentioned in this year's Throne Speech—When this Liberal Government took office in 1949 it was in the position of having something over forty million dollars in the Treasury—It was a fortunate position—I suppose—It was a fortunate position—I suppose if the present Government had continued from 1949 until now doing the same as the Commission of Government who had done it for sixteen years, if they had done that we would probably now have eighty million dollars in the Treasury and no debts. But this Government found itself faced with this in 1949 when it took over: A fat treasury and an impoverished Newfoundland. They found that after sixteen years of Commission of Government, apart from some hospitals, a start being made on cottage hospitals, they found that very little else had been done. A programme of health, for instance—the additions to the General Hospital had been built mostly all since 1949. The Commission of Government did nothing about any additions or expansions to the Mental Hospital. The Commission of Government had done very little from the point of view of surveys for minerals. Oh, they would send fifteen or twenty people in two or three different parties two or three months in the summer season, that is all. They had done

nothing from the point of view of trying to develop any minerals. They had done very little from the point of view of building schools. They had done nothing from the point of view of conservation in forestry. They had done nothing for agriculture, apart from two or three loans to a couple of fresh fish companies they had nothing with regard to any programme for the fisheries. They had done nothing on roads in Newfoundland either for construction or reconstruction.

MR. BROWNE: Nothing?

MR. MERCER: Comparatively nothing, put it that way. At least compared with what we have done in the past eight years and still have set out to do now the Commission of Government had done comparatively nothing. They had done nothing to encourage cultural education the children who were then at school. When they took over in 1933 or 1934 the children who were then at school and who are of voting age today, they had done nothing to help them. In school they studied nothing to try to learn what was meant by Democratic Government, what was meant by Responsible Government and how we should go about trying to elect a Responsible Government. I remember, Mr. Speaker, at that time I was a student at the Memorial University College, it was then, with my honourable and learned friend, the member for St. John's East, and I used to write letters to the paper expressing the fact that this was a good opportunity now for the Commission of Government, who were independent of all voters and independent of the people, entirely a good opportunity for them while they would be in office to start a civic class in every school in Newfoundland and to instruct teachers accordingly, send out pamphlets and literature, in other

words to start a miniature political science course in every school by study, like my honourable and learned friend studied political science, I think it was under Professor Fraser, the political set-up of countries all over the world. This would be a study of the political set-up as it had been in Newfoundland and which we expected to come back to. I wrote letters and signed myself "M.U.C. Student" until the late Doctor Paton, then president, said one morning in assembly that somebody had been writing in the papers and signing "M.U.C. Student" and would this person report to his office. I did and told him I was the culprit. He said: "Look here, Mercer, I have been reading your letters and so have the people, and now I have instructions of the Government that these letters must be stopped or cannot be signed "M.U.C. Student." The Government pays all the expenses of the University—Now for heaven's sake stop signing your name "M.U.C. Student" or we won't have any coal to keep the place running; but keep on writing the letters." So that instead of the Commission of Government trying to do something to help people learn something about Responsible Government they were discouraging them. That continued until 1949, so that when this Government took over in 1949 it found itself, as I say, financially in a beautiful set up in Newfoundland but industrially and from the point of view of education, from the point of view of health, from the point of view of roads, it was an absolutely impoverished country.

I think that is well borne out by the fact that in 1949 and 1950 the first thing that this Government found itself faced with was to institute immediately a temporary Public Works programme to keep people from having to go back on the dole as they

were in 1932 and 1933. Yet for all that we had forty million dollars in the Treasury.

Now, as I said, had this Government in the past eight years carried out that same programme we would have eighty million dollars today but we would have less people in Newfoundland than we have today, because they could not stay here, we would not even have the roads that we do have, we would not have the health programme that we do have, we would not have any of the preventive health programmes that we have; we would not have nearly the schools that we have now, if we had carried on along these lines. But instead this Government began to bring in in each Speech from the Throne, as I remember, programmes for agriculture, for forestry, mineral development, fisheries, health and so on and so on, with the result that we had a Royal Commission appointed by this Government to the fisheries, agriculture, into forestry.

MR. BROWNE: And pensions.

MR. MERCER: And pensions—These Commissions brought in their reports. These reports were debated and a programme was drawn up, the course was set. Now having set the course on these various industries there is no necessity to repeat them in the Speech from the Throne debate this year and to keep on repeating them. It is only repetition. Having had the Commissions, made the investigation, having debated them here, having gotten the programme going, having had the necessary legislation brought before the House and debated and finally passed and having set the course and embarked upon it as far as these industries are concerned, now it is only a matter of this House voting the necessary money for this year

to continue it into effective operation. Therefore, why have it in the Speech from the Throne?

Instead, Sir, the Government this year, as far as I can see from reading the Speech from the Throne, decided upon a new course. They are not satisfied with what they have done or just to carry on developing what they have already done. They are not satisfied with that at all. Let us carry on with all that but now let us go on another course, and this course, the particular one I am going to refer to here in my few words is a road programme. It is not a new course, it is merely a concentrated effort on what the Government has already been doing during the past eight years. It is because of this road programme included in this Throne Speech that I consider this Throne Speech this year one of the most important speeches from the Throne ever read in this House. The road programme is one of the reasons, I will give you another one later.

Mind you I may not be understood by all the honourable members of this House when I say that, as I quite conceive now that I am not being understood by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I will be understood by the member from Fortune-Bay-Hermitage, by the member from Burgeo and LaPoile and by the member from St. Barbe District, White Bay North and South, Green Bay, Twillingate and Bonavista North, and in a moment or two we will see why I am bound to be understood by these ten at least and maybe others. I believe, Sir, I would be completely understood by every honourable member of this House if each one of them were to accompany me around Fogo District; I sincerely hope I shall be excused for using Fogo District as an example of why I con-

sider that this Speech is of such great importance because it is included in it this road programme. For example, Sir, just think of places like Island Harbour, Hare Bay and Deep Bay on the Western Side of Fogo Island, only about ten or twelve miles from Fogo proper and yet they might just as well be one hundred miles from nowhere, and places like Aspen Cove and Ladle Cove only ten or twelve miles from Musgrave Harbour and might as well be nowhere; places like Carmanville, Roddickton, Fredricton, Noggin Cove, Main Point, Victoria Cove, Beaver Cove, Horwood North and South, all these places, Dog Bay and Gander Bay, you might as well be nowhere as to be living in one of these places for this reason: You can only get there or get out of it during two or three months of the year, two or three months of the summer season. Mind you, not every day then, if there is a heavy wind blowing on shore, and that can be anywhere from southeast to northeast, you cannot get on shore at all and if you are on the shore you cannot get off unless you want to travel through twenty or twenty-five miles of brush wood and marsh. If the wind has gone down and it is quite calm and then a heavy sea rolls in you still cannot get on the shore or get off it. Now think of yourself being in these places and becoming seriously ill, and you cannot get out of it to get a doctor nor can a doctor get in to see you, you cannot get to a hospital, cannot get in or out of it by boat and you have no road. You cannot get a teacher to go there to teach school because there is one thing, a teacher told me in Victoria Cove (and Victoria Cove is in Gander Bay one of the largest settlements) Mr. Rowe, as a matter of fact, who had been there for seven years came from Heart's Content originally, and he pointed out to me, if he

were not as old as he is now and if he were not married there and settled down with his family, and taking part in the community life and really finding he belonged to the place, if he were not in that position, in this day and age, he said, he would never go to Victoria Cove to teach school unless he was a confirmed missionary. He pointed out to me that they are not going to get teachers to go into these places unless they have a sincere and heartfelt feeling that they are cut out for missionary life, simply because you cannot get there and cannot get off it.

I sincerely hope, Sir, that during this five-year term the Government will develop this road programme to such an extent that I can stand by the mouth of the Gander River in the bottom of Gander Bay and looking out the bay to Black Head, Victoria Cove, Horwood North and Horwood South, and see them connected by road down to the Gander River and on the right Carmanville Road connecting beyond Fredricton, Ladle Cove, Noggin Cove, Aspen Cove, Main Point, Davidville and Gander Bay South, connecting all to the river and from there to Gander Airport Road.

That, Mr. Speaker, alone is going to mean at least one hundred miles of road—I can imagine going through the mind of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition right now—If you are going to have a hundred miles of road down in Fogo District and that is going to cost fifteen or twenty thousand dollars a mile, that is two million dollars you are going to throw down in Fogo District. But I say, Sir, if I had two million dollars to spend on roads down in Fogo District in the next five years and if all the other districts which I have mentioned, which I think are the worst off in this country, had two

million dollars each spent on them, that is twenty million dollars, and it would only then be bringing these districts up just near a level with the roads existing in Bonavista, Burin Peninsula and Avalon Peninsula. I am not just taking St. John's either, but it would be only bringing this part of the country up near these three peninsulas.

There are some seventeen settlements in Fogo District, and there are some thirteen settlements in this district in absolute, complete isolation apart from the odd time two or three months in the summer when they can get in and out by boat. I hope something will be done about it during the next five years. Then we could have good schools and we could have good teachers and churches and we could have a fair, at any rate, transportation of goods, and services. For example, I was in Gander Bay, Victoria Cove, one day last September when the Motor Vessel Bonavista came in. She comes around every two weeks. That is their only means of getting freight or mail or transportation. When she came in she had to anchor about a half mile off because it was blowing too hard to get in nearer, and it was blowing too hard for boats to go out and take their freight. They waited all day and as the wind was not abating and she could not be held up, off she goes. So that they got no freight and the people had to start going hand to mouth and door to door sharing with their neighbors until the next boat, and hoping to God that the next time it would be calm.

MR. HIGGINS: It is as bad as living on Bell Island.

MR. MERCER: I believe it is worse. Then again by having the roads linked up how many cultural advantages

there would be to the people in being able to visit with people in other centres, think of the broadening of view there would be for the people. The people would soon begin to feel that they are all as one in Newfoundland. They might even begin to feel that they are almost one with the people in St. John's and we would not just have this cleavage.

MR. HOLLETT: They would be all parasites then.

MR. MERCER: That is when you would again begin to deparasite yourselves. Think of the economic growth that can be stimulated by these roads, because in the area from Gander Airport down from the country towards Carmanville is a very, very fine stretch of timberland, a fine stretch of fertile land, and I am sure a lovely stretch of fertile land where settlements would grow up. Now I could go on and on and on and give the various advantages of this road system of which I am speaking now, apart altogether from relieving the conditions under which the people have to live down there now because of roads.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I hear members of the Opposition talking about wanting to have better and improved roads around St. John's area and advising the Government to go slow on their road programme in various parts of Newfoundland, when I hear that I really begin to feel almost like Reilly on television,

MR. HOLLETT: To a point of order there, Mr. Speaker,—That was not heard from this side of the House—No such statement.

MR. MERCER: Go slow on these roads. Think of the bad roads we have around here. That is the impression I got from this side. When

I think of that and I look at that little triangular strip of land lying between Petty Harbour and going to Cape Spear and on to Pouch Cove and then South to Portugal Cove and to St. Phillip's and St. Thomas's and back to St. John's again, when I look at that little strip of land and I find anywhere from one hundred to one hundred and fifty miles of road on that little strip of land, practically every fellow's garden on that little strip of land is crossed by a road leading to St. John's, and then takes in the District of St. John's West and St. John's South and St. John's North and I believe St. John's East, that narrow triangle of land with no more people living on it, at least no more settlements on it, and with anywhere around from one hundred to one hundred and fifty miles of road, and compare that piece of land with the vast expense that there is in Fogo District on the mainland part alone, forgetting altogether for the moment, Fogo Island, in that part of the Mainland which is Fogo District, put that parcel of land down in Fogo District, in Ladle Cove and we would not use it to put a lobster trap on, not big enough. Yet it has a hundred and fifty miles of road, or at least one hundred and thirty. Now I have nothing whatsoever against the people living on that strip of land, they are a very fine type of people. I know lots of them. Lots of them are my friends, I think they will be as quick to tell you, Sir, that I cannot see where the people on that piece of land have produced or had in any way helped to build up the economy of Newfoundland over and above the people of Fogo District. I doubt very much if they have contributed nearly as much to the economy of Newfoundland. Yet they have roads and roads criss-crossing all over the place, bad though they be, I agree.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder could I ask my honourable friend a question. Does he think Bell Island, which is probably just about the same size of Fogo and perhaps not as large should not have any roads at all?

MR. MERCER: Bell Island could go into Gander Bay in only a little corner.

MR. BROWNE: Should they have roads?

MR. MERCER: They have roads. They have a cottage hospital.

MR. BROWNE: No, they should.

MR. MERCER: They have nurses and doctors and if things go wrong a helicopter to fly them over. Sure, they have everything over there, and what they have not my honourable colleague is going to have for them, he says.

Now what I said up to this point about Fogo District, Mr. Speaker, applies, I believe equally well to the ten districts I have named, and perhaps it applies to St. George's South and St. George's North and Humber East and West, I do not know, and it may apply to other districts as well. Certainly I think it applies more so to the districts to which I referred. Along with this programme of road development—and this is a suggestion I am going to make to the Government—I suggest that the Government should consider at the same time as they are planning a programme of road construction a plan for airstrips around the country, in various parts of Newfoundland. Because I think the building of air strips, at least ten or a dozen or more air strips the building of them at various points in Newfoundland should go hand in hand with road construc-

tion programme. I do not know if the air strips are partly responsible to the Federal Government or not, but I do know that the Federal Government contributes towards them, fifty-fifty, my honourable colleague says, and they have to be built in accordance with Federal Government Standards. I suggest also the Government should impress upon the Federal Government the necessity of planning with the Provincial Government the air strips at the same time as the Provincial Government is planning the road programme.

Then another thing which I want to suggest to the Government in connection with this road programme, and that is the relocation of certain settlements in Newfoundland. I do not think that any road programme will be thoroughly planned, not on the overall, without having first exercised every possible means of inducing and encouraging people to move from certain places to others. Now to give an example, Mr. Speaker, I know off hand right now of at least ten places in Fogo District where the people should leave and go to Carmanville. Carmanville is one harbour on that coast. Anywhere from Fort Albert down Dog Bay and Gander Bay and down the strait Shore to Lumsden, Carmanville is the harbour where you can get in and out most of the time. I am going to suggest also, as one of the ways of encouraging and inducing people to move there—and I know I am going to be called a wild man for saying this—would be that the Government should build the houses for these people at Carmanville, free of charge and move them—free of charge because if the people from these ten settlements were moved to Carmanville I can see, one hundred miles of which I was talking about for the

district fifty miles of road construction would be saved. So that I have already cut my budget from two million dollars to one million. Now if the Government can save a million dollars on people being moved, just on the construction of roads, then I think these people should have homes built for them and they should be shifted free of charge. The Government would save money on road construction alone to say nothing about the maintenance of roads in the future, there again I suggest to the Government that they should also impress upon the Federal Government that they should come in with the Provincial Government and help financially to move these people, for this reason: In all these eight or ten places sometime during the next five years I am going to have a public wharf and a public building—in every single one of them if the people are there. Now you take all of these wharves as you go through that district and go into little places with ten or fifteen or twenty families and here you find a wharf anywhere from a hundred feet long to seven hundred feet long, and you cannot build a wharf out across the bay for seven hundred feet for nothing. Now if the Federal Government would save the building of public wharves in all these ten places and the building of a Post-office and whatever other public buildings they build, if they are going to save money on the construction of these things, to say nothing, again, of their future maintenance, surely they should be able to be persuaded to come in financially with the Provincial Government to help these people move.

MR. HOLLETT: May I interrupt to ask the honourable member a question: Is he aware of the fact that the people in these ten places are anxious

to leave these places? Do they want to leave?

MR. MERCER: I had two and a half weeks going around Fogo District last September. I packed a lot of information into my head during that two and a half weeks. I visited every single one of them. I did not ask that question, I was told it by the people from several of the settlements of which I spoke, that they would be tickled to death to move. At that time, I believe, and I believe this is public knowledge, this Government was offering four hundred dollars to families to move. In those times, when you have to try to get a boat to get through the mountainous seas, a man should not move his furniture for four hundred dollars. That seems to be their only obstacle. The people were very anxious, the people were practically praying to me about it. But the feeling was—I am thirty-five, I am married, I have children growing up with no schools to go to, shift me to Lewisporte, Carmanville or some other central place where I am on the mainland and can get going and my children can get to a decent school. This one district is an example of places like Carmanville, a very central place, where there could be a small town, a cottage hospital, decent schools and churches, and then it would have this forty or fifty miles of road. At the same time there would be little or no disturbance to the people, who are fishermen. They might be shifted to Carmanville because at Carmanville it so happens they would be near their fishing grounds as they are at the present time—so that there would be little or no disturbance to the people. There is every advantage in God's World for it, and I believe a little expenditure of money getting such a programme going and inducing and en-

couraging every single one of the people in eight or ten settlements to move to Carmanville. Carmanville is going to be a good town, and of course, if they get the road from Clarenville to Gander, which is absolutely necessary for that part of the Province—So that the great advantages, it would be to the people and the great advantages it would be to education and the savings to the Government in the future these are reasons why I consider that this Speech from the Throne, when it included in it the road programme is one of the most important speeches ever read. Now I really believe it is really a part of the programme of road building, as I see it, the road programme broadened out to include the building of towns and have people relocated, broaden out the programme to that extent and it would probably include a report which may be made, I understand, by the Royal Commission on the Southwest Coast on an economic and social basis—I presume—I included these two districts in the ten which I referred to because of the fact that I feel they are suffering from the same isolation as all the other districts I mentioned. For that reason I feel that may be included into their report and their report included into this broad general programme. I sincerely hope at any rate. If nothing else, I sincerely hope we get that report. We will find it backs me up in what I say here this afternoon.

May we have a recess, Mr. Speaker?

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair:

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that my trend of thoughts would be broken by the recess and I would not know what to say when I

came back. Instead I find something else—something I forgot altogether, another part of the advantages to be derived from the Government embarking on a programme of road building.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman has forty minutes in which to speak.

MR. MERCER: I was speaking of this harbour of Carmanville, and I was speaking about a concentration of people in Carmanville and I was speaking of a road from Carmanville into Gander Airport—not exactly from Carmanville. You see I have to give this Government some credit for some roads done during the past summer. The Government did build a road and a very fine type of road, I think, about twelve miles long, from Carmanville over to about the centre, I would say, of the eastern shore of Gander Bay, coming out between Main Point and Davis Point. So from that Carmanville Road I mentioned the advantage of having a road run from there up to the Gander Airport and of concentrating people at Carmanville, now that gives not only all the advantages to the people there but at the same time to Fogo Island. It is obvious we can't—as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition unofficially suggested to me. "Let us put a bridge from Carmanville across to Fogo Island." We cannot expect the Government to do that, but it so happens there is a natural barrier between Fogo Island and that part of the Mainland of the Island of Newfoundland. There are quite a large number of islands, so that there is not very much sea, and no matter which direction the wind is in there is not very much sea. That would make Carmanville an ideal centre for all along the shore. Right now for instance the people in Fogo Pro-

per, which is really on the northern tip of Fogo Island, to get to Lewisporte have about eighteen hours run in a motorboat, when they can get there. But this programme of which I speak, would give the people of Fogo Island nine miles to drive over in their cars—and mind you there are quite a few cars on Fogo Island—across to Seldom and then about an hour's run in a boat, in fairly good water so that they can make trips almost any time because of the islands from Seldom across to Carmanville, then by motor car from there to Gander Airport. Look at the great advantage it would be in transportation of freight, goods and services for the people themselves on Fogo Island to have that road from Gander Airport.

As I say, I am not making a special plea at the moment for that road. I can probably do that by petition later on in this session, but it is one small part of the great advantages which can arise all over Newfoundland because of an intensive road programme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning to another part of the Speech from the Throne; the paragraph dealing with the appointment of the Royal Commission to take evidence and make recommendations with regard to the question of the civil service pensions. I am not going to say much on that because I presume the idea is the civil service pensions of the present and what appears now to be building up for the future—and I only know enough about it to realize that it is such a vast subject and an important one that I dare not talk about it until we get the recommendations of the Royal Commission. But while on it I would like this to be brought to the attention of the Government; and I believe this question was raised by the Opposition perhaps a year or

maybe two years ago—I am not sure who raised it, but I believe it was the honourable and learned member for St. John's East—one of the honourable gentlemen anyway on the other side—I sincerely hope the people to whom he referred do not have to wait for the recommendations of this Royal Commission before something is done—and I refer to some fourteen police officers, mostly sergeants, pensioned between the year 1949 through 1952. They were pensioned in this way, Mr. Speaker, and the problem comes up. Up until, I believe, 1952, the take-home pay of all police officers was made up in four different ways, first of all he had his basic salary, then he had these difference allowances. I think one was called Housing Allowance, one Living Allowance and one called some other allowance—four different outfits to make up his take-home pay. Now I think those allowances were started by the Commission of Government for the purpose, of course, of instead of increasing a fellow's salary they give him an extra allowance. Now it is easier to cut off an allowance at any time than it would be to reduce a salary. So that he had all these different allowances. In 1952 this Government made these allowances part of the basic salary with the result that a man who was pensioned before 1952 was pensioned on his basic salary—because pensions are not paid out on allowances—whereas a man pensioned after that was pensioned on the salary including these allowances. Now that makes this difference. Take two people of equal rank and an equal number of years service, and one was pensioned, say, the last week in March and the other the first week in April. The pensioned fellow in the last week in March got about eighty dollars a month pension because he was pensioned on his basic pay whereas a man

pensioned, after the same number of years service, on the first week in April is getting one hundred and twenty dollars a month because he was pensioned on a salary which included these allowances. Now I think petitions will be made to the Government in connection with that, and I think it was brought up by the Opposition, and I believe the Honourable the Attorney General has promised to look into the matter. I bring it up here only to suggest to the Government that I sincerely hope, and I hope I will have the support of the Opposition in this connection, that they will not have to wait until the recommendations by the Royal Commission into the whole fabrication of the civil service.

MR. HOLLETT: It is a select committee and not a Royal Commission.

MR. MERCER: A Royal Commission it says here.

Then, Sir, turning to the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne dealing with the present Federal Royal Commission on Term 29, of the Terms of Union. I consider, Mr. Speaker, that this is the most important Royal Commission that we have ever had or ever will have again in the future, from the financial point of view, as far as Newfoundland is concerned. It is another reason for my saying that this Speech from the Throne is one of the most important ever to be read, up to the present time at any rate, in this House. I feel quite satisfied in my mind, Sir, that it was impossible for any member of that delegation appointed in 1948 to deal with the Terms of Union with the Federal Government, it was impossible to get any body of men anywhere who would be able to forecast what would be required. Now there may be some difference of opinion on that. Some of the Opposition members might feel

that if they were there probably it might have been different. But whether they agree with me or not it is now water under the bridge, it is gone by, and it is now for us to co-operate one with another to do the best we can as this comes up now. Because undoubtedly this will be the last opportunity in this connection. We all know that Term 29 of the Terms of Union is very vague, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, was purposely left vague to give the Royal Commission which the Federal Government was to appoint, and which now has been appointed, an opportunity of a wider scope to interpret the meaning of the article in order to give it its widest possible at this time, to do the best they possibly can for Newfoundland. I believe that was purposely left vague.

Now I feel that we should all not only co-operate but go further than that. You see, as we have already been informed by the Honourable the Premier in answer to a question by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, we will not know anything about the recommendations of our own Royal Commission in preparing the arguments to be placed before the Federal Royal Commission, until the Federal Royal Commission have presented their report to the Federal Parliament. While I believe that, and I have confidence and faith in the individual members making up our own Royal Commission. I am not saying that now because I was the mover of the Address in Reply in the year in which this Commission was appointed by this Government. At that time I said in moving the Address in Reply that I considered that we would not be able to find any better men from the point of view of learning, from the point of view of experience in letters, from the point of view of experience in busi-

ness and from the point of view of experience in industry, that we could not find men better qualified to do the job of preparing Newfoundland's arguments for the Federal Royal Commission than were the men appointed. I said that then and I repeat it again now. Nevertheless, even though that is so, I feel that also that if you search the world and you got men on a Commission to present arguments, to dig up facts, there still may be something which would elude them, there still may be some points which were inadvertently missed, and even if no point is missed, even if they got every possible point they could possibly think of bringing up and their argument is very well done, still I am a great believer in having one hundred people present the same argument, repeat the same argument even from some different angle or even from the same angle, I still have great confidence in having a hundred people do it instead of one, I think it makes a much greater impression upon the persons who have to listen to it. I say that while this Federal Commission is sitting in St. John's, the Board of Trade, the various societies, the Fish Trade, individuals, anybody who thinks that he has a point or an angle at all should clamour, absolutely clamour with the Royal Commission to either be heard or to present a brief. Because I believe that those three men will be even more impressed by having the same thing come from various angles than by having it come from one direction only. I think we should do it in such a way that we should bombard the Royal Commission with arguments and put it so strongly to them and from so many directions that the Royal Commission would have to put their recommendation in such a way that the Federal

Government could not turn them down.

I think we should, this House, with regard to all the other items mentioned in the Throne Speech debate, we should forget all animosity, we should forget our differences between St. John's and the rest of Newfoundland, we should forget about saying that one part of Newfoundland may be more informed than the other, more enlightened, because the development of our fisheries all around our six thousand miles of coast line, the development of roads, the health of the people, the development of minerals, the preservation of the forests, the success of the ANL Company, the success of Bowater's, the success of the recommendations of the Royal Commission to the Federal Government is as much the lifeblood of St. John's as it is of Joe Batt's Arm and vice versa. It is our one chance to work together for the benefit of all of Newfoundland—Let us not let it slip by.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

OPPOSITION: Here! Here!

(Applause from Government and Opposition side.)

MR. WHELAN: Mr. Speaker, I feel first, Sir, I should offer you my sincere congratulations on your election to the high office of Speaker. It is indeed an office, Sir, that has grave responsibilities—the right of free speech, the right of each member to be heard in the public interest, the duty of seeing that all Bills and Resolutions affecting the public welfare are carried by the voice of the people, Democracy with all its rights and privileges should not only be preserved but furthered—and I am confident, Sir, your great sincerity and integrity will perform these duties well and with fairness on all sides. I would like to

say, Sir, and I believe I am only echoing the sentiments of all the honourable members of this House when I say, I wish in all sincerity I will lighten that task by complying to the best of my knowledge with the Rules of the House and by strictly adhering at all times to you, Sir, and to the rulings of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the Speech from the Throne we have considerable criticism of the policy of the Government. I suppose it is characteristic of an Opposition, it is their duty, and they say it is good for the Government to be criticized, it keeps them on their toes, makes them careful to avoid mistakes and generally helps in stabilizing Government policy. We have heard the new industries criticized, I believe, which must of necessity be a very long range programme, something that the future as well as the present would have to take care of—Take the mill at Corner Brook, the paper mill at Grand Falls, they were criticized, jeered at—look at them now.

At the time the trend seems to be towards more machinery and bigger machinery, more mechanization, more skilled mechanics and engineers, more engineering projects, more construction projects, in view of this should, as has been suggested by some of the criticism, should the machine plant be written off or would it be just pure optimism, to expect that in the not too distant future a generous section of the development and advancement will develop so that the facilities of the present plant will be inadequate? I think the same principle holds for most of the industries in this country. We have already millions of dollars worth of building materials, building cement, purchased in Newfoundland that would otherwise have to be im-

ported. I think that the value of the business to a community for an industry to accomplish does not depend so much or not entirely upon the profit it makes but rather in the service that it renders in the community, in providing and implementing the keeping of monies circulating, promoting local trade and keeping monies circulating at home and in off-setting imports. Most of our industries are already contributing in that respect. In fact most of the main countries in the world have reached their present state—Look at England—For centuries industrialized—We seem to be dissatisfied and pessimistic because it is not done overnight.

We had the argument too that the monies invested in these industries were spent, some of it wasted—I maintain, Sir, that this money was invested in the interest of our economy in the interest of our people, and it is already payable in dividends, some dividends indirectly, but helping to shape up and stabilize our economy and keeping a whole lot of our money circulating at home instead of having it sent out of the Province to develop foreign industries, help maintain foreign industries. Some of our industries will take years to develop. It is logical to expect that the energetic and consistent policy of this Government will devise and implement means to correct any mistakes that they have made in the industrial development programme, and I believe that over the next ten or fifteen or twenty years the people who work in industry in this country will make an honest and ample living from it, and they will be the ones to judge whether or not our money was properly invested.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the Government have been accused of neglecting the fisheries, or were over generous. It is

well known that the production of salt fish dropped off considerably in the recent years, since the beginning of the last war, I believe—but could the Government be wholly to blame for this, or was it caused mainly by a great surge of employment particularly on military bases? At the outbreak of the last war the fishery was by no means in a healthy state. Incidentally there was an upsurge of employment, there was ample employment, the lure of cash wages took a lot of our young men away from the fishery and a lot of older men. Many of the young fishermen joined the forces—This all left the fishery depleted and consequently we found a serious decline in the production.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—I hate to interrupt the honourable member. There is too much noise in the building. I do not know where it is coming from but would like it to be stopped. But would the honourable member please speak a little louder—Please continue.

MR. WHELAN: It does not seem likely that the Government could compel these fishermen to go back to their boats, even if they offered to pay them the same wages, they would probably prefer to work on the bases—There was a bit of adventure to it. It was something new to them. These were times of wars, and wars have strange effects on people's lives. There was uncertainty. There was tension. There was unrest. You could hardly expect a young man to stay home and go fishing. But the situation has changed now. A lot of these young men have married and have families and they want to go back fishing. I believe that they will go back as soon as they are satisfied that the fishery will offer them a sufficient return to support their families. I believe, Sir,

the day is not too far distant when these hopes will be realized. I feel sure this Government will do all in its power to revitalize the salt fish industry. I believe the salt fishery is still the back bone of that industry. In the reshaping and in the development programme should be included provisions that every encouragement be given those absent fishermen who want to return to their boats.

This present Liberal Government has shown remarkable drive and energy and has shown great initiative and imagination in pursuing a host of worthwhile enterprises. I feel confident they will be able to implement ways and means of providing this encouragement to our fishermen. Our fishermen of the past, our great fish killers were at one time the main bulwark of this country's economy. The history of our fishermen is a romantic one. It is a tale of courage, of self sacrifices, of dogged endurance and high adventure. It was a challenge, a challenge which brought forth great qualities in our people and produced some of the ablest and best, none greater on the face of the earth. I do not think, Sir, that this heritage should have been forgotten. We still have men with these qualities, and if they were given the incentive I believe they would still come forward.

Now, Sir, let us consider agriculture: Farmers in this country have always had their problems. They had plant diseases, insect pests, poor growing conditions, poor markets. Most of the other industries have their experts and trouble shooters. Business and financial houses have their cost accountants. But the farmer for most of his problems must depend on outside help. This help came in the form of Government services. That these services have been good we will not deny.

Government research has played a great part in overcoming plant diseases and insect pests and in developing fertilizers and in general advancing the science of agriculture. They have assisted the land clearing development and have advanced loans and so on. But one problem that has not been overcome is that of marketing. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that unless we tackle this problem with vigor and determination the present conditions of flooding our markets from the Mainland, from Prince Edward Island by high pressure selling, callous disregard of the welfare of our Newfoundland farmers on the part of some of our large importers, lack of organized systems of marketing will make it hard for the farmer, the small farmer in Newfoundland to survive.

The assistance that this Government has given in developing agriculture has been highly effective, and there is every reason to hope that the marketing problem will be solved. Then the way will be clear for the farmer to increase his rate of production and the value of our local agriculture produce to the economy of this Province will be greatly enhanced. There is something about the ordinary, the small farmer in Newfoundland: He grows his crops, raises his cattle, supports his family and works industrially on a small scrap of land that is limited sometimes almost to a stone's throw from his door. He produces from the soil. It has become a family tradition and a family heritage. It is something which must be preserved.

Now, Sir, on the question of roads—I am afraid I cannot agree with members of the Opposition who contend that road expansion should be limited to what we can maintain and keep in good shape during the winter.

I realize, Sir, that this is very important, extremely important, but I feel it is much more important that many new roads be opened up. Practically all of our development depends upon roads and upon road extensions. As I feel it, the most important thing is that many new roads be built, an extensive road programme of construction covering a period of probably four or five years would not likely give us what roads we need, but it would certainly put us in a much better position than we are now. I believe that after the Government has shown itself capable of constructing a new network of roads surely they will, surely we will give them credit for being able to handle the much lesser job of keeping them in repair and keeping them open.

I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to take this opportunity of subscribing wholeheartedly to a view expressed by the honourable member for St. John's North and that is that wherever practical we institute toll roads. I feel that this would have to be part of a long range plan for the reason that toll roads would have to be a very high standard. I feel that the scheme would meet with favour from all quarters. Any motorist would be glad to pay the toll, the relatively small fee for the privilege of having a fifty to one hundred mile stretch of excellent road to travel on. Another advantage of this system would be that the initial cost of construction would be spread over a longer period of time, and people in future generations would be helping pay the initial cost of construction. This, I think, is only fair because they would be reaping the benefit, and why not let them pay their share of the cost.

There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, of which I am very proud and

for which I must commend this Liberal Government, i.e. the work that has been done and continues to be done in the advancement of education. I am very pleased to see how keenly the Honourable Premier and his Ministers are aware of the very high importance that should be placed on education. Sir Winston Churchill once said: There was no better investment than that of putting milk into babies. I feel, Sir, it is an equally good investment to put the right kind of knowledge into young and growing minds. The most advanced countries of the world, socially, politically and economically are generally those that have the best seats of learning. Because of the scientific, engineering and administrative technicalities of most industries today it is necessary for the sound operation of management to have a class of highly skilled workers and professional men. These are only available in countries that have the facilities to provide them. We all realize what a tremendous advantage it is to industry to have the resources and the skills of a well-trained and well-educated population to call upon. I am sure we can all see what a wonderful boost it will be to our own industries and to our own development projects in this country if we could provide these trained and skilled men from our own ranks. I am sure no one would be prouder than this present Government if in due time there came forth from our own local training establishments and our own university numbers of men of vision and training who would carry forward this great scheme of industrial development which the Government of this Province, because of their faith in the future and because of their faith in the people of Newfoundland, have chosen to lay on the threshold of destiny.

(Applause from both sides of the House.)

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, items two through five—But before calling the items might I call the attention of the House, to the attention of my honourable friends from St. John's South, that in accordance with Rule -6 (b) on Page 13—whenever Government business has precedence Government orders may be called in such sequence as the Government sees fit. That is our reason for having taken the liberty of moving around the Order Papers.

Committee of the Whole on Various Bills:

On motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Honourable Member for Bay de Verde-Carbonear, Chairman of Committee.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Trade Union Act."

MR. BROWNE: When this was before the House before, Mr. Chairman, I asked the Honourable the Attorney General, who was then in charge, if any provision has been made for the safekeeping of these documents to be transferred now kept in the vault of the Registry of Companies. They should be kept in an equally safe place. It seems to me—I also asked if any provision had been made to permit the public to search these documents?

MR. CURTIS: No, Mr. Chairman, there is no provision in the Act. The present Trade Union Act allows for search to be made, and that is an omission which I ask leave to be attended to. Actually I would ask the House to pass this legislation now with

a view to our not immediately implementing it but because we hope to get these records out of the Department of the Registry of Deeds and Companies as soon as we can, because the place is just simply jammed with documents that are there have long since been superceded by more modern records. This Bill was repealed a long time ago, and it is felt that most of the records that are in the companies division of the Registry of Deeds are practically out of date and might well be destroyed.

MR. BROWNE: They have historical value.

MR. CURTIS: They may have—but unfortunately we are not running a historical society.

MR. HIGGINS: Does the Minister of Labour have a safe place for them, a strong box or something?

MR. CURTIS: He will have a file. It is understood they will not be moved until they are reasonably safe. But it is felt these documents are practically of no use, and they will not be moved until necessary.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if it is quite clear—Is the position we won't be able to make a search on any companies in future?

MR. CURTIS: No, only on Trade Unions.

MR. HOLLETT: I see. Thank you very much.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We could not deprive the honourable gentleman of that.

MR. HOLLETT: I was worrying about the new industries.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): I wonder if the

Honourable the Attorney General would go along with, instead of bringing in a new Bill to provide for it—Why not insert it as Clause 3?

MR. HIGGINS: And then have nothing to do next year.

On motion Bill passed without amendment.

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

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I presume that is just changed from the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

On motion Bill passed without amendment.

A Bill, "An Act to Make Further Provisions Respecting the Supply of Water in the Town of Carbonear."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me if there are any other companies like this where people pay taxes to the local water company?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Placentia used to be and Harbour Grace. There were three such.

MR. BROWNE: I did not know they paid direct taxes to the Government, to the Crown.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. They used to pay the company.

MR. HEFFERTON: There are provisions here whereby the Crown delegates the powers to Municipal Council of the Town of Carbonear, and taxes are paid to the Municipal Council.

MR. HOLLETT: What is meant by "Any Valid assessment"? Does it mean there has been?

MR. CURTIS: That word "valid" is just a normal word in a phrase like that.

MR. HEFFERTON: They were made last year in fact, adopted by the Town Council, and this is the one they want to use now for the water Company.

MR. HOLLETT: There is no doubt about their being valid?

MR. HEFFERTON: No.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, under Section 3 it says the owner shall pay to the Crown. If the Minister may delegate to the Town Council I think three should be tied in there. "The duty of collecting any taxes imposed by Section 4.". Don't you think three should be tied in?

MR. CURTIS: I think the honourable member is right. It should be.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is all tied in very neatly.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to ask, if it is going to be transferred to the Town Council and why does the Minister retain a sort of control over it? Why is not the whole thing passed over to the Town Council?

MR. HEFFERTON: That is very true, but here we are talking about extension of services which may go outside the immediate limits and not be under the immediate jurisdiction of the Town Council, and therefore they could not do it without coming to the Minister for approval.

MR. BROWNE: I suppose I should have asked before in second reading but why does not the Minister turn all rights in the water company over to the Town Council?

MR. HEFFERTON: Again, I think we have turned over all the rights to the Town Council that the Town Council can do under its own Act. But in a case of extension outside, then of course the Town Council would not have the jurisdiction to do it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the honourable and learned member for St. John's South has not really read this Bill. That is an extraordinary thing because here in past sessions he has not only read all the Bills but quite evidently studied them late into the night, burning the candle at both ends, so that he was able almost to memorize the Bill. Here today we find, when we get down to hard facts, he has really not studied them. It makes me begin to think he has his mind in other directions altogether. I think if the honourable gentleman is to be here and helping to run Newfoundland and get legislation through properly he should at least read the Bills and not just read them after he comes in here—I am beginning to think he is losing interest.

MR. HOLLETT: Have we the right to make Town Councils act for the Crown?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We make every place of entertainment act for the collection of taxes, shopkeepers and restaurants operators, agents of the Crown for the collection of taxes. They act for the Government for specific purposes. They are not just general agents but act for a particular purpose.

MR. HOLLETT: I just raised the point.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Premier is quite wrong. I am afraid I did study this,

but I must say I found it complicated. Here is the position—The water company has been taken over by the Government, and they have a Town Council but the Government does not pass over the rights of that Carbonear Water Company entirely. They just do it under this Bill now insofar as collecting taxes and giving water services to the people outside the city or people casually there—But why is not the whole thing transferred to the Town Council? Is there some reasons why? That is what I want to know.

MR. HEFFERTON: It must be remembered the Carbonear Water Company was incorporated by a number of private shareholders. The Government spent approximately forty thousand dollars in order to buy up forty thousand dollars worth of shares.

MR. BROWNE: How many shareholders?

MR. HEFFERTON: I don't know—forty thousand dollars approximately. There is about one thousand dollars worth at the present time outstanding. That means the Government having purchased them turns around and delegates to the Town Council, the only incorporated body it has in Carbonear, the right to tax and to manage a public utility.

MR. BROWNE: When they collect do they pay it to the Government and the Government pay the shareholders the dividends? Are there any dividends or anything?

MR. HEFFERTON: No, the Town Councils holds in a trust account, and as far as I know, pays the administering expenses out of that and the balance is just left in the bank. At the moment it is somewhere around four or five thousand dollars, I believe. And that they are hoping to

use for extension of services outside their immediate boundary.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, on page one hundred and thirty-two of the Public Accounts there is an amount guaranteed the Carbonear Water Company, Capital Stock, 1956, guaranteed a thousand and outstanding a thousand. Has that amount been retired now?

MR. CURTIS: I think the Minister referred to that—You see the Government bought out all the shareholders and there were some shareholders that could not be located.

On motion Bill passed without amendment.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Community Councils Act, 1956."

On motion Bill passed without amendment.

On motion of Mr. Smallwood the Committee rose to report having passed certain Bills and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and passed Bills, "An Act to Amend the Trade Union Act"; "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Development Loan Act"; "An Act to Make Further Provisions Respecting the Supply of Water for the Town of Carbonear"; and A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Community Councils Act," and a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Pensions Act," without amendment.

On motion report received.

On motion Bills read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. CLARKE: On Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Highways," the Committee reports having made some progress and asks leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion report received committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

On motion all further orders of the day stand deferred.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3.00 of the clock.

—

TUESDAY, April 2, 1957.

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

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Presenting Petitions

MR. W. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Beaumont North. This petition is signed by the voters of Beaumont North. The prayer of the petitioners is for help in the construction of a new school at Beaumont.

Mr. Speaker, I know from personal experience that the present school at Beaumont is quite inadequate for the number of pupils attending that school. The building, I understand, is over forty years old and badly in need of repairs.

I strongly recommend the prayer of the petitioners and I ask that the petition be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of the Department of Education for the year ending March 31st, 1956.

Notices of Motion

None.

Notice of Questions

Notice of Questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Browne.
(See appendix).

Answers to Questions

QUESTION No. 57:

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, in answer to Question No. 57 and also Question No. 59 on today's Order Paper—The answers are being prepared and I will table them as soon as they are ready. The answer to Question No. 57 will probably take a day or two.

QUESTION No. 58: Mr. Hollett.
(See appendix).

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that—

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is not permitted, Mr. Speaker, to argue nor debate an answer.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not intending to debate it. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. There is no comment to be made on questions nor any debate to be entered into.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question relative to that: Is the Honourable the Premier aware that the answer yester-

day stated that an agreement had been entered into?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Honourable Minister is here now. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition might now direct the question to him.

QUESTION No. 58: Mr. Hollett. (See appendix).

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, may I repeat the question to the Honourable Minister of Finance? Is he aware of the fact that in reply to a question we had here, which referred to this same matter, it was distinctly stated that an agreement had been entered into between the Government and the bank

MR. SPENCER: The word "agreement" might have been used inadvertently. There was certainly no written agreement.

QUESTION No. 60:

HON. J. T. CHEESMAN (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, that answer is in course of preparation.

Orders of the Day

Third Readings:

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Trade Union Act."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Development (Loan) Act." On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Make Further Provision Respecting the Supply of Water in the Town of Carbonear."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Community Councils Act, 1956." On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act." On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

First Readings:

Honourable the Minister of Education asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education 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 (Teachers' Training) Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Public Welfare asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Welfare of Children's Act." 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 Further to Amend the Accident Insurance (Licensing) Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY:

MR WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to extend my congratulations to you on your elevation to the Chair. From what I gather, Sir, and the very fine comments I have heard, I do not think there is any doubt in the minds of anyone that

the choice was a good one. I wish you well, Sir, in your very high office.

I would also like to extend my congratulations to the Honourable member for Harbour Grace and the honourable member for Bell Island who so ably moved and seconded the address in reply.

While on the matter of congratulations, Sir, I would like to extend my wholehearted congratulations to our Leader, the Honourable the Premier, who led his party triumphantly to a triumphant victory last October, endorsing once again, Sir, the confidence the majority of the people of Newfoundland have in him and this Government.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate personally the friendly manner in which the Honourable Leader and members of the Opposition have accepted us into this Honourable House. I hope it continues that way, Sir, and through our difference of opinion we may all work for the same cause, namely, the good and betterment of Newfoundland in general.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is not necessary for me at this time to recount much of the history of my district of Labrador North. Many of my colleagues, I am sure, have had the privilege of hearing the Honourable the Minister of Education give detailed reports of Labrador while he was its representative. Certainly in the past few years we have come to learn that it is not the "Land that God gave to Cain." If it were then Cain was given a very fair or rich share of the world's wealth. For we now know that in particular Labrador North has a wealth of potentialities especially in minerals. It is rather amazing, Mr. Speaker, to realize that so many of our people in Newfound-

land and on the Mainland still think in terms of Labrador as a frozen wasteland, inhabited by a few Esquimaux and Indians and perhaps polar bears. Certainly it is rather amazing, Mr. Speaker, as I said, that so many people think so little of Labrador. It is significant to note, Mr. Speaker, that there are several thriving communities in my district of Labrador North. I should like to point out that there is a sharp contrast in the mode of living between the people of Hamilton Inlet and Lake Melville and that of the people of the extreme Northern area. It is probably not generally known that many of our Esquimaux and Newfoundlanders and other residents who have settled in Happy Valley enjoy such entertainment as "TV" provides, I may say they enjoy a good wrestling match—It is quite a change, Mr. Speaker, from my first experience of that part of the coast.

Although much has been accomplished since there has been a positive approach to the many problems and the wealth of Labrador, unless we as a Government are content (I am positively sure we are not) to see Esquimaux and Indians living in canvas tents in sub-zero weather with temperatures from anywhere between ten and forty degrees below zero, much remains to be done. I feel, and I feel quite confidently, much will be done by this Government for the betterment of our less fortunate people.

This Government and its positive approach has brought to Northern Labrador many long overdue and improved conditions. I refer to in particular the opening of a new hospital at North West River about two years ago and the opening of a nursing station and a school dormitory and a new Government store at Nain, the construction of a road between Goose

Airport and North West River, the construction of a new six-room school at Happy Valley, which I understand will be opened within a very short time. I may add, Mr. Speaker, this school is one of the most modern of its kind. Of particular significance too is the Government sponsored move of centralization and assistance to those wishing to take part in this programme.

Education in Northern Labrador like in many other outports is still a major problem. Unfortunately Northern Labrador provides but a few of its teachers, and the Government in recognition of it have taken over the responsibility for paying the salaries of the Missionary teachers who in general come from places outside the Dominion. I would like to note, Mr. Speaker, that this applies only to the Northern part of my district. The Southern part of my district, North West River and Happy Valley, there the education standards are on a par with probably the best in the province.

Special mention should be made of the untiring efforts of the various Missionary groups working in Northern Labrador. I am thinking, of course, of the International Grenfell Association, the Morovic Missions, the Pentecostal and last but not least the Oblate Fathers whose work as Missioners is well known throughout the universe.

A thing in particular too to which I would like to refer is the matter of retaining some of the distinctive aspects of the Esquimaux and Indian culture. It would be unfortunate indeed if their races were to become partners of our modern living and they were to forget all traces of their ancestry. The Esquimaux and Indian

languages may well be preserved and used in conjunction with the English language, and some of their arts and crafts and native skills are well worth preserving. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced if the Esquimaux and Indians are to survive they must be brought into contact with the white man's way of life. This Government is to be complimented on its policy in this respect. In a land that was for so long neglected and backward and which has rather suddenly become a place of great activity, one of the natural problems with which we are faced today is that of communications facilities. I am thinking in particular of the need for public wharves to be constructed in the Goose Bay Area for the convenience of the people of Happy Valley. I hope the Federal Government will give this very urgent indeed very serious consideration; as well as improved postal and telegraphic services.

At Happy Valley there is a greater need for a supply of electricity than for any other public service. The attitude of most people is that while water and sewerage is desirable or highly desirable, electricity is essential, and no modern community can survive without it. I hope, Sir, in the not too distant future this Government will give this matter very serious consideration.

As time progresses I am certain that this area of my district will become an even greater centre of activity than it is at present. Mr. Speaker, when speaking of Northern Labrador one naturally thinks of the cod fishery. I think this Government would be wise in thinking seriously of this particular aspect of Labrador life. I hope I do not cross wires with my honourable colleague from White Bay North in this respect—The industry of Labrador

North never did give a very high standard of living to the people of that area. I agree with the Government's policy of trying to absorb as many as possible of the people of Labrador North into more centralized places. It is a well known fact that the inhabitants of Labrador are quite adaptable to other occupations, and if given the chance, I think, they can fit themselves into other fields. At the same time, however, I think the Government is following a wise plan in assisting those who are still interested and able to secure part of their livelihood from the cod fishery. I am convinced too that as the younger generation of Labrador North become better educated they will not be content with an occupation that offers them at the most a very meagre existence.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few years the eyes of the whole world have been fastened on Labrador. In my district is one of the greatest airports in the world, giving employment to hundreds. As long as there are airplanes to fly I feel Goose Airport will remain the hive of activity it is today. However, Mr. Speaker, I feel the future of Labrador rests primarily in the vast mineral potentialities, many untouched and undetected. I believe the Wabush developments are a mere beginning. The greatness and wealth of Labrador have been lying dormant and sleeping until this Government brought to its shores one of the greatest exploration and developments in North America—I am thinking, of course, of the British Newfoundland Corporations, better known as "BRINCO." This great company was formed through the genius, the enthusiasm and statesmanship of the Premier and Leader of this Government. Even his greatest critics will praise him for this accomplishment. This company will, I be-

lieve, help make Labrador one of the most prosperous places in all Canada. It might very well be that hundreds of our Newfoundlanders in the future will be going North and settling in Labrador in preference to the Mainland or any other country.

Labrador, in my opinion, has a very bright future, and I am happy and proud to represent the district and the people of Labrador North. No other group of people in the Province, Mr. Speaker, would I rather represent than those of Labrador North. Much has been done in my district. Much remains to be done. I feel confident that with this Government much will be done.

(Applause from both sides of the House).

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate on the Address in Reply I should like to add my voice to those that preceded me in congratulating you, Sir, on your elevation to the high office of Speaker. I am sure no one knows better than yourself the responsibilities that go with the office. I feel that we are all confident that you will discharge those responsibilities with credit to yourself and to your profession and to the district which you represent.

I would like to join too in congratulating previous speakers especially the members who have spoken in this House for the first time. There is one speaker, however, the honourable member for White Bay North, perhaps that did not come up to our expectations and perhaps what I have to say will not come up to his. But when he referred to the City of St. John's as a parasitical, gossiping city I think those of us (and there are a few of us in this House) who look upon it as our native home, it made our blood

boil for the moment—But I feel when there is time to consider what he has said he will repent—If he looked up the meaning of the word “parasite” he will also realize the motto—“Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones.”

One remark he made was this—If you took out Fort Pepperrell and two fish plants and the civil servants, what would you have?—Well, if you are going to take away some of the most important things belonging to any city what are you going to have? Nevertheless I can remember the time when none of these two plants to which he referred was there nor was Fort Pepperrell and yet St. John’s was here. St. John’s was even here a hundred years before there was a civil service. So it can hardly be that something which existed back for over four hundred years can be called a parasite or that those who live here are parasitical. As a matter of fact I would point out to the honourable member, as I did while he was speaking, St. John’s is a bigger fishing community than any other fishing community in the country. That was pointed out—I doubt if there is any other fishing community in which there are more traffic in certain fish than right here in the Harbour of St. John’s.

The honourable member referred to the District of White Bay North in comparison to the City of St. John’s, surely that is not a clear comparison.

Now, Sir, the Speech from the Throne contained some very important matters, and I am sure that the one that is nearest the heart of the Premier is the appointment of the Royal Commission.

The Premier was very gracious on opening day to the members of the

Opposition, and he even promised us assistance, secretarial assistance and other assistance. I am sure those of us who remember his encouragement and the tips that he gave us as to how to be a good fighting Opposition will make the Government stand on their toes. He will realize we are only returning the compliment when I tell him we will do our best to keep the Government on their toes, and we will, I think, strike as hard as necessary.

Now, Sir, in regard to this Royal Commission, I am sure that the members of the Royal Commission must realize more than anybody that the terms that are to be considered are very inadequate for the situation. That Clause in the Terms of Union, to my mind, is a very complicated formula, that is not readily grasped. I cannot grasp it, and if anyone will repeat it they will see how complicated it is to find out what financial assistance, if any, is needed to maintain the services of Newfoundland —

MR. SMALLWOOD: To continue—

MR. BROWNE: To continue the services of Newfoundland that attained and the levels reached subsequent to Union without resorting to taxation more burdensome than—having regard to capacity to pay—That is what I mean—There are so many different commutations—I am glad the Premier thinks it is simple. I know that men who have been sitting on the Commission for three and a quarter years and know a great deal more about it than I do and have been in consultation with the Premier (and I have no doubt he knows more about it)—But I want to say this, Sir—But I want to say this, Sir—I do not consider myself bound by the findings of that Commission and I do not think our party does either. We believe we should

got far more than that Royal Commission can give us. Because that Commission is only there to find out what financial assistance if any is necessary to maintain the standards and levels—to continue the services—Well that is to maintain them—at the standards and level reached subsequent to Union. I do not think our services are up to the right standard. Take our railway. Take the railway—Everyone is complaining about the service of the railway. We have a narrow gauge railway that takes anywhere from twenty-four to forty-eight hours to go across the Island, a distance of five hundred and twenty-five miles. That does not come within Term 29. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we need things that are not mentioned there. I do not think there was any Province that went into Confederation so lightly, so light heartedly as this one. I do not think any Province gave such a good bargain as this one. Not only should we have the wide-gauge railway across this country but we should have a Government built road, Federal Government built road. This country is not equal to the task of financing the building of a modern highway from St. John's to Port aux Basques. It is just as well for us to recognize that now. Now the honourable member for St. John's North thinks he has a solution in toll roads. Does not that amount to the same thing? The Premier knows that in 1949—and he said it here many a time—that this country was far behind the Mainland of Canada in many many respects and it has not yet—and he knows that—approached the standards and level obtained in the Provinces on the Mainland. Therefore, Sir, I feel that these men if they have prepared their case well must realize that it is not going to take them as far as we should go.

The Speech from the Throne mentions—Oh, yes, I do want to say one other thing in connection with the Royal Commission—The Speech from the Throne says—“And my Ministers await the outcome of the review with confidence”—I think the Premier is a little bit too confident. He spoke I believe in a “TV” or radio announcement and said he expected to get between ten and twenty million as a result of this—He is so confident in the results that he is making plans how to spend it. I think that he is overconfident, and I do not think that he is going to get anything like this amount under this Term 29. If he read, and I am sure he did, the announcement of the Prime Minister of Canada when he announced the formation of the Royal Commission—The Prime Minister was keeping that Royal Commission to the words of that Term 29.

Now, Sir, the Speech from the Throne speaks about a Royal Commission to take evidence and make recommendations on the question of civil service pensions. Now, Sir, I submit that this is a ridiculous thing for the Government to do. If the Government believes there is a problem in connection with civil service pensions—As the honourable member for Fogo pointed out yesterday in connection with the police—civil servants—who were pensioned many years ago when the standard of living was lower than it is today, the cost of living especially was lower than today—How are they expected to get along without any increase in the amount of their pensions? Well, if the problem exists what is to stop the Government from appointing the Royal Commission? There is nothing we can do about it here, unless it is the intention of the Government to appoint the Royal Commission and

bring in the report before the session adjourns. The Premier shakes his head—They are not intended to do that—Then why not appoint the Royal Commission? What is holding up?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is awfully impatient today. We will get around to that.

MR. BROWNE: I am only taking a leaf out of the Premier's book. He suggests that the Opposition be critical. It is good criticism to suggest there is nothing to stop that—We are not stopping them. In fact we are urging them to hurry it up and appoint this Royal Commission because the civil service pensions are at such low rates they are probably starving for want of an increase. So we will do all we can to expedite it—but there is nothing to do at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

I notice that the Government is going to put temporary buildings up to house University students. I have here the statement of the Premier where he details the progress report. That is very interesting. But what is stopping him from that? The plans are all made—What is stopping him building the university? For one thing he has not any money—He has not any money—He could not borrow a loan last year. When he went to look for fourteen million he could not get it. The surplus at Ottawa is hypothecated to the Bank of Montreal, obviously, when there is an overdraft of nine and a half million dollars was arranged to go against it—or the surplus was arranged to go against that overdraft—He has not any money to build this University without going to the market and raising more. Where else is he going to get it? He will get some from the Federal Government; through new mines he has cre-

ated, but will he get enough from them. He has not told us. I ask him now to tell us when speaking to this Address in Reply where he expects this money to come from.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Gladly.

MR. BROWNE: Several of the honourable gentlemen who have preceded me have spoken about roads. They seem to take the attitude that we are opposed to roads. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a complete misunderstanding of the attitude of the Opposition. Our attitude is that the Government did not spend enough money on roads in the past eight years but too much money on industries. If instead of spending money on these industries they had spent it on roads we would be in a better position today than we are, and any communities that are calling out for roads and for repairs to roads and for snow clearing would get their needs satisfied. Now our policy was to build roads. If we had been elected we would have done so, and not put our money into the industries where such little return is being given for it.

Now, Sir, there is one other observation I want to make in connection with some of the needs of this country—My attention has been drawn to that by two articles which appeared in the "Telegram" last night, where it was stated that a mother and her baby lost their lives because they could not get medical attention on Bell Island. They were brought here, I believe, by helicopter, and they died. I submit it is a very sad state of affairs, and I would like to go on record, Sir, as being very strongly in favour of having a hospital on Bell Island. I quite realize that there may be times when even the existence of a hospital in a community may not be sufficient in a difficult

case to save the life of a human being. But when we realize the serious conditions caused by the ice blockade at Bell Island during this winter we must realize that the people over there, especially those who work in the mines, are living in constant jeopardy. There may be a fall of rocks or an explosion in this mine, such as occurred at Springhill and many people may be injured and it may be extremely difficult to get them here to St. John's, and there are no adequate facilities on Bell Island to look after them. Therefore, Sir, if the Government is considering the expansion of the hospital programme—and I recommend this especially to the Honourable Minister of Health—they should give consideration to the Bell Island people. Bell Island is one of our most prosperous communities. It has a great and inexhaustible amount of ore, and it has been producing wealth for this country. It cannot be said to be a parasite, and I think it deserves a hospital. There are communities which are not so prosperous which have far more amenities than Bell Island. There are twelve thousand people on Bell Island, very intelligent and industrious people, producing wealth and paying taxation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The election is over.

MR. BROWNE: I heard the Premier.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): There is another one in a month's time.

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Speaker, this need has existed there for a long time. I heard the Premier last year when the honourable member for Bell Island, at that time Mr. Jackman, brought in a petition here for repairs to the road at the east end of

the Island when he said—this community is producing a great deal of wealth and should get this road and the Premier—I am not sure of his exact words—said, it is not because of that—"It is not because of that," he said: But why not because of that—If it is a big community and producing this wealth does it not deserve to have some money spent there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I mean that even if it were not so great a producer it deserved to get the road, and not merely because it is a good industrial centre.

MR. BROWNE: The same way as it deserves the hospital. I trust therefore that the Government will take this into consideration, and if the money is available—and I know how difficult it is for the Government to get it—I hope they will consider Bell Island as the first on the list.

Now, Sir, several of the honourable members on the other side congratulated the Premier—and I do not blame them—It is what I would expect from them—but should I congratulate the Premier? I can certainly congratulate him on his forecast of the result of the election. But I think, Sir, I can go further than that because this is the third successive victory—He has a record, I believe, that is unequalled in this country, winning three elections in a row. It was a victory which he earned by long planning. He has remarkable industry. He has other great natural qualities including an unbridled optimism and resourcefulness. Now, Sir, he has returned to this House with a fine group of men, some of whom have been for years leaders in their Communities, and who have been held in the highest esteem by their constituents. The prestige which they have, the esteem in which

they are held, the positions of trust and responsibility which they have discharged for many years to the satisfaction of their constituents has added prestige to the Government, it has given to the Government a sort of guarantee of honesty and stability and high principles. What do the visitors think coming here and looking at this fine array of honourable gentlemen on the other side? What do people think who read of this country returning thirty-two members to the Government and only four members to the Opposition? When we hear of the type of men, magistrates who willingly relinquished their jobs and rushed in to the political fray to fight for the Liberal Party. What a wonderful people we have in Newfoundland—If we are to believe some of the honourable gentlemen who have spoken in this debate, they did not need any encouragement—No, they were filled with high patriotism and they left jobs of five thousand dollars a year to take jobs at three thousand dollars a year. Now, Sir, I submit the honourable gentleman may think me prejudiced, but it is very hard to think we are as credulous as all that. There is something else induced the honourable members to leave their good positions and come out for the Liberal Party. However, they are here now. They have good records behind them. I hope that they will live up to the good reputation which they have earned in their communities, and that here, as on the bench, they will let their conscience be their guide.

Now, Sir, I have been a member of the Opposition here in this House for the past three years. If I may be pardoned, Sir, I would say, with all due respect to those gentlemen who are new to politics, the first thing that they should do is to study the debates of this House since 1949. I

can recommend to them no better reading than reading the Hansards of this House since 1949. Unfortunately only four of them are available. But I believe that even the year 1951, which has two Hansards, will provide them with sufficient information to change their opinions of the high opinions which they have apparently of the Premier at the present time. Kipling wrote: "How little they know of England who only England know." The honourable gentlemen who have come into this House for the first time do not know the Premier if they do not know his past history at least since 1949, if they have not read Hansard. That is one reason why, Sir, I recommend that they should read Hansard and get some idea of the difficulties that the Premier has had to face. They do not know what he has gone through at all. They do not know of the high purpose he set out with, the ambitions he had, the terrific optimism he had that he could take worthless businesses and transform them into industrial successes, that he could deal with foreigners who do not speak English and make a success of the business that they put over on him. I do not know how much my honourable friends know about the Icelandic Boats. Read it in Hansard in the Premier's own words. He will tell you how two Icelanders came to his office one day and sold him four boats for two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. I do not know, Sir, whether the Government has ever got the money back from that, but I have heard they did get a little few herring, but not many—not very much. That was the greatest failure that had ever occurred in Newfoundland but it was only a symbol of what was to come.

The Premier, relying upon one solitary fact made a generality of what had been a particular object during

different times. In 1923 the late Sir Richard Squires influenced the British Government to go fifty-fifty in a guarantee of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company. That is how the Humber was started. The Premier thought he could introduce that principle in to every kind of scheme. Unfortunately his adoption of that principle brought him into many, many difficulties. One of the first things he went into was the Birch Mill. Now the Birch Mill up to the present time has cost this Treasury nearly six million dollars. Over five million dollars. An answer was given by the Honourable the Attorney General the other day that it cost the Treasury about four and a half million dollars. But in addition to that there are hundreds of thousands of dollars still under guarantee at the Bank, bringing it to over five million dollars. It was supposed to cost a million at the beginning. Do honourable gentlemen on the other side realize that that building was built without any supervision—without any supervision. No one checked the quantities, no one checked the qualities of material, no one checked the prices. I am sure that no honourable gentleman would consider that that was a wise venture for the Premier to undertake.

You know something about the tragic story of Dr. Valdmanis who came here in 1949 or 1951 and told about his escapades in Latvia under the Russians and then in Germany under the Germans—his great experiences—and the Premier fell for it and engaged him as his most trusted adviser and paid him the handsome sum of twenty-five thousand dollars a year, and placed him in charge of this programme of economic development. This trusted man was trusted so much that he was allowed to go and negoti-

ate for contracts of millions of dollars worth, without the Premier having a Newfoundlander side by side with him to see what was going on. As a result this country has lost a half million dollars—a half million dollars—that is the greatest single loss to this country ever sustained in connection with any of its scandals at any time in its history.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was the only time that the principal in a scandal went to jail, out of all the scandals.

MR. BROWNE: Maybe it is the only time the principal went to jail, nevertheless the five hundred thousand dollars is still lost to this country.

Did the honourable members know that Dr. Valdmanis got that five hundred thousand dollars from two companies? Do they know that this Government paid exgratia payments of five hundred thousand dollars to these companies? Do they know that that cement mill was supposed to be sold in New York before it was built? Do they know the Government broke the contract and paid fifty thousand dollars so they would not have an action against them? Do they know the contracts for the sale of that mill has been lost and cannot be produced, cannot be found? I don't know, Mr. Speaker, after socialistic ventures—socialistic ventures of the Government with Dr. Valdmanis in charge in the Department of Economic Development, the Premier called an election in 1951 to ask the people for a mandate for a fifty-fifty proposition. Then these industries in Germany would come here and set up factories. They had no money but would bring out their machinery and the Government would provide them with an equivalent amount of capital to get them going on a fifty-fifty basis. That is something

everyone understands. You know that never came off. Although the Premier got the mandate there was not one factory set up on that basis, not one, and in the majority of cases, I say now, the Government put up almost all of the money, almost one hundred per cent. Some twenty-five million dollars of our money went into these different plants. I say that that fifty-fifty business was a farce. If the honourable members will read Hansard they will find out how incorrect were the promises of, or the prophecies of, the Premier. It makes me think, Mr. Speaker,—perhaps I am a little suspicious—it makes me think the Premier in 1951 made these prophecies knowing that they were false. You have only to take up Hansard and read where he said that the machinery plant at the Octagon in twelve months or less than twelve months (that is in October 1951) or by the first of June, 1952, will have five hundred men—five hundred men working there and by the first of July 1954 there will be five thousand men working there. Now the honourable members on the other side are all sensible, intelligent men, and they must realize that when an honourable gentleman makes a statement like that he can only be regarded as deliberately misleading people or that he is completely unsound in his prognostications.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is there not a third possibility?

MR. BROWNE: Not that I know of. The Honourable the Premier can tell us about it. Then that was nothing, that Mill was to be nothing compared to the Steel Mill to be erected at Bay Roberts. There were to be fifteen thousand jobs created as a result and nobody can tell us now how many people are working. We are not

now allowed to know. We are told: "Go and ask the plants how many people are working."

Then you have the Premier stealing from under the noses of the stupid people at Ottawa Mr. Planta and bringing him down here and giving him fifteen thousand dollars a year as a fish expert. That honourable gentleman left a trail of debts behind him in Vancouver to St. John's and he will never pay them back. The Premier himself and Senator Patten was stuck on one for eight thousand dollars. The dishonest gentleman was kept here for many months afterwards to help pay off some of his debts.

These are errors of judgment. They must be taken into account when we are looking at some of the difficulties that the Premier has had to face.

Now despite these difficulties, despite these examples of unsound finances and these unfulfilled prophecies, those colossal monuments that have been erected either to the Premier's honour or to Dr. Valdmánis's, despite the fact that Dr. Valdmánis left here in disgrace, despite the fact that so many of these companies all of them have failed to pay one cent back out of the twenty-five million dollars—not one cent—not one cent back—despite all that the Premier goes to the country in 1956 and he is returned and the good ship, the Liberal Party, comes into port with a few changes of its officers, almost a new crew and the jaunty captain on the bridge whistling a tune he learned down in Jamaica, a calypso tune.

Here we have again—How was it done? How was it possible for the Premier despite all these scandals associated with his Government, despite all these failures, how was it possible that he should get such a wide ac-

clamation from the people of this country?

Now this is real socialism in my view. He invested twenty-five million dollars in these industries, ten million dollars into the fish plants—that is thirty-five million dollars of funds he has put into these various businesses—Despite this enormous investment the public has been kept almost in complete ignorance of what is being done with the money. There is no one in this country today, not including the Auditor General, who knows what became of most of that money. What was done with it?

Suppose we just take for argument's sake a million dollars given to Koch Shoes. What did they do with it? How much was paid in salaries? How much was paid for motor cars, how much for one thing and another? There was any amount of opportunity to graft there. Yet the public knows nothing at all about it. You have heard of Koch. Perhaps you have heard of Schaffer, Max Braun Wogau, they are gone, and I can remember a lot of others who are gone, and I suppose some are still going.

Let me give you an idea of the investment—Schaffer brought out eleven thousand dollars worth of machinery. Do you know the amounts of loans, Mr. Speaker, that have been given to that leather goods factory, gold sail factory? Up to the present time two hundred and twenty thousand dollars (\$220,000) on a general investment of eleven thousand dollars. I submit it is absolutely out of the question, it is unsound financing to lend money at that rate. Now the answers that come from the Government benches is—What odds if they are not making money. The Junior member for Harbour Main spoke along that line. Look

at the work, it is better than relief—We are making things in the country we do not have to import and we are giving out millions of dollars to workers. Well, how long can it keep going? How long can it keep going unless it gets from time to time transfusions of blood from the Treasury, otherwise they are bound to fail. There was a momentum of spending, thirty-five thousand dollars that keeps them going for quite some time. Anybody could start a boom with that amount of money. But it is not an efficient thing, it is not a great development, and I submit here it is not sound.

Now, Sir, I have been ridiculed by the Premier for using that expression that test of whether a proposition is sound or unsound. But I submit it is the only test that a deliberative assembly like this can apply to any proposition that comes before it. That was not done in the past by members of the party on the other side of the House. The Premier has appealed to the great majority of the people, to the toiling masses. He has claimed, and I think to a large extent he is entitled to some credit for it, the credit for introducing Family Allowances and Old Age Pensions and other forms of assistance which people can accept without any sense of shock to their pride. But he lets loose here an era of spending that created inflation and brought prices up tremendously, I would say three and four times to what they should be in some cases especially in the matter of housing. If you take all things together, if you take this surplus of fifty million dollars, the thirty-eight millions of dollars borrowed money, eighty-eight millions in all, and the new money that came in and was widely distributed in Old Age Pension and Family Allowances, and then take the

expenditure to which he referred yesterday for wharves, etc., spent by the Federal Government and money spent by the Canadian National Railway to bring it up to the standard it is, there was a tremendous amount of money in circulation at one time, and therefore people thought it was never so good. Then we had the finance companies here, trust companies, mortgaging companies lending money on houses, motor cars, lending money to purchase "TV" sets, refrigerators, washing machines. It all combined to put a large amount of money in circulation and gave people the impression of our having the greatest boom in our history.

Now, Sir, have we come to the end of that? My honourable friend from St. John's Centre has already stated that in his opinion there are signs of the ending of this boom. Today we have eighteen thousand people—the figure has been kept more or less level for the last several weeks—eighteen thousand people unemployed. Relief payments are mounting, and the need goes on, and people are unable to pay their installments on their motor cars and these have been repossessed and sold again. Who is going to suffer if there should be a recession? Will it not be the toiling masses for whom the Premier is said to have laboured so hard. The Fortune Bay Company is going into insolvency and the little town of Fortune, where so many people were encouraged to come from nearby settlements, to work in the fish plant, are idle and trusting to God that perhaps some American Fish Company may take over the plant and operate it and give them back their work.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): You see, it is not only Government sponsored things that fail.

MR. BROWNE: That hardly could have operated without the assistance the Government gave. The Government put nearly half a million dollars in it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They were operating for over a year before they asked us for a dollar. Then we did lend them some. It was an American Company.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Sir, that may be so.

MR. CURTIS: It is so.

MR. BROWNE: But the Government has had lots of difficulties of its own and has also accepted the difficulties of others as its own and tried to help. I agree with that. Because we have here a very abnormal regime—The Premier himself is an extraordinary man.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hope not abnormal though.

MR. BROWNE: I think that is the correct name.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a back hand compliment.

MR. BROWNE: That is what it was meant to be. It was suggested to me, Mr. Speaker, when we hit we should hit hard, and I am going to try to do that. The Premier is a master of something that I don't think any previous Premier of this country nor any Province of this country ever equalled, and that is in connection with propaganda. I heard one of his present friends, at any rate, discussing him before Confederation and saying that the Premier then said to him—"Give me a paper and I will put this country into Confederation." He was right. He knew his powers, his immense power of propaganda. Now,

Sir, there were two other gentlemen that I have heard of who were also great masters of propaganda, one was Hitler and the other was Mussolini—but they had nothing on the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not forget Trotsky, Stalin and Lenin.

MR. BROWNE: Let us look at it sensibly, and think, if there is any Premier in Canada today or ever was a Premier in Canada to our knowledge with the exception of Mitchell Hepburn of Ontario, who used all the props of propaganda to the same extent as the Premier—You could hardly listen to the radio without hearing he is going or he is coming or saying this or making an announcement about this, some special announcement about this, some special announcement of the Premier to be presented on "TV." I have several of his interviews here at the present time. There is hardly anything goes by that the Premier does not get some announcement to make. I think he has shown that with him politics is going to be vital and vigorous—Those were the words he used on opening day. He also used two other words "true" and "sincere." May I be permitted, Sir, to question if his politics are true and sincere. They have been colorful—but "true" and "sincere"? Let me remind him—let me remind him of "IBEC." Honourable members who are here in this House at this time, let them read the story of "IBEC." Let me recall to them that on New Year's Eve I waited in a crowded room with bated breath to hear the statement being announced, the announcement coming over the radio, announced some time previously—Listen tomorrow and the Premier at ten o'clock in the night will make the greatest announcement the people of this generation ever heard. At ten

o'clock, the hour of doom, the Premier came on and began the greatest announcement the people ever heard in this country—The Rockefellers are coming—what a let-down—The Rockefellers are coming. I think they charged us seventy-five thousand dollars for coming here. What have we got—I ask the honourable members to go to the library as soon as convenient and ask for the report that the Rockefellers left here which cost us seventy-five thousand dollars.

Then the new industries were announced, and NALCO and BRINCO. I would also suggest to honourable members that they read up our statutes since 1949 and read up particularly the statutes creating NALCO and creating BRINCO. My honourable friend who just spoke, spoke about the wonderful statesmanship-like work of the Premier. Anyone can give things away. We do not have to pay people to take sixty thousand miles of territory and water power and rights to all the minerals and water power and forest resources in that area. We surely do not have to go with a gun to people and tell them they got to do that—Do you think that is wonderfully statesmanship-like. I say it is the reverse. I say it is unwise. In previous sessions I tried to show it was a mistake on the part of the Government to try to give such vast concessions. It will be years before you can see it but when it comes out—In the last session of this House when the Premier spoke to us about the uranium find by BRINCO at Monkey Hill and I do not know what other places, anyhow there were seventy miles apart. To listen to the Premier you would think it was a solid clump of uranium worth about thirty-five thousand dollars a pound—all that area was nothing but uranium.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You would have to be thoroughly simple to get that from what is said. Anyone would have to be a dullard to get that. My script was written for me. If the honourable gentleman would allow me, Mr. Speaker,—Mr. Claude House who was the former Deputy Minister of Mines of Newfoundland and Mr. David Baird who is now, and was that moment the Provincial geologist, two of them collaborated, got together and wrote exactly the words I used. They were not my words at all but the words of the two top geologists of Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a pity the Premier did not tell us that before.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why should I?

MR. BROWNE: Because the Premier did have—and it seemed a little extraordinary to me that the Premier would let a thing so good as that go without giving his own natural embellishment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not being a geologist I took the wise course of asking the two top geologists in Newfoundland to write the exact wording of what I should say. What do I know about uranium?

MR. CURTIS: I think you said so at the time, too.

MR. BROWNE: Well, the Honourable the Premier certainly gave us the impression there was a lot of uranium.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not what I said.

MR. BROWNE: Well you told the House it was yours then. Then we had this expression, this propaganda, about the third paper mill.

During the election I was informed the Premier, at a big meeting said, I did not want to say much about this third paper mill because the Tories would not believe me. I am just letting you know in secret, we are going to have a third paper mill. You know what Bowaters and the AND have done for this country. We are not going to have a third without a fourth paper mill because we cannot just develop enough water power for a third mill, we got to have a fourth mill at the same time. Now since we have no explanation of what happened about that third and fourth mill, whether we will see it or whether we won't, it has been on the carpet a long time now. Back in 1949 or 1950 the Premier started talking about the—

MR. SMALLWOOD: And working on it.

MR. BROWNE: I suppose he is justified in talking about it to some extent, but to give the impression that everything is imminent.

MR. CURTIS: Does the honourable gentleman know how long it took to develop the Corner Brook Mill?

MR. BROWNE: I think from 1913 to 1923. I remember very well—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does my honourable friend ever consider the extent to which breathlessness is imposed on those statements not by the person who makes them but by the newspapers and radios building up before the statement is made. It is going to be made every hour on the hour and every half hour on the half hour—be sure and listen—I have given up making statements—I have not made any —

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps it is the Premier's own propaganda—They are

only copying him. Everybody today in public business has the Premier for a model to follow.

MR. CURTIS: It is contagious.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, and perhaps he is affecting some of his own Opposition.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before recess I was giving some examples of the Premier's power of propaganda—I had referred to an announcement concerning Rockefeller and BRINCO and uranium and the third paper mill and so forth. Generally speaking it seems to me the people of this country have been kept in a perpetual state of agitation by the Premier. He is a political spendthrift who has been laying waste our natural resources and wasting our substances. Our surplus is gone and we are in debt to the tune of thirty-eight millions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That "laying waste" is beautiful.

MR. BROWNE: And, Sir, he has produced his masterpiece of propaganda, "The Best Eight Years Yet." Let us examine this now, Sir. It must have been a very expensive document to prepare. It was prepared in advance of the announcement of the election. Like Joseph's Coat it is many colours, red, blue, green and black, and appropriately the industries are in the red.

Sir, how do you judge, how do honourable members judge the Best Eight Years Yet? How would you judge your own best eight years? Would it be by the amount of money you spent or the amount of money you earned? Would you judge it by what you have to show

at the end of it or by the amount you have to spend?

MR. CURTIS: Neither.

MR. BROWNE: No, Sir, we judge our best eight years—If a man says—I had a good night playing cards last night—I won five dollars—I had a bad night last night—I lost five dollars. Well we spent eighty-eight million dollars of capital in the past eight years.

Now let us compare the last seven years with the previous seven years: I asked a question the other day of the Honourable Minister of Finance and this is the answer—I have it here:

What were the amounts of saving by the people of this country as at December 31st for each year from 1951 to date: The total amount of savings of the people in the banks at December 31st 1941, the year that the Americans came was two millions of dollars in round figures. In 1948 (now honourable members pay attention to this) In the year 1948 it had risen to seventy-six millions of dollars. The people of Newfoundland put in the Savings Bank forty-seven million dollars in the seven years in between—The Newfoundland Savings Bank—I take that as an illustration because I can only go forward with that. In 1941 we had five and a half million dollars and in 1948 we had over twenty-one million dollars. There was an increase of almost three times as much, two hundred and seventy per cent increase (270%) in the money in the Newfoundland Savings Bank, by 1949. At the end of 1949 there were twenty-two millions and at the end of 1956 twenty-eight millions, six hundred thirty-seven thousand and fifty-two dollars (\$28,637,051) an increase of only thirty per cent, between 1949 and 1956. Between 1941 and 1948 an in-

crease in the Newfoundland Savings Bank of two hundred and seventy per cent (270%), nine times as great, and an increase in the Bank of Montreal of two hundred per cent (200%), and the Bank of Nova Scotia one hundred and thirty per cent (130%), and the Royal Bank of Canada one hundred and seventy per cent (170%). So, is there any doubt, if we take as our standard of what is good and what is bad, what we have to the end of the period, what we have saved, is there any doubt that the seven years before Confederation were better for the people of Newfoundland than the seven years afterwards.

MR. LANE: That is when the parasites were saving the money, making the money.

MR. BROWNE: The honourable member is still not sorry for the remark, the insulting remark he made about the people of St. John's the other day, Sir. I remember when the honourable member first became a magistrate, and I think we treated him kindly and helped him to learn what he did not know about law, in every way we could we obliged him—I do not think he is doing himself justice when he is talking like he is.

Now, Sir, the Premier, as I said, prepared for this last election. One of the most important pieces of preparation was the new Act dealing with the House of Assembly. My honourable friend the Minister of Provincial Affairs, introduced it, and he knows how it was juggled around and the districts split up to give my honourable friend from White Bay North a seat, the Secretary of the Fishermen's Federation. He should not be here at all. The Government is supplying the funds to pay his salary.

A masterpiece of the Premier was the Deferred Pensions Act. I would

suggest to my honourable friends on the other side of the House to read again—I am sure they have read it already—the Deferred Pensions Act. That was a stroke of genius because it enabled the Premier to go around to all civil servants and say: I want you for White Bay North—I want you for Gander—I want you for such and such a district. That is not the end of it. The Premier can not put into those vacant seats men that he has confidence in, confidence in to run for him again in five years time—In five years time go around to Gander, White Bay North, wherever he puts magistrates and say—I want you to run in Trinity North and in Trinity South and all these civil servants are in a position as magistrates at the mercy of the Premier.

MR. MERCER: We will be all magistrates.

MR. BROWNE: No, I imagine there will be certain expendables in connection with these, but the Premier can always raid the magistrates and bring them out and put them in this House, civil servants, teachers are all covered by that Act. Well, by carefully selecting the men to replace the magistrates now in political life he will get a number of Government flag wavers all around the coast who will become his members when the time comes around—Who would dare refuse him?

MR. CURTIS: Does my honourable friend know who the chief beneficiaries of that legislation have been so far? Do you know the very first one came from your side of the House?

MR. BROWNE: Does the honourable member refer to the Candidate for Harbour Main, Bell Island?

MR. CURTIS: No, I refer to Mr. Dawson who was defeated.

MR. BROWNE: Well, he was eligible for it, but I am sure he was not the one that was thought of when the Bill was introduced into this House. It was to make it simple for the Premier to recruit. Because we know how difficult it is for us to get candidates, and the Premier was having the same difficulty. I return to it, I started out earlier when I said the Premier went out and got those prominent men, these men who were so highly respected—That is why today we are facing a group of men who naturally give a fine impression to any district in this House; that is why the House is lopsided. Is it any wonder—If we could do it it would be the same thing—But we cannot. If we could lay our hands on people and tell them—come here and come there—we too would have better candidates perhaps, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that was before the election. Now, Sir, I would like to refer again to the best years yet; the Premier knows that is the most fertile field that he has, or the most profitable one he has to work is Confederation—and so he comes out claiming the benefits of Confederation. You see, the Premier, the Founder of the Province, and I suppose in time to come people will raise their glasses and drink to the immortal memory of the Founder—the Founder of the Province who changed the course of Newfoundland History because he brought Confederation. Every election for the twenty-five years that my honourable friend from White Bay hopes to be here it will be trotted out—Confederation.

Confederation—We are not fighting the battles of Confederation over again, we are fighting on the record of the Government—and that is what we should do. Well, the new indus-

tries are with us, and I suppose are going to be with us as long as the money lasts at any rate.

Now—"Man of Truth"—Smallwood told the people Family Allowances would be paid for every child up to fifteen years. The Opposition said it was a lie.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the innuendo? Who were the Opposition? Who said it was a lie? Did I ever say it was not true? I do not think the Honourable the Premier would say I said it. Which of the Opposition said he was a liar?

"They said the Family Allowances were a bluff". The Honourable the Premier knows that back in 1939 I was an advocate, advocating the Commission of Government to introduce into the Civil Service, the former Chief of Police, the Honourable member for Port De Grave, knows that in 1939 I was advocating to the Commission of Government to introduce Family Allowances—and so unfamiliar was the theme to members of our civil service association they asked—What is it, you do not mean to say that two people sitting side by side are going to have different earnings, one man because he has eight children and another man because he has not—they thought it was unfair. That is how unfamiliar at that time it was. I recommend to the Commission of Government to introduce Family Allowances and the difference in the cost of living bonus to married men as distinct from single was the gist of the argument I put to the Commission of Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I say to the honourable gentleman, I accept that from what I know of the honourable gentleman, I accept that. I believe he did advocate precisely that

long ever before Confederation. Because the extraordinary thing about him is that for a Tory he advocates so many Liberal measures that he must be at heart a Liberal—It is astounding.

MR. BROWNE: Well I advocated what the Liberal Party also advocated. I am a Progressive Conservative because I believe in specific traditions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh yes, who put them up here (pointing to paintings).

MR. BROWNE: Yes, I admit the Premier has a natural nostalgic feeling for the Old House of Assembly, before the Commission of Government.

"He told the people Old Age Pensions would be paid to every man and woman seventy or over. The Opposition said it was a lot of huey". What member of the Opposition contradicted that, Sir? Surely the Opposition were intelligent men. The Opposition to which he referred were in the debates in the National Convention. We are not the people in the National Convention. There is only one honourable gentleman here today. I do not know if there is one on the other side besides the Premier, and the honourable member for St. John's East—three honourable members here who were in the House at that time. The Premier, the Minister of Labour. I do not know whether there was an Oppositor in the National Convention.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is a sort of rumor there was Opposition to Confederation.

MR. BROWNE: Supposing instead of those statements that were made we had statements like this:—

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Speaker, is not the honourable member violating the

Standing Orders on page 38 of the book?

MR. BROWNE: I think, I know, Mr. Speaker, what is referred to. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly in order. I am reading extracts from a book, Mr. Speaker. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly in order what I am doing.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is, I think, using these extracts and incorporating them into his speech as part of his argument.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If instead of these statements this statement had been made—The Premier said that by July 1st., 1952, there would be five hundred men working at the Octagon—The Opposition did not believe it. The Opposition told the truth. The Premier said that by the 1st of July 1954 there would be five thousand men working—

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not say "the Premier said." It says "Smallwood." Clearly this refers to the fight for Confederation. Clearly.

MR. BROWNE: Why bring it up now. We are not fighting it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Look around you and see. Look over there and see.

MR. BROWNE: But what I am getting at, Mr. Speaker, is that the man who used these arguments was not true and sincere in using them. He was using them because he found them useful but not because—

MR. CURTIS: And true.

MR. BROWNE: They call him Judias Iscariot and a traitor and a quissling. Supposing they did, what has that got to do with the election of 1956? What is the point?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It tells the truth. A man of truth.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, but I could show where the Premier had made a hundred incorrect statements that were fantastically untrue.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not untrue, but incorrect perhaps.

MR. BROWNE: I do not know whether untrue, Mr. Speaker, but it was told to me someone was supposed to be at a meeting of the Premier's and jumped to his feet—Tell the people about the Steel Mill and the traffic was to be so great they would have to build a tunnel.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is obviously untrue. Never in my life have I spoken at Bay Roberts about a Steel Mill. Anything is said as to what I said in Bay Roberts about a Steel Mill is untrue because I never said anything about a Steel Mill there. Now the honourable member for Fogo was the member for that district and he is the man who did the campaigning. He will say whether he was ever there.

MR. MERCER: The Premier was never with me. It is just one of those stories told about him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, there are hundreds of them.

MR. BROWNE: So like what he said that people cannot be blamed for believing them.

Now, Sir, I could elaborate on the fallacies contained in that document. I have examined them, and I think I could point out a great many, but I want to refer more particularly to some incidents of the election of 1956.

The Premier will remember that at the last session he was going to

come out in the Provincial elections and he was going to defeat me in St. John's West, South as it happened. The honourable members who were in the last session know how we passed a local road board Act. Well, I was asked to go to the Goulds to assist the people in forming the road board. I took the thing seriously, the Act seriously. It was not until yesterday I learned that four hundred and fifty-nine of them had been appointed by the Minister of Public Works and I doubt if he knew anyone had been appointed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Surely the existing local road committees constituted local road boards,

MR. BROWNE: There were no local road boards in many communities.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And still are not.

MR. BROWNE: It so happened that on the date before I was to meet the people for a meeting I went in Hefferton's Road, a road I know well. Last time I went in my car got stuck. I had a client who was building a house and went in to see him, and I got stuck again. Not only did the car get stuck but I had the muffler torn off the car. A local road, Sir, I have known the place over forty years, and I do not believe that in that forty years one dollar of public money was spent. So the next day I held a meeting in the parish hall of the Goulds, and we decided to take in the area between Big Pond and Rubies Line. Five hundred and fifty voters. It required ten per cent, about fifty-five people to be present to pass the resolutions and there were only about forty-five people present. So we adjourned the meeting until Thursday night following. We were to have a political meeting and thought we would com-

bine the two then and do it. There was a press gentleman present, employed by the Royal Excavating Company who said—Why go to the trouble of forming a road board, you can't get public money. I had innocently told them you could not get Government money to work on a local road unless you get a local road board. I took it quite seriously. But last fall the candidate of the District, then Liberal candidate, appeared with the Premier and had a meeting and after the meeting decided to get money from the Government to go to the Government and get money to spend on this road work, and then took all the people down to the tavern and treated them very nicely to refreshments. The next day, I am informed, he and the Premier went to the Department of Public Works and—there is one question on the order paper. This is the only one unanswered for a week—as to who ordered this work and how it was done.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To this moment, if I may say, I do not know any more about it than the page and Mr. Speaker, than the Clerk, than anybody. I did not go to the Department of Public Works. I did not make any order. I did not know any order had been made. I do not know to this minute if any money went out. That is sincere as anything I ever said in my life or ever will say.

MR. BROWNE: It is very excellent to hear the Premier deny any responsibility. If the Premier had not any knowledge of it who did? How did it happen that seventy-five hundred dollars were spent on a local road without any authority?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are you certain it was spent? Was it spent.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, I know the people. One of them who worked there nominated me. I know there were three trucks employed. I know the road was built. I was in there Sunday last.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is news to me I never heard of it to this moment.

MR. BROWNE: I hope the Premier will investigate it. It was in my opinion bribery and corruption. Government money used illegally on a local road road without a road board being formed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was certainly contrary to the whole intention of the plan.

MR. BROWNE: I will say this. I understand the Premier was not present when the party adjourned to the tavern for refreshments.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not only that but I left the meeting long before it was over and came on back to my office.

MR. BROWNE: Now I want to speak of another meeting, one which took place on the Blackhead Road—the Premier will remember that—in which it was said—"If you want to stay the way you are here vote for Brown or "Billy Browne," no road, no water and sewerage. But if you want to get water and sewerage here and want to get good roads vote for my candidate." Well, Sir, is money to be dispensed in that fashion. What have I done that I should be treated like that? Have I any rights? Have the people who support me any rights? The majority of the people there in 1953 had supported me but in 1956 they did not. One of my opponent workers went around to the people

and said this: Look here now, you vote for Kelly and you will get the water and sewerage within four days and you will have good roads, but if you vote for Browne there will be nothing doing. Look here, he answered, I am a veteran. I spent five years over in Europe during the war, and I was fighting for freedom and justice, was I not? And the party said, "yes."—Well, he answered, if I was fighting for freedom and justice is it freedom and justice that I must vote the way you tell me or the Premier wants me? Have I no freedom at all?

I took that man to Petty Harbour to the meeting and he told that story himself at a public meeting, the way he had been persuaded. Now these are not fair tactics and the Premier knows it is not fair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know anything about this party worker. I do not know anything about that. I know I was at a meeting on the South Side. I know what I said. It was very, very public. The newspapers and radio men were there, and it was broadcasted over a "PA" System. There was nothing secret about it, and I do not think I said anything that was wrong.

MR. BROWNE: The Premier will remember back to 1949. I can never forget it. What was said to the people of Ferryland—"If you vote for Bill Browne there will not be a cent spent in this district"—and it was said in different settlements. I knew it next morning. I took twenty-two sworn statements from the people who heard the Premier. The Premier was giving a bad example when he said that—and it is not fair—it is not just to use expressions of that kind, Sir. In the District of Placentia East the Premier's friend, the former Minister of Fin-

ance, now the Minister of Public Works ran against a "CCF" Candidate. He was elected with a majority. But in three settlements Mr. Thoms got a majority and one of those was Long Harbour. The highest majority Mr. Thoms got was ninety-three votes to seventy-four for the Honourable Minister of Public Works.

What happened? The road work was stopped immediately. Orders were given by someone to take the road machinery away from Long Harbour and sent it to somewhere else. What happened this winter? (I am sorry he is not here to hear what I am saying because I have a letter right here from Long Harbour dealing with the whole subject and giving me authority to use it)—The snow plow was not sent to Long Harbour during the winter until about February 24th, after I wrote a letter to the paper, and put this letter in the newspaper. That came from Long Harbour. The Parish Priest for the place went to the Minister and asked him to clear the road. No, he would not do it for the people. Why? Because they voted against him. Good Lord! Mr. Speaker, do the Government own this money? Do not the people of Long Harbour, the intelligent and industrious people of Long Harbour pay taxes the same as the people of other settlements?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is the honourable member saying the Honourable Minister told the Priest he would not do it and the reason he would not do it was that the people had voted against him? Did he tell the Priest that? Did the Priest say it was so?

MR. BROWNE: I have not spoken to the Priest. I am only going by the information of a resident whom I trust and from whom I have a letter here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman must want to be fair—I myself have had to write Clergymen who wrote me personally appealing "for God's sake, get the road cleared." I had to write back and say no—and they voted for us—We have all had to do that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is reported to me to have said—I would do it for you, Sir, but not for those people who voted against me. Now the people are under no misapprehension. They realize that they are being discriminated against because they voted against a Government candidate.

I have a letter here from Point Lance, and I draw attention of the Honourable Minister of Health, the member for that district, to it—Point Lance was the district which voted against the Honourable Minister of Health, one of the few districts that voted so in the majority—And here is a letter saying they have not had a plow all winter.

MR. MURRAY: There is heavy traffic to Point Lance, I presume?

MR. BROWNE: There are people there wanting to get to hospital and wanting to get food in. The Honourable Minister for Provincial Affairs need not be sarcastic.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But we cannot plow thirteen hundred settlements. There are two hundred Point Lances in Newfoundland. We cannot get plows in to them. There is not that much money for snow plowing. The honourable gentleman knows that—He knows that. It is all right to criticize us, but don't make ridiculous statements.

MR. BROWNE: The Premier can turn it aside as he wishes. But there is no doubt he does not know so much about Point Lance. I know it is a remote settlement but they have four miles, I believe, from the main road. The road goes to Branch which is quite a large settlement. I imagine it is plowed to there—Then there is a side road about four miles to Point Lance.

MR. CURTIS: Have they many people there?

MR. BROWNE: I would say three hundred and fifty or four hundred.

MR. CURTIS: We have settlements like that that never saw a plow.

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Speaker, what I want to draw the attention of the House to is that there is no doubt about it that the Minister who was elected from Placentia East had an easy time with twelve hundred and ninety-one majority, no Opposition from our party who might be expected to get a good following, and one of the two settlements, Long Harbour, that voted against him why should they be penalized on that account? I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Public Works, the present Minister, was a man with a fine sensitive mind. He was a poet. I have often read his poetry and I admired it, and I think I should cite some poetry to him now.

"Oh, it is excellent to have a giant's strength but it is tyrannous to use it as a giant.

Could great men thunder as God himself does

Heaven would not be quiet

For every petty officer would use Heaven for thunder, nothing but thunder."

and it goes on:

"Oh but proud man, drest in a little
brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most
assured, his glossy essence;
Like an angry ape plays such fantastic
tricks before high Heaven as
makes the Angels weep."

The Minister is dressed with a little brief authority, here today and gone tomorrow. But Long Harbour and the people of Long Harbour will be there, and they will remember his injustice in this matter. Let him while there is a chance heed the words given by the honourable member for Harbour Grace when he said: "Let us so behave, let us so act during this term of service here as members of this House of Assembly." How? "so that people will look back upon us and say—These were the times—These were great men—When none were for the party and all were for the State, the rich man lead the poor and the poor man lead the great, when the lands were fairly portioned and the spoils were fairly scaled, and Newfoundlanders were like brothers—in the brave days of old."

On motion of Mr. Canning, the debate was adjourned.

Committee of the Whole on a Bill,
"An Act Respecting the Department
of Highways."

On motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair:

Mr. Clarke Chairman of the Committee of the Whole:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, did I understand from the Honourable the Premier a day or so ago, the passing of this Bill did not necessarily mean the setting up of a new department, at least appointing a new Minister?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I did not say that. What I said was that the passing of this Bill to create a new Department of Highways did not mean an addition to the number of members of the Cabinet; that we have no intention—my exact words as I remember them—There is no intention to increase the number of the Cabinet. Now clearly there will be a Minister of Public Works and clearly there will be a Minister of Highways, and if the number of the Cabinet is not to be increased then that Minister of Public Works clearly must come from amongst the present members of the Cabinet. That is clear. As a matter of fact I do not mind saying it is the intention that I will take back the portfolio of Economic Development and ask one of my colleagues to accept the position and recommend this appointment to the Government to be the Minister of Public Works.

MR. BROWNE: What is this going to mean? I presume, Mr. Manning will remain as Deputy Minister of Public Works and a new Minister, probably an engineer, will become Deputy Minister—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not like to speak for my honourable colleague who is absent in the next Chamber doing some work as the Minister, but the Minister has the intention to create a completely new Department of Highways. I think his intention is to begin practically from scratch to build a new Department, but a very small one, not a big Department. My understanding is that Mr. Manning will not be the new Deputy Minister of Highways because, of course, he will remain where he is. Now on the other hand Mr. Manning is a walking encyclopedia of information. He is now, I believe, the oldest public servant in Newfoundland. I do not mean

to say in point of age but in the number of years he has given to the service. Since the retirement of Mr. W. J. Carew he is now, I believe the veteran of Newfoundland, and as such he carried I am sure—and my colleague the present Minister of Finance would confirm this—in his head an enormous amount of information about everything that appertains to the existing Department of Public Works, including those parts that will go to the new Department of Highways. I hope—I have not as yet been able to raise the matter in Cabinet nor I have not as yet had an opportunity to have a consultation with my colleague about it, but I hope to consult my colleagues in the Cabinet on the question of making available to the Minister of Highways the specialized information and knowledge and experience of Mr. Manning on Highway matters, even though Mr. Manning continues in the Department of Public Works and does not go to the new Department of Highways.

MR. BROWNE: Well that all goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that this does not seem to be very wise, if it is going to be an entirely new Department and is going to depend on Mr. Manning in another Department. It seems to me it is going to run into very many difficulties. I think we should know, roughly at any rate, how many new officials are going to be appointed. I don't suppose there is going to be any change in the division for the Registration of vehicles, for instance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I doubt it.

MR. BROWNE: In the different sections across the country; Clarenville, St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There might very well be in that latter regard some re-arrangement and re-appointing and

shifting of personnel from one division to another. There might very well be that—

MR. BROWNE: Well, is there anybody able to tell us how many people will be shifted from this Department now to the new Department? We should have some idea. I mean, this gives authority. We would like to know what is involved.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am sorry, my colleague is in the next room. But actually in this matter the committee must remember the Department is under two broad classifications, one that classification consisting of the Highroads part of public works who are in the headquarters and two the second classifications, thousands of them, who are not in the headquarters but who are out in the field. Is that clear. There are two broad divisions.

MR. BROWNE: Now with regard to the second of these two classifications that is some thousands of public workers whose concern is with roads, who are out in the field, there will not be much change although there might be some transfer of men from one section to another section, but there will be no or little increase in the number. There will be no change to speak in that regard.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Except, as I say, they may be transferred from one section to another section. Now with regard to the first of these two classifications, these in the present Department of Public Works whose duty is especially connected with roads, as to how many of these will be taken over into the new Department of Highways is a matter about which I am not able to say a great deal except that I know that my colleague is anxious to create an entirely new Department of High-

ways from the standpoint of administration staff, that is the headquarters staff, say, Deputy and the like.

MR. BROWNE: It is not a simple thing at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course.

MR. BROWNE: Where will the office be?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have not found an office yet. There is a strong desire on the part of the Attorney General to have the Department of Public Works remove themselves from what we know as the court house building so that the court house building could be occupied exclusively by the court and other Departments connected with it, administrative, justice for example. It could be the offices of the Attorney and his staff. There might also be within it a Department of police or a police office, as distinguished from the police station. Then again it has also been a thought that the Premier might resume having his office there. That has never appealed to me. I know that a number of Premiers did have their offices in the office presently occupied by the Minister of Public Works. In fact that is where the Council Chamber was. I think Sir Edward Morris sat there as a member of the Council. I know that Sir Edward Morris as Premier did and Sir Richard Squires and I suppose Bond. I don't know about Bond but Morris and every Premier before Commission of Government—and the suggestion has been that the Premier's office should be put back there. That has never appealed to me. Somehow I prefer to be in this building where I was for a while. So at the moment it is not decided where the new Department of Highways will be housed. There has been a suggestion that it be in the Government Building on Cornwall

Avenue, which is presently occupied by BRINCO in one part of it and by the Government printing Department in the other section. It has been suggested that that building be taken over by the Minister of Highways provided these other organizations find new quarters to which we move—but it has not proceeded very far.

MR. BROWNE: In Clause five, Mr. Chairman, does that mean the exact proportion of money allotted to the Highways Division of the Department of Public Works will automatically go to the Department of Highways?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the honourable gentleman state that again?

MR. BROWNE: In this Clause here, when in the Act provision is made based on estimates for the period from the first day of April 1957 to the thirty-first day of March 1958, to defray expenses of the public service of Newfoundland within the Highroads Division of the Department of Public Works such provision and estimates shall be interpreted as applying to similar or other as well as like classifications of the public service within the Department. I take it that means the money will be segregated to the Department of Highways in proportion?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. This is the only time the estimates for the Department of Highways will be shown in the Department of Public Works. After this year the estimates will be shown under their own heading.

MR. BROWNE: It will not be set up immediately?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but it takes time to set it up.

MR. HOLLETT: What about ferries and that, are ferries supposed to come in here?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, here in the next section, I think.

MR. BROWNE: Are there some ferries which are under the care or assigned to any other Minister?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are none we know of.

MR. BROWNE: The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may establish such boards, committees and councils as he deems necessary to assist and advise the Minister in carrying out this Act or the Regulations. Would the Premier tell us what is meant by that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is not that in all the Acts?

MR. BROWNE: I do not think that is in the Public Works Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think it is in most of the Departmental Acts.

MR. BROWNE: It is not in this one anyhow. Could we not have someone tell us where it came from.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Actually I think I can tell the Committee. The Minister-to-be of Highways at least tentatively discussed, at least has discussed with me the idea of setting up some kind of highway authority somewhat similar to the old highroads commission. He has talked of that, and this clause would of course give us authority to do this if it should be decided in the end it is the right thing to do. I think that is in mind.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps now the Minister is back, I wonder could he elaborate on it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes—it is as I just said.

MR. BROWNE: Although the explanation sounds sensible enough, it seems to me this is a very broad power, and we should, I think, consider it more carefully. The Government can establish such boards, committees and councils as it deems necessary to assist the Minister in carrying out this Act or the Regulations. You got carte blanche there to appoint a Commission.

MR. POWER: Only powers within the scope of the Act.

MR. CURTIS: Only power to assist and advise the Minister. That is not very drastic. The Minister does not even have to take their advice. It looks very innocent to me.

MR. BROWNE: It looks innocent, but how will the Minutes of Council read?

MR. CURTIS: It cannot go beyond advising and assisting the Minister, that is the ultimate.

MR. BROWNE: Will it be a paid board? It might be like the Board of Liquor Control.

MR. CURTIS: No, an advisory Committee. It has not been crystalized any more than we have at the present time.

MR. POWER: The stage reached at this date is that the Premier and I and the Attorney General have discussed it on two or three occasions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not yet before Cabinet. That Act is now before the Committee and if it is to be done now is the time to take the authority to do something, which we have not as yet decided to do but may after the Minister brings it before Cabinet and after the Minister decides.

MR. BROWNE: Could the Minister indicate what sort of a thing this Committee or council or board may do. I would not like to see another board like the Board of Liquor Control or any control of political appointments or even the civil service commission. It is bad enough now.

MR. POWER: What I had in mind was a Committee consisting of other members, some other members of the Cabinet. There would be no question of salary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If that is all you do not need a clause—you do not need legislative authority. We can do that at any time.

MR. POWER: We have to take in sometimes people with special knowledge.

MR. BROWNE: But Mr. Chairman, you have power to engage technical staff. You have power to do that now.

MR. POWER: Well, here is what I had in mind: Paving in Newfoundland if the Government have to do it out of their resources will be a long time away, the paving of all the roads that need to be paved. But there are certain roads in Newfoundland that other arrangements might be made, and this arrangement would only be with the consent of the people who live in the area concerned. Now the only area I have gone into about this idea, discussed with the people, was the area around Placentia, concerning the Argentinia Highway. What I did say to them was: If this road were paved what would you save on operating your vehicles per year, your tires and replacements and on your trade-in and so forth? Without exception they said two hundred and three hundred dollars and some said

four hundred dollars each year. So I said: Then, if we pave the road and made a toll road in that way those who live in the area would have an increase in their registration fees every year, say thirty or thirty-five dollars, would you be satisfied for that? Everyone said yes. Those who did not live in the area would pay a toll when using the road. For instance, from Colinet, well, I have a scheme worked out on prospective revenue whereby we could pave the road and amortize the cost in twelve to fifteen years, depending on the rate of interest we had to pay. What I thought we would need for a set up like that would be a sort of financial committee to advise the Department. For instance we would have to guarantee to the Government we would have certain revenues we could not guarantee to pay back the money. Each project like that would have to stand on its own legs.

MR. BROWNE: Stand or fall?

MR. POWER: Well we hope not fall. The Lewisporte road would be another one on which the same offer might be made to the people.

But I would like to make it clear there is no intention of doing it anywhere that the people were not satisfied. This may not be a good idea at all, but it may have possibilities.

MR. BROWNE: When you spoke of the Argentinia Highway, did you mean from Holyrood to Argentinia?

MR. POWER: Yes. Another aspect of this is that presently the black top that is used for paving roads comes in drums. A drum, I think, costs seven dollars. That raises the cost of paving to an outrageous degree. We thought of talking to the oil companies and asking them to bring in their

mix here and have tanks at certain points. Then later make arrangements with the Canadian National Railway to distribute it as they do in other Provinces of Canada. In that way we could reduce the cost of paving by a very, very substantial amount. But that is as far as things go so far. The authority here would be to have a sort of highway finance committee that would handle the matter of guarantees and revenues and all the rest rather than have it go into the consolidated fund.

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Minister to tell me—he spoke about the possibility of toll roads. Has any thought been given, in a very rough way, of course, as to what might be the results for maintenance and maybe the capital outlay in relation to the outlay and possibilities of traffic.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is what he has been working on actively.

MR. POWER: For the first five years the engineers tell me the cost of maintaining is very little, probably ten per cent of a gravel road. After that it runs into retopping and so forth. Certainly the overall picture would be vastly changed so far as maintenance is concerned. I would say the people who live on the roads in paved areas would certainly have substantial savings as far as operation of vehicles is concerned. If they were satisfied to do it we could go further with the thing. I believe myself that practically everywhere it is possible to do that the people would be satisfied and they would ask for it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, do I understand it is conceivable that the Minister may have twenty or thirty or a hundred committees, advisory boards

set up in different parts of the country.

MR. POWER: That would be trouble for myself.

MR. HOLLETT: He spoke of one road and one committee for that road.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No one committee for all the programme of paving, community paving that should go ahead.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I think myself, in view of the Minister's explanation here that the clause is not wide enough. If such a board council or committee is set up I think what should be would be a sort of authority which would be a legal entity and which would have power to raise bonds and spend money and such essential things and amortize a loan which would be applied to a certain section of road. I think myself the clause should be set forth in much more detail, in view of what is envisaged.

MR. HOLLETT: I cannot agree with the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs. It looks to me a way out for the Department to pass the buck to various committees to solve our road problems. Then the Department of Highways would be scott free.

MR. POWER: Well, let us say we asked the Government for a million dollars to pave the Argentina Highway. Under this scheme I have in mind we would guarantee to pay the interest on that amount and pay a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the money in say twelve or fifteen years. What I would want this authority to have the authority to do would be to collect the revenues that were necessary and hand them over to the Government. Therefore we would be assur-

ed that the money collected would be used for our purpose and used to amortize the loan.

MR. MURRAY: The money to be specifically ear marked?

MR. BROWNE: How about maintenance?

MR. POWER: The maintenance would be under the same authority as now—the maintenance would be much less.

MR. BROWNE: According to Mr. Manning, who is an encyclopedia of knowledge, the maintenance of paved roads is greater. That did not seem logical to me but that was what was given. I think the amount was six hundred dollars per mile compared to a lesser amount for other roads.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend has other thoughts about maintenance though. Perhaps it is a little premature to talk about that.

MR. HOLLETT: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, although we have a statement from the Honourable Minister it does not specify definitely what duties such a committee is going to have. I think this ought to stand over.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think instead of standing over we might pass it and at the next session it will have to be greatly amplified.

MR. POWER: It will not be made use of until after the next session in any case.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It will take a year to get it going.

MR. BROWNE: Are there any such boards in existence now? There used to be the Board of Works.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not now. There is a Treasury Board. That is the only board I know of. There are several local road boards, of course. None at the Goulds.

MR. HOLLETT: Does the Minister suggest that these boards collect the revenue on account of these roads?

MR. POWER: Yes, these boards would be responsible for the raising of the money to service the debt, and pass it over to the Government.

MR. HOLLETT: They would be paid boards?

MR. POWER: Well, it could be members of the Department including a Cabinet Minister and so forth. There are any number of possibilities, that would not be paid. I can assure the honourable gentleman that there is no intention of creating another set of jobs for people at salaries to be paid.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the time is passing, so I move the Committee rise, report having made progress and asks leave to sit again.

On motion the committee rose to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair:

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered Bill, A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Highways" and has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

On motion report received. Committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the day do stand deferred.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do ad-

journal until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 of the Clock.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on the motion for adjournment might I ask the Premier if the Government now inserts in Hansard the questions when we get the answers to the questions asked?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am very glad the honourable gentleman raised that question. It is the first time it has ever been raised in the House. I have thought of it but I have thought of it at the wrong moment a hundred times. I think the House will agree that the steno-typist and the Editor of Debates should take note of this fact, that in the Hansard of everyday's sitting of the House—Say; the Honourable Leader of the Opposition gave notices of question and the honourable member for St. John's South gave notices but not repeating the question but on the day the question is answered then the question and the answer together so that it makes sense. If you go back over the old Hansards of this House, back for fifty years or whenever they began, it is the most maddening experience to see questions asked and never a reference to the answers or to see answers given to questions that are not mentioned in the Hansard. It is all a piece of insanity. Another thing is this—Frequently a member reads a quotation, and the Hansard reporter drops that and does not report it and it is an essential part of the argument. An essential part of a member's argument is lost because it lies in this illustration he has used that consists of a quotation of one sentence or more. When this is not quoted and it hardly ever is, then surely it destroys an essential part of a member's speech. I think in that case the Editor of Debates should seek out the member and ask for the

quotation used in the case the reporter does not get it down. But the reporter ought to make an attempt to get it down, at least enough to identify is so that the Editor may go to the speaker and say—What was it you said exactly—get the exact wording of the quotation. That is especially true with figures which are very difficult to get down.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall discuss this matter with the Clerk and the Editor of Debates, and by the pleasure of the House, in future the questions with the answers will be published. We will take steps to have them published as the Premier said—agreed.

MR. HOLLETT: If they are in the public interest.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the answers are given they are in the public interest.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 of the Clock.

—
WEDNESDAY, April 3, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. P. J. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from the Maritime Hospital Service Association of Newfoundland. The petitioners pray, Sir, to bring in an amendment to bring their association up into uniformity with the other Maritime Provinces. I pray, Sir, that the petition be received and tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: This is a petition to introduce a private Bill.

On motion petition received for reference to the Committee on Standing Orders:

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices of Motion

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 Policies of Accident and Sickness Insurance," also A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act."

Notice of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Browne:

Answers to Questions

None.

Notices of Motion

MR. BROWNE: To move—For all books of Account including Ledgers, Bank Statements and Cheque Stubs and all Orders Book and Receipts of the former Superior Rubber Company:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the provisions of Beauchesne, Third Edition page 145, I am today moving for the production of certain documents which are in or should be in the custody of the Department of Economic Development. I do not know if the Minister is going to produce those without a debate, because last year he did not—The former Minister of Economic Development refused—And as the Minister is not in his seat I presume he has had notice of this motion and that he does not intend to produce the documents to

which I refer, without any debate in this House.

So, Mr. Speaker, if I might point out to the members of the House that apart from answers to questions voluminous documents or papers dealing with a subject may be laid before the House. In pursuance to the provisions of an Act of Parliament, for instance when the Minister of Labour produced the work of the Labour Relations Board. An Order of the House, that is what I seek. I am going to ask honourable members here today to vote in favour of this motion to order the Minister of Economic Development to produce these documents dealing with the Superior Rubber Company. I have here, if anybody wishes to hear, copies of Hansard for March 14 in which similar motion was made by Mr. Knowles, Acting Leader of the "CCF," Ottawa, when he made on that day four motions for the production of various documents, all of which were attended to by Mr. Howe or his parliamentary assistant. If any member or the members on the opposite side wish to see I will pass it across to the Honourable the Attorney General.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no doubt that the honourable member has the right, or any honourable member, to make such a motion, provided he has a seconder.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, it is an elaborate form of question. It is too elaborate an answer we could not expect any minister to give in the usual form. Now, Sir, I have here the question which I asked last year on the 5th of April—To ask the Honourable Minister of Economic Development to table copies of balance sheets of the Superior Rubber Company as at December 31, 1954 and December

31, 1955. That was refused. I have here also the order paper for the previous day when my honourable friend asked a number of questions, and I believe many of the answers to that question were also refused.

Now here we are dealing with a company which was established in 1953, and in regard to which an Act was passed on the 20th of May, when it received the Royal Assent. This Act confirmed an agreement previously made between the Government—Hon. Joseph R. Smallwood, Minister of Economic Development, hereinafter referred to as the Government on the one part and Superior Rubber Company, a company incorporated under the Laws of Newfoundland as the other party. Now the agreement was made on the third of March 1953 and the company had been previously incorporated on the ninth of October 1952. There is the sequence. The company was incorporated on the 9th of October, 1952 and at that time there were three shareholders. The company was incorporated with a million dollars capital, ten thousand shares of a hundred dollars each, and there were three shares taken out therefore there were supposed to be three shareholders. But it is customary, Sir, too, in connection with any company there must be three signatories to a memoranda of association whether they subscribe or not. They are supposed to sign their names as subscribers whether they pay for shares or not. And it is customary also that they do not pay at all. There is not actually any money transferred. These three signatories at that time were, I believe, the Lieutenant-Governor, Max Broun Wogau and I am not sure about the third, but I believe it was Dr. Valdmanis. However, there were three and only two signed the

agreement here with the Government. Now there was never any more than three shareholders registered in that company, and never any more than three shares and these were shares of one hundred dollars each. And there was a million dollars capital for the company.

This was one of those companies with which the Government made a contract on the basis of a fifty-fifty. They were supposed to bring out machinery and other equipment to the value of the same amount which the Government would lend them in the form of guarantees, the form of which is here in the Act equivalent to the value of the machinery they bought.

Now, Sir, on previous occasions I believe that I showed here beyond any doubt that these people brought out nothing of their own, unless it can be regarded they brought it out and sold it to the Government because there was no money as far as the public records show invested in it by the promoters of this company. Therefore it became a one hundred per cent Government concern.

Well, Sir, during the time that that company was in operation there were many rumors going around about the conditions, and of course the Government was advancing money from time to time. In 1952-53 in that year between the time of its formation or perhaps before the time it was incorporated, as far as we know, because we don't know the dates, all we know is the amount that is to be found in the Auditor General's Report and in the estimates. The Superior Rubber Company received from the Government in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1953, before the Act was passed by the Legislature, four hundred and

seventy thousand dollars. In the following year 1953-54 the Government paid to that company five hundred and twenty-nine thousand nine hundred and ten dollars and fifteen cents. In the following year, 1954-55 the Government paid three hundred and eighty-seven thousand dollars and in 1955-56 only twelve thousand two hundred dollars and in 1956-57, two hundred thousand dollars. Well, I must confess, Sir, to having some difficulty in finding out the exact amount which this company received. I believe it was in the neighbourhood of one and three-quarter million dollars, up to the end of March 1957—one and three quarter million dollars. Now that was the money that was used to build the plant, to run the plant, pay all expenses in connection with it. And the record in the Registry of Deeds show only three shares which were transferred from time to time and I believe the last shareholders were Mr. Ches. Pippy with one share, Mr. Pushie with one share and I am not sure about this but I believe Mr. Dawe had the other share—three shares—and one and three-quarter million dollars had been poured out from the Treasury into this company.

Now, Sir, we only know in the vaguest manner what happened to that one and three-quarter million dollars have some idea how much was paid for land, because the sale of land has to be registered and the sale of land was registered. I believe twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars was paid for the land. And some people up there whose homes were taken, to be removed for the purpose of clearing the site for the erection of the plant received compensation of perhaps fifty thousand dollars. About that figure went into the purchase of land and buildings. After that we know nothing.

I don't think it can be said that anybody here knows who built it, under what terms it was built, how inspected on behalf of the Government. We do get some information after the thing is built and gets into operation because we have an affidavit from one of the men who worked there. I have here an affidavit which I have read here in the House already, and I do not propose to read it all again. It is from Frank Pronold, a man who was of German birth and a Canadian Citizen since 1935, and came down here and worked as a designer or pattern maker in the plant. And he made this affidavit here in St. John's and he told us that at that time, that was in 1955, over two years ago, February 24, that the plant needed reorganization and should be closed down immediately. It was losing money at the rate of twenty-five thousand dollars a month; that it was badly constructed and had to have several alterations; that the goods that were produced were invariably defective; the company's sales averaged about twelve hundred a month, and sixty per cent of the money that was received for sale was refunded.

Honourable members who were here previously and heard this statement will remember he also swore that twenty thousand pairs which were shipped to Montreal at a loss of two hundred and seventy thousand dollars cost fifteen dollars a pair and sold for a dollar and a quarter to jobbers in Montreal.

Now then we were also told the machines in the plant were also second hand. There may have been one machine, an expensive machine, that cost forty thousand dollars. That was a new one, but they were six months trying to install it, and it was paid for twice, we are told. And in connec-

tion with the installation we were told that Mr. Braun Wogau wanted to put in padded payrolls to the Government.

Now, Sir, the position I think is quite clear. Here is an undertaking which was fully financed by the Government and the people's representatives in this House are entitled to know in detail the whole story of that plant and they can only know that by the production of the different documents dealing with its construction, the vouchers for expenditure for construction and for the purchase of equipment and for the operation. We can only get that from the Minister of Economic Development. If he refuses to produce that he is defying this House, he is ignoring the rights of the members of this House, all the members. We all have the right to see that now we are here in a representative capacity. We are not dealing with chicken feed; we are not dealing with trifles, but with very substantial amounts of money—at least, I would say, one and three quarter millions of dollars.

Now I suppose all honourable members are familiar with the fiction of the private companies. We have been told that in connection with other companies that information cannot be given because it is a private company. But this is not a private company because the definition of a Crown Corporation is one where ninety per cent at least ninety per cent of the capital is supplied by the Crown or is owned to the extent of ninety per cent by the Crown. But here is something that is one hundred per cent. Where is Braun Wogau? He is gone away somewhere, I do not know where and the other gentleman disappeared from the scene long ago. Mr. Braun Wogau was, I believe dismissed by Mr. Dawe,

a partner of the Attorney General. Now is it right that people outside of this House should be in a position to dismiss the president and manager of the company, to send him notice and the members of this House not know why or what for or anything at all about the expenditures.

Now this raises, it seems to me, a very serious principle. And I think I am justified in having some confidence in the integrity of the honourable members opposite especially those who have been in positions as magistrates. They know what it means for people to see that justice is done. Now here is the opportunity, probably the last opportunity that the people of this country will ever have of knowing what happened to Superior Rubber. Are we going to be told it or not? Is the Minister of Economic Development under any obligation to produce here the vouchers for the expenditure of this huge amount of money? If not it is just as well for us all to fold up. It is no use calling this House of Assembly of the people of Newfoundland any more. We are no longer here in any representative capacity. The people are told in plain words that their representatives are not entitled to know this even though the company is now bankrupt and it did not even go through the formalities of bankruptcy.

Fortune Bay Products Company at the present time is in liquidation and all its affairs—it is a private company, a company which owes the Government four hundred and fifty thousand dollars—all the information will be laid on the table before the liquidators of the company and everyone of the creditors may see exactly what happened to that company and may send a representative or may go himself and ask the general manager of

that company any question he likes about the way the business was managed or anything in connection with it. But here is a company in which the people of Newfoundland invested one and three quarters of a million dollars and we are not entitled to know anything about it. Now is that fair? Is that just? Now the principle of justice requires that we should give to every man his own. A man is entitled to his own. And the people of this country have that much invested, nearly two million dollars, and each one of us has a little interest in that company and is entitled at least to know what happened to this money. I put that to the honourable gentlemen who are magistrates and who have been magistrates—the people are entitled to know what happened to their money—if not it is a great injustice. We do not know how much of that was squandered, how much was stolen. We are told that some was stolen. We have been told that three hundred and sixty thousand dollars was just thrown away for junk, that obsolete machinery had been taken off the scrap heap and the rust chipped off and the article painted and sent out here and sold to this Government who never chose to inspect nor enquire as to the quality of the material for which was paid the people's money. Now I say that is an injustice, a grave injustice. And if the Minister of Economic Development or the Government refuses to answer this request then it seems to me they are bringing justice into contempt and the people will get the feeling—Oh, what is the use asking the Government anything. They won't tell us if it does not suit them. They can do just what they like. And politicians will go into greater disfavour and greater public contempt then they are at the pre-

sent time. I think that would be a very serious thing.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, is my honourable friend in order making a speech at this juncture? He has given notice of motion, the same as one gives notice of questions. He sent over to me a list of what has happened in Ottawa, and I cannot see anywhere there anything about making such a motion, making such a speech.

MR. SPEAKER: He is making his motion at the present time, but I do not think he is quite in order in the last part of his motion. This House will deal with the motion. It can be debated, it can be passed and made an order or it can be voted against. But I do not think that members ought to be told that the House will be brought into contempt nor into disfavour if they vote for, either for or against a motion. I think that is up to themselves.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, I have here the Hansard of the House of Commons of Ottawa of February 7, 1955, where an almost identical motion was given by the gentleman who is now the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, who was the leader, I think, at that time. This is February 7, 1955. This is a motion for all letters and communications since the first day of September 1954 that have passed between the Department of Transport and the Canadian National Railways, respecting the lease of the Queen Elizabeth Hotel in the city of Montreal to Hilton Hotels Corporation. Mr. Marler was first to speak. Mr. Diefenbaker did not open his mouth. The motion was there in his name. He uttered not one word. The first words were by the Minister of Transport

who refused to table the documents in question. The next voice was that of Mr. Speaker, MR. SPEAKER: The motion is withdrawn? and there is a question mark after the word "withdrawn." In other words he is asking a question. MR. DIEFENBAKER: No. That is the first words the mover of the motion has said—No, he is not withdrawing it. MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member says, no, and naturally he expects me to collect the voices (that is to put it to a vote of the House). I do not want to offer any objection to that today, but I do want honourable members to follow my reasoning and try to think it over so they will decide themselves what they should do in the future with respect to these motions, motions for the production of documents such as we have here today. It is simply this: the House is entitled to get only what it is allowed to get—it is entitled to get only what it is allowed to get. The House is not entitled to ask for confidential documents of a private nature nor for any documents which the minister may decide is not in the public interest to produce. When a minister rises in his place and says—I cannot produce these and an honourable member says. I would like the opinion of the House to be decided by a vote it means one of two things. Either the member who is now asking that I collect the voices for the purpose of providing a division does not believe the minister when he says that the documents asked for are not in the public interest to produce and therefore he is not accepting the minister's word which in all cases must be accepted in this House. When a minister declares a thing to be such and such he declares it on his honour, and therefore his word must be accepted. If on the other hand the House should vote upon the mo-

tion in an affirmative way, it would mean that a minister of the Crown has declared that it is not in the public interest to produce certain documents, the House would override that and would force the production of confidential documents or documents which it is not in the public interest to produce, and thus the House would insist upon having documents which it is not entitled to obtain.

I would like honourable members to think that over, because it seems to me that in most cases, as far as one can look back in Hansard since Confederation (i.e., since 1867) that was the decision arrived at. Of course there was a time when these notices of motion for production of papers were debatable, such as we have here today for the production of papers. There was a time when they were debatable and long debates took place upon them but all leaders of parties, in or out of power, have always agreed that they should not insist upon production of papers which are declared not to be in the interest of the House to get. I will leave these remarks for the consideration of honourable members and perhaps later on I shall hear comments of honourable members upon this reasoning. Does the honourable member for Prince Albert wish to say something?

MR. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Your Honour has seen fit to give a summary of the past procedure in giving an indication that any such appeal at this time would indeed be almost in the nature of an appeal from your own view, I am not going to press it at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: I tell the honourable member from Prince Albert that

I sincerely appreciate the attitude he is taking on this particular matter. As I said I do not want to impose a ruling today, but I should like honourable members to think over carefully what I have said because I do not see how one can get out of it. To me the situation is simply this. You can put on the order paper a notice of motion for the production of papers. If you were to ask for documents that it is not in the public interest to produce, the clerk of orders and notices would tell the honourable member who would like to put some notice of motion on the order paper. "You cannot put it on the order paper; I cannot accept it." You cannot ask for the production of confidential, private or personal documents or those documents that it is not in the public interest to produce. If you ask for documents and the minister says it is not in the public interest to produce those documents, if you do not accept his word it is tantamount to saying that the minister is not telling the truth. If he is, and that is to have the motion dropped. For today the motion is to be dropped.

Then Mr. Fulton, who is one of the Tory experts, I believe, over parliamentary procedure. MR. FULTON: May I make a suggestion, Mr. Speaker? I know I am not entitled to question Your Honour but I make the suggestion that some opportunity be provided for further discussion on the point at another date this session. I take the liberty of suggesting that, as Your Honour has pointed out, in the old days these motions were debatable. It would then be open to the minister to satisfy or to attempt to satisfy the House as to the justification for his position that it was not in the public interest to produce the document. In the same way it would be open to the

party seeking its production to try to satisfy the minister and the House that it was in the public interest. Your Honour has pointed out that that sort of debate is no longer permitted. I think it is for that reason that the practice of having a vote on such motions has arisen; because some members of the House may genuinely and sincerely disagree with the suggestion that the matter is against the public interest. Before we appear to accept that suggestion that such motion should not be the subject of division, I would again repeat my suggestion that there be further opportunity to discuss the matter.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is what Mr. Fulton said, then Mr. Speaker resumes: "May I suggest nowadays the motions are still debatable, but not when introduced in this way. If the honourable member looks at standing order 51 he will see this: but if on any such motion a debate be desired, it will be transferred by the Clerk to the order of "notices of motion." MR. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon and yesterday several of the matters that I have dealt with were referred to and they were referred to without objection from Your Honour. One speaks of co-operation. I am all for co-operation, Sir. MR. SPEAKER: May I interrupt the honourable member at this time. He has just said several points on which he has been touching were dealt with yesterday. That is precisely my point. Standing Order 46 (2) reads as follows: "Mr. Speaker, or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House or of the committee to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevancy or repetition—the language of that was simplified by the Rules Committee, as it reads—tedious repetition must be avoided either in respect of an argu-

ment or in respect of an argument given by another in the same debate. Is the honourable member telling me today that I should repeat some of the points referred to yesterday? I am justified in the position I am now taking by virtue of Standing Order 46 (2) etc.

Then Mr. Diefenbaker speaks and finally Mr. Speaker says: I do not wish to encourage honourable members to repeat either their own argument or those used by others, but may I say that if the rule is not enforced as regularly as perhaps it should be it is because, as honourable members will realize, it is one very difficult to administer. How can I tell if a member is just dealing with repetition."

Now finally he says: "Once all arguments on a given subject have been presented honourable members should decide the matter by putting of the question. That is the spirit of our ruling—one should not, remember, abuse freedom of speech by repeating ones own argument or the arguments of others in debate."

Perhaps that part is not too applicable, but I hold Mr. Speaker, the procedure as in the House of Commons and the procedure in the House of Commons has very direct bearing. Your Honour will agree, on this matter. The procedure is that the member who wishes to have the production he mentions placed on the motion, places the motion before one of the clerks. I do not think it is the Clerk of the House of Commons this is some other clerk evidently—and the clerk either puts it on the order paper or does not. If he does the motion is called, whereupon the minister concerned makes a statement. If his statement is to the effect that this is not in the public interest to

produce the documents in question no debate is allowed, but the member whose motion it is can call for a division. A division took place in this case and the Speaker was upheld when only fifteen voted against Mr. Speaker and the rest of the House supported Mr. Speaker. Now if that procedure had been followed here today I would have said, had I had the opportunity—

MR. SPEAKER: If the Honourable the Premier would excuse me—I think he has explained his point very well, and I was about to make a few remarks myself —

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before you do make these remarks have I an opportunity to reply to the point of order raised by the Attorney General and the Premier?

MR. SPEAKER: The Premier spoke.

MR. BROWNE: The Attorney General previously referred to copies of Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not want us to get into a long debate.

MR. BROWNE: Why not, Your Honour? These are things that must be settled. These are principles either right or wrong and we can not tell which until we have heard all the arguments,

MR. SPEAKER: Well, we have just heard the procedure.

MR. BROWNE: A very long argument from the Premier, but I have not been given the opportunity to answer. In the first place, Your Honour, the Attorney General, as he is accustomed to do, just brushes the Hansard aside which I sent over to him showing where Mr. Knowles had —

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Mr. Browne has on that particular date given notice of motion for the production of various documents. Now he says there is no debate here—But in that particular case, Your Honour, the minister got up and said, all the information has been put forward previously. Now the minister of Economic Development was not in the House when I stood up here this afternoon. I put down a notice of motion, and Your Honour knows you discussed with me whether I should have notice for the production of the documents or notice of motion, and I advised Your Honour I did not believe the minister was going to produce them. Now Standing Order 51 in Beausheune referred to in the debate by the Premier reads as follows: Notice of motion for the production of papers which the member asking for the same intends to move without discussion, shall be placed by the Clerk on the order paper above "Notices of Motions," under the heading "Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers." All such notices when called shall be forthwith disposed of; but if on any such motion a debate be desired, it will be transferred by the Clerk to the order of "Notices of Motions."

MR. SMALLWOOD: This one is not marked with an asterisk.

MR. BROWNE: I am just reading the standing order here—It is on the order paper with an asterisk, and all such notices when called shall be forthwith disposed of, that is without debate—but if upon any such motion a debate be desired it will be transferred by the Clerk to the order of Notices of Motions.

MR. CURTIS: Was I correct in rising to a point of order and saying

you were debating it? I find no record in these three cases you sent over here where the person who made the motion spoke. You take this one here of Mr. Knowles on March 13 for the copy of the minutes of all meetings of Northern Ontario Pipe Line—This is the motion for the production of papers of a Crown Corporation. And this is a motion on a corporation. The speaker answered—Since the railway was established, if this precedent were established by the passing of this motion that documents could be called for, this would keep this House engaged constantly and the civil service engaged in typing throughout the whole year. Under the circumstances I must decline to bring down this information as a matter of policy. And later on the speaker, in the same day ruled that the motion is not debatable. In other words, apparently the motion is not a debatable motion.

MR. BROWNE: All such motions shall be forthwith disposed of but if on any such motion a debate is desired it would be transferred to notices of motion. Surely private members should bring in private motions and have debates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not necessarily. If it is against the rule you cannot do it.

MR. BROWNE: It is the rule here, and that is what I am trying to show for the benefit of the House this is desirable in the public interest—and there is a big distinction between the documents asked to be produced by Mr. Knowles in the House of Commons and here, where there they are dealing with the Canadian National Railway and the pipe line.

MR. CURTIS: But one is a Crown Corporation and the other is a private Corporation.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General really is serious in saying that Superior Rubber Company is a private corporation then he is not really facing the facts—he is not—there are only three shares—He knows as a lawyer that there are only three shares—

MR. SPEAKER: Order—I think we are getting off the point — Order—

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I presume you have heard enough to be able to decide that this is a debatable motion, and if you give your ruling —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Your Honour, may I just say one word—If the honourable and learned member for St. John's had not done more than stand and say, "I move this motion" or one or two words more, if he had done no more than that I should have stood in my place and if the minister himself had been in the Chamber, which he was not at the moment—he was out in another part of the building—he would have stood and said "it is against the public policy. We will not produce these documents—That would end the debate and there could not be a debate at this time—But because the honourable member did not do that, he began what could be a long debate, which in fact is out of order—It used to be debatable.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Premier cannot say it is out of order until Your Honour has ruled.

MR. SMALLWOOD: According to Mr. Speaker in Ottawa—He said in times of old it was debatable. When the minister says it is against public policy, which he did not have an opportunity to say until I said it when I rose to a point of order—when he once says that all debates stand, ex-

cept years ago when the Speaker at Ottawa said they used to be debatable, but not for many years. He said that all speakers agreed for years past that it has not been debatable once it is declared against public policy.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker—

MR. SPEAKER: No, I think if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will—No member has a right to speak at this point.

MR. HOLLETT: I have a right to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: No, the Speaker may hear a debate. He does not have to hear it.

MR. HOLLETT: That is a new one—Is that in Beauchesne? What number in Beauchesne?

MR. SPEAKER: It is in Beauchesne. It says "The Speaker may hear debates."

MR. HOLLETT: Then I am not allowed to speak to this? The Attorney General and the Honourable the Premier were allowed to speak but the Leader of the Opposition has been denied the right to speak. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker!

MR. SPEAKER: It is not the Leader of the Opposition. We might continue the debate almost indefinitely—If the honourable member would forgive—What I was about to say was merely that—I did not say the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would not be allowed to speak. I said: "The Speaker may hear a debate," when the honourable Leader of the Opposition spoke of his right to speak. There is no right to speak at this time. That is where I was interrupted. But I would like for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to express his views briefly.

MR. HOLLETT: The honourable member for St. John's South was allowed to speak about half an hour and the Honourable the Premier for about ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to hear the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. But I would like to explain the position that it is not by right the Honourable Speaker heard the debate—I would like to hear the Honourable Leader, if he so desires—He mentioned the right—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, have you made the ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: No, I have not made a ruling. I would like to explain the point carefully. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition insisted he had a right to speak. I merely said: "No, the honourable member did not have a right to speak when the Speaker was about to give a ruling—Beauchesne says—The Speaker may hear a debate—That is the point I wish to make. I did not wish to tell the Honourable Leader that I was not going to hear him. I did not say that. I said, as a matter of fact, that I would be glad to hear the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two:—This motion was passed to the Clerk of the House. It was transferred to the Orders of the Day which is one of the requirements necessary to allow debate. It was brought up here today by my learned friend and no minister on the opposite side did get up in his place and say it is not in the public interest, therefore he was allowed to debate it, and I think rightly so. Therefore, I think, if he was allowed to debate the question for half an hour there is no reason why any honourable member in the House, who represents the people,

is not allowed. That is the point I wish to make.

MR. SPEAKER: I might say, at the beginning I did not anticipate this particular point of order would come up today. I had prepared a few notes because I thought that there might be some differences of opinion—The Premier has stolen most of my thunder—What I wanted to say was this, that the production of documents may be refused by the responsible minister—and here I quote Beauchesne, Third Edition, on Citations, 393: And May, Fifteenth edition, page 258, was another point. If the House agrees a committee can be ordered by the House to call an official of the company and order books, correspondence between the Government and the company may be asked for and produce it if it is in the public interest. Now, however, if the committee, supported by the majority of the House wishes it may refuse the production of any documents on the grounds that it is not in the public interest to produce them—This would be all the more so if the Government did not have these documents in their possession.

Now as regard the point of introducing this motion, I knew all along that the honourable member introducing the motion was not allowed to debate it, because I too have read Hansard, and I know these motions are not debatable in the House of Commons in Ottawa. But I feel that the honourable member would want to make an explanation and I allowed him to do so. I may say that I thought on several occasions that he was about to end and that the Premier or some other responsible minister would get up and say what the Government's attitude on this matter was. I was waiting for that to happen. And I believe when the Honourable the Prem-

ier was interrupted he was just about then to sit down—Am I right?

MR. BROWNE: I don't know if that is a very important question to put to me now. I was not finished. I had a few more things to say. I was not going to be much longer. I do feel we are dealing here with very important principle—If the rule in *Beauchesne* says, if a debate is desired it will be transferred to the notices of motion. In the English Language, if it is put under notices of motion it is debatable. And I understand when a motion is debatable any member can speak on it and then take a vote on it. And that is what I expected to happen this afternoon. But what I want to emphasize and have emphasized before in connection with this motion—to call the Superior Rubber Company a private company is pure fiction—If it were a private company it would be in liquidation and the creditors would be clamouring to have it wound up and the assets disposed of. But this is a Government company. This is entirely owned by the Government, and it cannot be said it is a private company at all. There is nobody here can seriously say that it is a private company.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has introduced his motion. Of course he knows it is not debatable—I have given that ruling.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, you have given the ruling that it is not debatable?

MR. SPEAKER: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: Then Your Honour should have told me so in the beginning.

MR. SMALLWOOD: His Honour could not until the Government declared against the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like, when the honourable member sits down, the Government to state its position on this, because when the honourable the Premier spoke he was speaking to a point of order, and I do not think we could take what he said as being the Government's attitude.

MR. BROWNE: Well, he was certainly hinting, Mr. Speaker, that if he had said anything he would have said it was against public policy. What I was trying to do today was to try to show honourable members of the House that there was no public policy concerned about it, that it was an expenditure of one and three-quarter million dollars and this House and the public should know what became of this money. If we do not know what became of the money it is a terrible scandal and a reflection upon all the members of the House who do not support this motion.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for St. John's East an order go to the Honourable Minister of Economic Development to produce these documents.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In reply, Mr Speaker, I have to say it is against public policy and we will not produce them.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the honourable member wished his motion to be put?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a division on it—

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that this House do order the Government to produce this document—All those who support the motion will please say "Aye."

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. BROWNE: Division:

MR. SPEAKER: Just entered as a division in the record?

MR. BROWNE: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

Orders of the Day

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on the Orders of the Day and pursuant to Standing Order No. 88, I should like to move for the appointment of a committee to nominate the various standing committees of this House for the ensuing general assembly, and I nominate as members of the committee the honourable member for Burin, Bell Island, Port de Grave, St. John's North and St. John's Centre.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed these honourable members will serve as a nominating committee, in pursuance with standing order 88? Agreed.

Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply:

MR. P. J. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate on the reply to the Speech from the Throne I follow the previous speakers in my sincere congratulations to Your Honour on your election to the Chair. I am, Sir, personally proud that this Honourable House has chosen you because it is a proof that a fisherman's son, from a small fishing village on the coast of Newfoundland, can rise to the highest honour in the land.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. CANNING: I have no doubt, Sir, you are capable of keeping good order here, for I have had the good fortune of being under your good counsel and good guidance at the Ex-Servicemen's School after the close of

the last world war. And I trust, Sir, that you will be as successful or that your value here will be as fruitful as it was to these men, many of whom have since graduated in many provincial spheres and are today again doing good service for their country. I know, Sir, that wherever they are today these young men join me in offering you congratulations.

Before dealing with the Speech from the Throne, Sir, allow me to say welcome to the political stage to all our new members. I sincerely congratulate the person who found them and those who elected them. I feel sure, Sir, having known most of them and having had dealings with many of them that they will serve their country well here.

Now, I will be pardoned, Sir, I know, if I say welcome to my fellow ex-servicemen who with valour once defended our democratic system. I feel sure that they will now play a part in the administering and preserving of that great freedom which is ours. I feel, Sir, that being—I was going to say the only private member—but one of the members I should say—being the only private member of the original Liberal Government—I am the only one left, Sir—As a matter of fact, Sir, I am the only private member, and I believe there are only eight others of the original group, including myself—I feel that it may be fitting today if I outlined my experiences here. Maybe it would be some help for those who sit here for the first time. Perhaps, Sir, or I hope, Sir, that with their honesty, sincerity and frankness they may contribute in some little way to the future political history of Newfoundland.

I feel, that we have now arrived at an era in our Island history of great

importance. The future of the province will depend on the closing chapter of the Terms of Union, which it was our great privilege here to write. At the same time I recognize, Sir, that it is a great responsibility. Perhaps it is one of the greatest responsibilities of this House, the greatest it has had since its opening back in 1949. A private member is not directly responsible—and I am not trying to shirk my responsibility—As a private member not directly responsible for final decisions, I may be in a position to appraise our past administration. Besides I have always felt it my duty, and I feel it is the duty of every member of this House and every minister that at least at intervals, at least once a year perhaps, to give an account of his stewardship as a representative of the people.

The seriousness of the lack of Opposition both in Newfoundland and in Ottawa compels us to at least examine openly our actions and to admit our omissions and weaknesses, and submit constructive criticism, to carry out the Liberal policy efficiently, effectively and well. I always remember the people who sent us here and trusted us to protect their interests. During the past eight years, Sir, this House has been noted for, in my opinion, two weaknesses (1) the lack of constructive criticism and (2) (and I am to blame as much as anyone else on this side) as the Leader on this side of the House usually carries the burden of defence. But he can perform that duty or whatever we leave to him so well perhaps it is wiser that we have helped him out so little over here—The past eight years have been a poor time for private members to become good politicians or good speakers because having that great orator and everything going along so smoothly and so well, we have had few opportunities or we did not

have much need to do much talking on this side of the House.

Bearing in mind, Sir, the things I have said, it is our duty that we should every now and then come out with what we have done in defence or admit any failure—I shall today mainly deal with the sections of the Speech from the Throne dealing with our financial terms of union; which, Sir, gives me great scope, without deviating from the speech itself. It is at this point that I feel myself compelled to go back to the year 1949 and give to the House a brief picture of the great needs of my district at that time, and after eight years, during which time millions have poured into this Treasury and great changes took place. But I can still say that great need exists before these people have the barest essentials of life. When I came into this House I represented fifty-two settlements. At that time I represented 9,662 people. 9,662 souls, of the Western World. They were not Chinese, they were people of English, Scotch and Irish or Irish I should say first with a strain of Scotch and French and Indian. A fine race, who were living on the coast of Newfoundland where they had been living for two hundred and fifty or three hundred years, and in some instances further back than that. And some aspects of their way of living was further back than that behind modern times in other parts of the western world. The main industry on which they survived or on which they existed were fishing, logging and backyard farming.

The fishery was carried out as their forefathers carried it out hundreds of years before. Logging was mainly carried on by a system of prehistoric instruments, called an "axe." The only difference in this instrument, Sir, and when the cavemen first got out and

tried to cut logs was that it was made of some kind of steel whereas the cave-man's was made of stone. Farming was mostly by the women folk. Their machinery (I should not call it machinery but contraptions they used) was the great historic shovel and the back-breaking contraption called a hand barrow, in which they carried fertilizers from the wharf. Briefly to sum up the situation, Mr. Speaker, those people through no fault of their own were isolated, they were underfed, they were lacking in clothing and medical attention. They had some good schools but many poor ones and underpaid teachers, and, Mr. Speaker, saddest of all, hundreds of intelligent children who had not up to that time had a chance nor an opportunity of a decent education and whose talents and abilities were lost to the country and to the world. But despite these conditions, I could look back in my own short lifetime and see many men and women who had come up from Placentia Bay under these hard circumstances and had played a great part both in and outside their home, the Island of Newfoundland. I can picture, Sir, great deep seamen, captains of both coastal and foreign ships, teachers and clergymen, doctors, etc., which reminds me, that at this moment behind me sits a man who has recently joined us who is a descendant, who had the misfortune to be born in St. John's, I believe, whose people at any rate comes from that well-known family of McGrath's whose children have contributed greatly to the Church and the state both at home, and away from home, as far as China. I am sure, that the honourable minister with his experience is well fitted for the job, and I think, Sir, that he will make one of the finest ministers of health this country has ever had.

Mr. Speaker, I have just briefly outlined, but without the slightest exaggeration, conditions as I found them in 1949 and as I had lived them in my early days. I went into the district, after a lot of consideration. Before I decided to go I considered the whole thing from every angle, asking myself was I fitted for it, I was not worried about winning. Anyway, I went in with one object. I went in to do my utmost to improve the lot of that people, my own people. I suppose I could have said I can go in to get what I can out of the Government and then vanish into oblivion. But I took the job seriously and I threw in my lot with those people who trusted me. They trusted me again in 1951 and again in 1956 when I did not have any opposition.

Sir, they were people that had suffered for many years, living under Governments who had done or made very little effort to improve their conditions. They lived under the heel of unscrupulous businessmen who lacked education and an economic sense and kept the standards of living of the fishermen and their folk below (perhaps I should not say below) standards of the people of Africa. This is not an exaggeration. I saw the conditions under which the Africans lived on the South Coast of the Continent and on the West Coast and on the North Coast and the East Coast of the Continent of Africa. I saw their conditions but I saw nothing I repeat, I saw nothing worse in any of those ports than I saw in the ports of Placentia Bay, my native bay. But I had great pleasure, and I was soon relieved by seeing great changes for the better. Time does not allow me today to do justice to these great changes during the past eight years nor, do I have time to lay before the House the needs that are still outstanding. If I am

here, which I hope I will be, please God, in eight years time there will be still need in Placentia Bay before we have brought our standards up to the standards of living on the Mainland of North America.

Mr. Speaker, during these best eight years yet I saw those little settlements change. I saw the people become more cheerful and contented. I saw the many social services that came there. I saw the children become better dressed and the older people more comfortable and the sick cared for and the breadwinners burden lightened. I saw new churches built, Sir, and new schools. I saw children remaining at school longer and at a later age than their families could heretofore afford to keep them there. I had the pleasure of seeing some of them reach college. Before, they could not afford to do this. I saw many young men come to the vocational training schools in St. John's and I saw hundreds of men making a fairly good living in the logging camps, in the mining areas, in the housing areas building houses, working on new buildings, new highroads, new stores, new garages and service stations. I saw them on survey parties, etc., which were carried on in Newfoundland and Labrador. The fishermen, they too found life a little bit better. But unfortunately until now so far their lot has changed but little. The story of the salt fishery is so well known and has been told to this House so often that I do not think there is any need of my reiterating what has been already said. The history of the fishery up to 1949, is water under the bridge, the history since that time is still with us, and I shall later on, refer to it. I say, Sir, the needs for my district are many, despite what we have done, despite the fact that many of them have

been relieved of isolation, the roads we have going into the settlements, the better homes, the better schools, there are still many needs, many wants, outstanding. But the first one which I will mention, amongst many urgent ones, is something which refers to your district and to the district of Burin and of course my own, the electricity on the Burin Peninsula.

Mr. Speaker, all your district and the whole of mine have not any electricity. The people are still burning their kerosene lamps, and in the district of Burin about sixty-eight per cent. The story is that there is a company here, United Towns. They have been there for approximately thirty years. They have a franchise and went in on the certified conditions that they would expand annually as far as the resources would allow them. As I said about sixty-eight or maybe seventy per cent of the Burin District was lighted. But they have not made a move during the last (I do not know how long) but in years and years. The water power is there. There is water power enough on two or three rivers on the Burin Peninsula to supply the needs, to supply all the needs for some time to come. But that company has failed, has continually stalled and has not done anything to further expand. The power is there which is shown as the result of surveys of prominent engineers. I am going to ask the Minister of Economic Development—I think it would come under his department—that he, in the name of all Placentia West, the name of all the west side of Burin District, and of those in Burin District who have not yet had lights, if he will approach this company and ask them what they are going to do, ask them to give a date when they are going to do it, and if there is an answer let us know

in this Honourable House before the close of this session. I am further going to ask him, if there is any more stalling, that he will bring in a Bill to cancel the franchise of the United Towns on the Burin Peninsula. We waited long enough. The Horse Power is there and if they do not intend serving the people what right have they got there? Just cancel their franchise and then we may get another company to go in and if we do not the Government will do it themselves. Mr. Speaker somebody has reminded me it is time for a recess—

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I was on electricity when I left off, I had asked the Government to consider cancelling the franchise. I hope that the House does not take me wrong in asking to cancel the franchise. I know it is something serious, if we are to have faith in other companies we know it is the last thing to do. I myself was and am of the opinion that the time is come that something must be done. They have had their chance. They have been asked to do something. The water power is there. The need is there. And if they refuse I think it is only fair to the people that we should cancel that franchise.

Another promise perhaps a problem surmounting all other problems in my district and yours and in practically every coastal area, coastal district of the whole province, it is this continuous discontent of people in isolated areas where they do not enjoy the most conveniences. They have neither schools nor teachers with grades. And Sir, a part of my district I am going to refer to now is that section of the west side of the bay from Little Har-

bour West to Swift Current, inclusive of Little Harbour West. I have a table which may be of interest to the House showing the populations in 1931 compared with the populations in 1956. With it Sir I have the number of teachers and the grades held by the teachers. I will take fourteen settlements, beginning with Petite Forte: In the Harbour of Petite Forte in 1931 there were two hundred and seventy six people. In 1956 there were one hundred and thirty—The number of teachers two. They have Grade "C" and "D", Great Paradise 153 people in 1931 and 131 in 1956—They have one "C" grade teacher. Little Paradise, 108 in 1931 and 56 in 1956—one "C" grade teacher. Southeast Bight, 92 people in 1931 and 90 in 1956—one "P" grade teacher ("p" for Pat) Mr. Speaker, I have tried to find out what that means. I think it is Grade XI and Memorial where she failed in one or two subjects. I believe that "p" would be pending her passing later on.

Little Bona—35 people in 1931, 22 in 1956—No school. Toslo, 38 people in 1931—Nobody in 1956—that is good. The next figure is an interesting one, it is Presque with 65 people in 1931 and 78 in 1956. What has happened there is that those people in Toslo went out of the frying pan into the fire and went into Presque. That is a serious situation. I think if we had to have any organization or any plans that would not have happened and these people would have gone to some place where they would not have had one "D" grade teacher as they have at Presque. For their children they left Toslo where there was no school and settled in Presque where there is one "D" grade teacher. Unfortunately they did not improve their lot very much. St. Kyran's in 1931 had 95 people and in 1956 had 43. One first

grade teacher. St. Anne's had 72 people in 1931 and 78 in 1956. One first grade teacher. The story is the same, right down through the bay. At Clattice Harbour Southwest and Northwest they had 193 people in 1931 and in 1956 they had 157. They have two teachers, one "D" grade and the other "B". Monkstown had 75 people in 1931 and 140 now, an increase, but they have two "C" grade teachers.

Mr. Speaker, besides these I have listed here, fourteen settlements, I don't know how many teachers in all, probably twenty or thirty in all, with one first grade teacher. To me, this is serious. Those children there have either no school or have teachers who are really not qualified to do the work.

The lack of roads, the lack of electricity or anything else of that kind, to me, is not nearly as serious as this situation. Hundreds of children are being deprived of an education. It is really too serious to think of—As I said earlier in my speech, their talents and their abilities will be lost forever. There is nothing much we can do about it. We just cannot get the teachers to go there. It is the same story with nurses and with wireless operators they do not want to go to those places. Any of the children who get through school and get a grade or becomes a graduate nurse definitely refuses to go back to their home area to practice or to impart their knowledge or whatever it is to those who are left.

Of course, the one person who is to blame for this situation, who has caused all this, is really the present Premier of Newfoundland. He has made them discontented there. He brought Confederation. Their earnings went up, their standard of living went up. He got fellows like myself who got interested in roads because they had motor cars to drive out to

settlements across the way, and then these people in isolation became discontent. They are on the move—They want to get out and enjoy the better things of life in other parts of the world. Now, Sir, that he has caused that, and his Government have caused it, I am hoping that he is going to do something about the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I have had hundreds and that is no exaggeration, of letters from parents in those places, I have had hundreds of them in the last two or three years, begging for help to get out—They are a fine crowd of people who are interested in the education of their children—That is the one outstanding thing they mention—"If we stay here we can't get teachers to come, and our children will grow up uneducated—Will you try and get the Government to do something about moving." And Sir, I think that every sane, thinking person in Newfoundland today will come to the logical conclusion—Take Little Paradise or Great Paradise up on the west side of Placentia Bay—there is no Government can afford, no Government could possibly ever get a road there. I do not think any engineer could overcome the obstacles. It is obvious that we are not going to get teachers to go there. So the only conclusion I can come to is that we must do something and perhaps do it soon, the sooner the better, and get those people out. We are not dictators so we cannot dictate. We cannot drive the nurses in there nor dictate to those teachers with grades to go in, and the only thing to do is to have the people moved. They need help to pull up their stakes and get settled elsewhere. I feel sure it is a Federal and Provincial responsibility to make room for them somewhere else, to build up towns with electricity and with water and sewerage and good schools, etc., and then

give them the help in some form to get away from this isolation. They are not Hungarians, nor Germans, nor Europeans, they are our own people crying for help in the interest of their children. And, Sir, I feel if we let this go and do not do something about it, the effects of it will certainly live after us, and I think we will be held to blame. I trust our fellow members in Ottawa will do all they can to make the Government of Canada interested and do something about this serious situation, with our help. However, Sir, when and if this does happen I will still have people in Placentia Bay in the larger settlements and I hope that they will grow and prosper. But to prosper they will have to depend upon the fishery industry as it looks now—Placentia Bay is one of the finest fishing areas on the whole coast, ice-free harbours and I think if we approach that problem and keep on as we have been going—Already as I have said there are improvements—the flakes are gone and the stages are gone, the fish is now handled at plants, and I hope it won't be too long before more of them get rid of their fish in that way—And they have been getting fairly good prices—We have had small plants grow up in the last few years, one at Merasheen which I hope will be successful. While it is in the growing stage at the moment, and like all other new things that come to us we have to adjust ourselves to them, but I hope that the fishermen will do their part and keep at the fishery up there and bring up their production and make it a success. As I said there is a plant at Merasheen. There is another modern dryer at Harbour Buffett and these combined can safely look after the amount of fish that can be caught despite that many more may go back at it this year now that they have un-

employment insurance for fishermen. I think they can absorb the fish and things will gradually become better as time goes on.

I am not going into the industries, Sir. We have heard so much about them and we are still hearing and will still hear. Yes, I will take one—I will be brief so that those new members who have come in here and heard so much criticism before they came and are still hearing it and are going to hear it, I assure them, for a long time to come. I will take one. You almost tempted me to take the Rubber Plant.

MR. BROWNE: Go ahead.

MR. CANNING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will take the Rubber Plant. Or I will take two. I will take the Birch Plant and the Rubber Plant, and I will just state to the House for the interest of new members just what the situation was.

I sat here in the next seat here, where that fellow who does not behave himself, who talks about St. John's, now sits—and I voted for the money for the Birch Plant. The Birch Plant is where you manufacture plywood for building, so I had to vote money to erect that plant and carry it on and I may have to vote more money. That I do not know—to still carry it on, I look upon it this way: It was birch for the manufacture of plywood and one hundred and one other things and the first thing I visualized was right across Newfoundland there were thousands of cords and millions of feet, I will put it that way, of birch that has never been used, that had blown down. So, as I said, I voted for the money for the birch plant, to give more employment to the people of Newfoundland, and I

surely felt it was justified and I felt Mr. Speaker, that there was room for one at that time and perhaps two today. Something has happened it. What I do not know, But the principle of the thing was right. Was it built in the wrong place? Should they have come near St. John's with it? I wonder. I do not know. Perhaps they should have gone to Bay D'Espoir, gone nearer the birch. I did not decide that, where it was going to be built. I do not know if the Government decided, to be honest—I do not know if they did. I think they made a mistake but that is a matter of opinion. I did not build it, I was not the contractor. So if the contractor charged too much to build it, it is not my fault. If the material going into it—we heard of high prices it is not my fault if they were. And, Sir, it is the same thing with the other plants. The Rubber Plant. There are some fifty thousand suits of rubber clothes used in Newfoundland every year and perhaps more rubber boots. Well, the principle of the thing is right. If it has gone wrong perhaps we may learn by the mistakes we have made and when we bring in another we might avoid the pitfalls. All I do know is the Government had courage enough to bring an industry in to invest in it and to set us right if we are wrong.

If we are wrong, if we have made a mistake I look on it this way: For us industry was something new. What did we have before? We had the fishery. We cut logs. We made some paper. We mined some minerals. We never saw a glove made. No we did not. We never saw a shoe made.

MR. BROWNE: Never saw a shoe made?

MR. CANNING: So if these plants are working or if there is one gone, I

do not care, it does not worry me. I have seen places go down and firms fail in Placentia Bay and in Fortune Bay and Burin. We have seen industries go down in a time when we could not afford it as well as we can now. Industries have failed. I have seen fish plants fail, not for the want of fish, not owing to the man who loaned the money to get it going, not that he did wrong by getting it going. So perhaps it is not for the public interest for me to say why some of these things failed. Perhaps I could tell the Honourable House this afternoon why the plant in Fortune failed—perhaps I could—but I am not going to tell, because perhaps it is not a good thing for Newfoundland. For example if I turned around and said this afternoon that the per capita output at Fortune was only fifty per cent of what it was in Gaultois, how would that stand. If I said that, how would it sound? Perhaps the man who has gone in to work in the fish plant at Fortune never before saw a fillet cut. Perhaps it is going to take two or three years before production is going to come up in Fortune. Perhaps, I say—I have not given that as a reason—Perhaps it is poor management. Mr. Speaker I could tell you how I could do wrong, by condemning—

MR. SPEAKER: Order:

MR. CANNING. Anyway, Sir, we are young at these things, we are new. I know that all is not well in the plants, in the Birch Plant. I know all is not well. I know the reason why it is not. Am I going to tell it? I do not think so. I do not think I should. But there is one thing I do know, or one thing I do think and that is the plant in Burin today is going to prosper. There are going to be a few adjustments to be made. We have put money into it. I have most

of my district fishermen to keep it going, the finest kind of fishermen bringing in bumper loads. They are not making good money. They are not making money enough. They are not paid enough. The price of fish is not high enough. Why is it not? Why is it not more than two and a half or two and a quarter? I think I know the answer. I feel I do. I feel I have studied it enough to know. But I do not think I should air it here. Perhaps I should go to the Minister of Fisheries and talk it over with him. Perhaps it is my duty to go to Arthur Monroe and tell him. If it is, and I find it is, I shall certainly go.

MR. BROWNE: Why do you not try?

MR. CANNING: Try to go to Arthur Monroe? Yes I will go to Arthur Monroe at any time, and any time I will defend the loan to Arthur Monroe here in the House or outside of it, justify it. That is that we were justified in loaning it. We were begging somebody to do something about the fishery. He was the one who had enough initiative, he was aggressive enough to go looking for it. We gave it to him—and those who were talking and criticizing it did not do anything. At the same time, Sir, I meant to say that I am hoping that the Minister of Fisheries will carry out, the new minister, will carry out some sort of investigation into the plant that we have given a lot of money to in guaranteed loans. If we are in a position to do that, and I think we are, and have the whole thing investigated and if it is necessary have adjustments made. Because as far as I am concerned it is the fishery that is very important, and we should not leave any stone unturned to make each and every plant operate successfully.

There was one observation that I meant to make earlier when speaking of the difficulty of getting nurses to go to isolated areas or doctors for our outport hospitals. There is one suggestion I am going to make, which I hope will be of some effect, I hope will be carried out. As I see it, the nurses and doctors that we are getting in from Britain at the moment are making Newfoundland a training ground or a stepping stone to further on. As I see it now some of our own nurses are leaving and going to the Mainland where they are being paid higher salaries. I feel, that the Federal Government should come in and help make the allocations to bring up the standard of the salaries of the nurses and doctors or standardize them across Canada. If they don't we are going to have this problem for a long time to come. Our nurses are fairly well paid, I suppose, according to the other civil servants and other people's earnings. At the same time they are attracted by a much higher salary offered them in the much richer province.

Sir, in conclusion I will just say that—let us work hard and make a great Newfoundland greater and a great nation of Canada greater still, that by our example we may lead the world in all our history.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended and in fact under ordinary circumstances I would not be speaking in this debate on the Speech From the Throne. But as it happens the circumstances are not ordinary, since I am here this time representing a new district. Consequently the few simple remarks I will be making here in this debate will be based primarily on the fact that for some four years I was the representative in this House for the district of Labrador and I am now

the representative for the District of White Bay South.

Before I go into any detailed references I should like to perform a number of courtesies. First of all, Sir, I would like to offer to you my sincere congratulations on your election. I think I can sum up my feeling about that election by saying that I predict for Your Honour a distinguished career as Speaker, and I have no doubt other functions as well in this House of Assembly.

I would like also to join with the other speakers in extending my congratulations to the honourable member who moved the motion and the honourable gentleman who seconded it.

This is, I believe, my fifth year in the House of Assembly, and I think, without exception, all of the speeches made on the motion and on seconding the motion, have been good. However, I am not making an ambiguous comparison when I say there have been none better than those which we were privileged to hear from those two gentlemen this year. I would like to extend my congratulations to the members of the Opposition, some of whom are back here with us once more, and one of them, who is for me, at any rate, a new member of this House, although he did spend a short time here under somewhat compromising circumstances a few years ago. I would like to say this: It is our duty as members of the political party to do all we can to get our party and members of our party elected, consequently, it is our duty to fight against these honourable gentlemen, insofar as is feasible whenever there is an election. It follows, moreover, that since there must be an Opposition, or at least there should be an Opposition,

and we all count on the Opposition, I think, speaking for all on this side of the House, there are no gentlemen in Newfoundland today whom we would rather see across this House than the four who presently occupy seats across there.

I believe I am the first Minister to speak in this debate, and I want to take advantage of that to extend to the new members my congratulations on their election, on their coming into this House. I believe I speak for anybody in the Government when I say that we are indeed highly pleased at this new blood that has been brought in to the party, so to speak, and into the House. In fact I am sure that the Honourable the Premier will not mind if I repeat a statement which I made to him I think over a luncheon a few days ago, when we were chatting casually about the new membership in the House of Assembly. And I believe I am correct that if the Premier had a vacancy in his cabinet and had to select a new minister he would be highly puzzled to know whom to select, not because there is any dearth of talent and ability but because there are so many talented and able among the new members who have come into this House of Assembly. I doubt if any Premier in our long history, and some of them have brought here eminent politicians, men of great talents and integrity and capability, but I doubt if any Premier from Little down to Alderdice was ever fortunate enough to bring into this House of Assembly such a group a large group composed of so many men of ability of standing and prestige in the community.

While I am on this, I had not intended to make this reference, but I think I should. I rather regret the fact that in some quarters, particular-

ly last year during the election and since, we have heard the insinuation that a number of the members on this side were in some way bamboozled, conjured, taken by the scruff, so to speak, and brought into this House of Assembly. I was very pleased that my honourable friend who represents the district of Carbonear took occasion to refer to that. As it happened he and I were in university together. He is one of the magistrates against whom so many scathing remarks have been heard in recent months. If I may be permitted to say so the honourable gentleman had political ambitions even then when at the University. I recall having the honour and the satisfaction of nominating him in an election for the Student's Representative Council of the University. I believe he was the first outport student to be elected as the president of the Student's Representative Council, which runs students' affairs in the university. Then he had political ambition because that in a small way was a political arena. I recall the confirmation of his statement heard some five years ago in a private conversation. I am sure he won't mind my saying this. He expressed his intentions at the first available opportunity of entering the political arena. I think that probably holds for other members over here as well.

We are fortunate enough to have here, Sir, a number of ex-servicemen, men like my honourable friend from Harbour Grace who obtained his majority out in the field, men like the honourable member for Bell Island and others here too, veterans of both wars or one or the other of the two world wars. These men were not used to being pushed around. We have here other eminent men. We have for example here on this side

of the House three eminent seafaring men, three captains. These men all up through the years have not been used to being pushed around. It is an insult to the Premier, to the Leader of the Party and to the men concerned for any person to insinuate that any of them were truncheoned by the Premier or by anyone else into entering this House of Assembly. These men came here of their own volition. They came because they felt they could make some contribution to the political life of Newfoundland. I am firmly convinced that without exception they will add luster to this Assembly.

I want too, Sir, to extend congratulations, openly and publicly to the Honourable the Premier who has achieved what no other Premier ever did achieve. He has won three general elections in a row, and he has done even something which is in fact to anybody who has studied the political history of Newfoundland something which is more startling than that fact which I just referred to. Not only has he won three political elections, three general elections in a row but he has come back with an increased majority both in the representation within the House and in the actual number of votes cast. I am one of these who believe that politics is honourable. It is a science, an art, an honourable art at that. That being so, then we must admire political skill and acumen wherever we see it. My belief is that this last election, looking at it purely from a political standpoint, purely from an aspect of politics was one of the most consummately planned and one of the most consummately executed elections that have ever been held in the history of Democratic Government. The Premier is to be congratulated not only on

being able to induce seventeen distinguished and honourable men to join with him in this House of Assembly but he is to be congratulated that once more the people of Newfoundland—and I would like to assure my honourable friend from St. John's Centre, the people in Newfoundland are informed, they know just as much about the birch plant as my honourable friend knows and know just as much about the Superior Rubber Plant as my honourable friend from St. John's Centre knows—the people of Newfoundland are free. In a free election having considered all the factors involved they returned the Premier and his Party in the greatest show of confidence ever displayed in any general election since we first had a general election over one hundred years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to say a word about the District of Labrador, which I represented here in this House of Assembly since 1953. It was my first district, and I am very happy to be able to say that from the first moment that I represented those people in this House of Assembly up until the time that I discontinued my association with them they gave me their unqualified support. My honourable friend who represents Labrador North in an excellent address yesterday spoke of some of the things that the Government has done in Labrador, particularly in the northern half of Labrador during the past few years; I think it is correct to say that the Government, with no particular merit on my part, it was the general policy of development, has accomplished a great deal for that area. For the first time they know in some parts of the district, both north and south, what roads are. It may come as a surprise to some of the honourable members of this House to know that

possibly by the end of this year, in the Straits of Belle Isle, fourteen settlements will be linked up with one another and also linked up with the Province of Quebec. And that in the Straits of Belle Isle, a fine modern highway is being built to link up the people of Goose Airport and Happy Valley and North West River area and others in that area. My honourable friend spoke of some of the things being done for the Esquimaux and the Indians of Northern Labrador. When this Government took office they were a disappearing people. The tuberculosis rate alone amongst the Indians of Northern Labrador was possibly the highest in the world, in the whole world. One year out of one hundred and twelve Indians in one of the settlements twelve were active cases of tuberculosis. Today tuberculosis is virtually eliminated from amongst their midst—and that applies to the Esquimaux as well as the Indians.

I was very happy that my honourable friend referred to this matter of centralization. Last year the Government, through the Department of Public Welfare, conducted what might be considered one of the most important operations of its kind ever tried in Newfoundland when we removed wholesale the Indian population of a comparatively large settlement—on a voluntary basis of course—and moved them in some cases several hundred miles to the south and re-located them, established them with Government help and their own help, in places like Nain and Northwest River and Happy Valley, places where they could enjoy medical services and places where they were within easy reach of communications with the outside world, and places where their children had a better chance

of education. That experiment was an unqualified success, and it argues well for the policy announced some weeks ago by the Honourable the Premier, the policy which we hope to be able to apply to the people, with the people's consent and of course with their complete approval and only their complete approval, and to a number of small isolated settlements in Newfoundland. I shall refer to that later, when I come to speak of my own district.

I was very happy that my honourable friend referred to Happy Valley. That is now the largest and fastest growing community in the whole province of Newfoundland. It is a community which did not exist five years ago—there was just a bunch of settlers on airport territory. Today, thanks to an agreement developed between this Government and the Government of Canada, those people are now on their own land and are now entitled to enjoy and are enjoying services and amenities which had for almost ten years been denied to them. I predict that Happy Valley will become a town of five or six thousand population perhaps within the life of this general assembly.

The reference which my honourable friend made yesterday to transportation and coastal services gives me an opportunity which I wanted to have for some time, the opportunity to refer to the co-operation which I, during the years that I represented Labrador, received from the Canadian National Railway in Newfoundland. I want to go on record as saying that without exception every proposal which I made to the Canadian National Railway to improve the services of Labrador were accepted and implemented. I am going to read a list of communities—These are well known names in this Province—St. Mary's,

Port Hope Simpson, North West River, Goose Airport, Fox Harbour, Postville—Not one of these places was a recognized port of call for a steamer years ago. During the open season they receive regular service from the Canadian National Railway Coastal boats. Repeatedly it was necessary for me to request of the Canadian National Railway extra services, special trips for freight, special emergency provisions to take patients to hospital—without exception they co-operated to the fullest. I recommended to them that they would extend the season, the coastal season in the fall. They did that so that the time of isolation was shortened very considerably. A service was instituted, leasing the Motor Vessel "Trepassey," a service was instituted whereby all Northern Labrador was linked up with Goose Airport, the place where the great majority of the men were able to find work. So that we have now a dual service to Goose Airport, one from the South and one from the North converging on Goose Airport and Happy Valley thereby making it possible for people from all parts of Labrador to go to that industrial area.

I am going to leave Labrador for a moment and speak of White Bay. Since I have become a member for White Bay it has been my privilege to make certain recommendations to the Canadian National Railway regarding the services there. On the whole, when I became a member and went down there and gave some attention to it I found White Bay was being well served by the Canadian National Railway. I believe that feeling was shared by my honourable friend, the member for White Bay North. Nevertheless there were several communities not included as ports of call, and there were other services

which I felt might be instituted. I made some recommendations to the Canadian National Railway on that. I got a note today that they are now being very seriously considered, and I have no doubt but what these new places will be included as a recognized part of call this year. I believe amongst other things the Canadian National Railway is giving sympathetic consideration to the possibility of extending the services of the "Nonia," the new ship further than in the past.

I would be lacking, in a sense of gratitude, I would be lacking a sense of responsibility, I would even be guilty of churlish conduct if I did not express my thanks to the Canadian National Railway. Men like Mr. Grayson, Mr. Peters and Mr. Cox who have always received me kindly and sympathetically, and in particular to the two men, Captain Dalton, former Marine Superintendent and to the present Marine Superintendent, Mr. Healey, both of whom have co-operated in every way possible to improve the services in the north of Newfoundland. I do not need to tell this House that there are still lots of little things that we would like to see improved in the north. I think I can speak for my honourable friends who represent the northern districts when I say this—But on the whole the service is a good service, many improvements have been made and invariably the Canadian National Railway people in Newfoundland have leaned over backwards to bring improvements and benefits to our people in Northern Newfoundland and in Labrador.

I want to make a brief reference—particularly since it has come up in this present debate—to the mineral exploration and development in Labrador. I was rather amazed the other

day to hear my honourable friend, I think it was from St. John's South (I do not know if anybody else finds it as difficult as me to remember all the districts) the honourable member for St. John's South referred once more to BRINCO in the way that he did, only yesterday—He used the term several times—"Give away" our resources—(and "depreciating" yes, that was what it amounted to.) He said anybody can give away the resources of Newfoundland. Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, whatever expressions during an election campaign that people will make use of, whatever argument they can make what ever excuse in making these references. Whatever excuse there was then in making such references there is none now. BRINCO has spent millions of dollars in Labrador that we could not have spent and that nobody else was willing to spend—and they spent it for one reason, because we gave them this thing or that thing? We gave them nothing except the right to explore and the right to develop. And there is not a Government in Canada today—I have in my desk up in the Department of Mines and Resources prospectus from various Governments, provincial Governments, sent out trying to induce industry to come in, offering concessions here and concessions there in an effort to get their natural resources explored and developed. Every Government of the world is doing it. That is what we did.

MR. BROWNE: Do you really believe every Government in the world is doing that?

DR. ROWE: Every democratic Government, yes. I said two or three years ago that I believed that the greatest single achievement of the Premier at that time, up to then, was the fact that he had been able to in-

duce twenty-five or twenty-six of the world's great companies to come together and to form a company which would obligate itself to spend millions of dollars here developing and with the idea of development. I regarded that as his greatest achievement. Nothing has happened since that to make me change my mind. I helped in a small way—I was then Minister of Mines and Resources—to work out some of the details of that—Nothing that has happened since, nothing that has been said since has ever made me regret one minute I spent on that. I can look the world straight in the face and expect always to be able to do it. It was a great achievement, and the Premier of Newfoundland will get the credit for it. Mr. Speaker, I regard statements of that kind, "giving away to this one and that one," "giving away our natural resources"—"giving away the birthright of the people." I regard these statements, as irresponsible. They are cheap. I do not know whether they are malicious or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—The honourable gentleman now is getting out of order in saying that the Opposition are malicious.

DR. ROWE: I will assume, Sir, they are not malicious—I do regard them as irresponsible. They are in line with some of the statements we have heard from time to time reflecting on the credit of this province, statements which sometimes if they are not vicious are certainly unworthy of people here in this House or outside this House, who make them.

Going back to Labrador again I would like to make a brief reference to the division of the district. I was rather interested to notice that there is a slight change on the part of my honourable friends opposite and their

friends outside perhaps, to the time when we divided up the district. The reason then for dividing it was that I might have, as it was stated, I believe, here in the House, a safe and sure seat in Labrador South. Now I find that it was merely to increase the Liberal representation or the Government representation in this House of Assembly. The actual fact of the matter is that in dividing up Labrador we were only doing what every democratic Government were doing, we were only continuing the principle recognized by every democratic Government on the face of this earth, a recognition of the fact that where you have people scattered over great areas there must be some special recognition for them in the Legislative Assembly of the Province or of the State of the Nation. That is why I said here before and I say it again, that is why the state of Wyoming has the same representation in the Senate of the United States of America as the State of New York, which has upwards of twenty million people. Now I know the contra argument to that is, what about the Lower House, the House of Representatives? Nevertheless that does not invalidate what I have been saying, in every democratic country in the world recognition has to be given to the needs of the great geographical areas which contain a sparse population.

MR. HOLLETT: How is it applied to the North West Territory of Canada?

DR. ROWE: That is not a province at all.

MR. HOLLETT: It is a great area, a wonderful area.

DR. ROWE: It just happens it is not a Province. Why it is not I do not know. Probably it should be a

Province. The North West Territory is not part of a Province.

MR. HOLLETT: It is part of Canada.

DR. ROWE: In every Province of Canada—British Columbia, all the Provinces even Nova Scotia and Quebec more so than anywhere else, that principle, I have just enunciated is recognized and is applied. I say now, I said it before and I repeat, it is absolutely impossible for one man to represent that tremendous area of Labrador properly and adequately in the House of Assembly and perform his other duties as well. He just cannot do it. There are too many settlements. There are people scattered too far. There is the problem of travel alone, of visiting—They want to be visited—It is all right for my honourable friend for St. John's West in two or three or four weeks he can call at every home, in his constituency. Of course one may, my honourable friend there, with energy, with, as we all admit, interest and sincerity of purpose, could represent the whole of St. John's far more easily than I could represent the district of Labrador.

MR. HOLLETT: We do not doubt that for a moment.

DR. ROWE: I want, Sir, at this time to pay my special regard to the two new members who now represent Labrador. In the North the Premier was successful in influencing one of our younger highly respected men—a man who comes from one of the best known maritime families in all this Province, a man who knows every inch of Northern Labrador and has gone over it many times, a qualified seaman, Captain, a man of training, education and background, and I am glad to say, in spite of the dire predictions I heard here only last year in this

House of Assembly, he was elected with a tremendous majority. I want also to pay my regards to my esteemed friend who was selected to run as our candidate in Labrador South. It may interest this House to know that he lived for many years in South Labrador and was a valued associate of the late Dr. Grenfell, and in his early work there he visited every part of Southern Labrador and knows almost every person in that district by name. I predict that both these men will give that great area and those fine people the representation that they deserve in this House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, if it is in order I would like to move the adjournment of the debate. On motion debate on the address in reply adjourned. On motion of Mr. Smallwood all remaining orders of the day to stand deferred. On motion the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 of the clock.

THURSDAY, April 4th, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the people of Carmanville and adjoining settlements with particular reference to a road between Carmanville and Gander Airport. Whereas Carmanville is the only safe harbour on the Mainland of Notre Dame Bay South and is located so as to provide ferry service for the whole of Fogo District the petitioners pray that immediate steps be taken to eliminate the present isolation of that section and further the Government's aim of centralization. The petition

prays that further consideration be given to the building of a road linking Carmanville with Gander and thereby eliminating delayed mail service and bring further advantages to the people. This petition is signed by one hundred and seventy-three residents of Carmanville, New Cove and Fredricton. I do not think I need say very much in support of this petition, as everyone knows from what I said a few days ago what my idea is toward those roads. It would be a main artery which would serve not only the people of those two or three settlements whose names are attached to this petition but would serve anywhere from fourteen to seventeen settlements in Fogo District. Almost half of the settlements in Fogo District would be served by this main artery. I have therefore much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the prayer of the petition and ask that it be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the Department concerned, or the Departments because this is not only the concern of the Public Works Department who would build the road but because of the centralization effect would concern the Department of Health, the Department of Welfare and perhaps other Departments, certainly, I would say, the Department of Municipal Affairs. So that I would like, Mr. Speaker, to have this referred to the Departments concerned.

On motion petition received for reference to the Departments concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

MR. O'DRISCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the report of a Nominating Committee set up yesterday for the purpose of appointing

honourable members of the Standing Committees.

MR. SPEAKER: I think we might receive the reports and have them read by the Clerk.

On motion report received.

MR. SPEAKER: The following members have been nominated to these Committees:

On Privileges and Elections. The Honourable the Attorney General; Honourable Mr. Lewis; Mr. Forsey; Mr. Canning; Mr. Winsor.

Miscellaneous Private Bills: The Honourable Minister of Public Welfare; Mr. Sellars; Mr. Browne; Mr. Mifflin; Mr. Sheppard.

Standing Orders and Library: Mr. Speaker; the Honourable Minister of Education; Mr. Mercer; Mr. Hollett; Mr. Clarke.

Municipal Affairs: The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply; the Honourable the Minister of Labour; Mr. Higgins; Mr. Strickland; Mr. Whelan.

The Clerk will post these lists in a prominent place.

MR. BROWNE: Do I understand there is no representative of the Opposition on Privileges and Elections? I do not think that would be right

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I believe the honourable members is right. There is none.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, if you put the motion on the amendment that one member of the Opposition be included?

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps that could be done now.

MR. O'DRISCOLL: I move Mr. Duffy's name be added to that, instead of Mr. Windsor.

On motion report as amended adopted.

Notices of Motion

None.

Notice of Questions

None.

Notice of Questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett, Mr. Duffy and Mr. Browne.

Answers to Questions

QUESTION No. 65:

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Finance): In connection with that particular question I beg to advise that the answer is in course of preparation. I have here the answer to another one if it would be appropriate to give it now or as you deem fit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister may give his answer now.

QUESTION No. 42: Mr. Hollett (See appendix)

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, May I ask a question. The revenue was three million six hundred etc. could the Honourable Minister of Finance tell us if that is at a profit that is made on a definite quantity of liquor and not by subtracting the sales—How is the figure of current revenue arrived at. You do not use what you spend for goods and take it from your product—Do you deal with the particular article sold?

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I can answer the question

to the satisfaction of the honourable and learned member for St. John's South—I repeat the question again, which says: give the total amount of moneys paid out for the purchase of alcoholic liquors and the total amount realized by the Board of Liquor Control for the sale of same since April 1st, 1956. Actually, Mr. Speaker, if I were to answer that question in the manner in which it is put I am afraid I would have to say it would be utterly impossible to give the answer—But having a general idea of what the honourable and learned member meant when he asked that question, I have arranged for the staff of the Board concerned to give us the figures spent during that time for stocks and the figures spent during that time for the sale of stocks—But I repeat, they have no relation or at least not one hundred per cent relation or anything near it between one and the other.

MR. HOLLETT: Did I understand, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister to say he will clarify that in other figures to be brought in.

MR. SPENCER: No, I did not say that.

QUESTION No. 66: Mr. Browne. (See appendix).

QUESTION No. 67: Mr. Browne. (See appendix).

QUESTION No. 60: Mr. Browne. (See appendix).

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I asked several questions, addressed to the Honourable Minister of Public Works I wonder if he received them yet?

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): The Minister is in bed sick today. I did not know he was sick until a very short time ago.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that Question No. 12 addressed to the Honourable Minister of Finance and Question No. 29 to the Honourable Minister of Economic Development and Question No. 45 and No. 56 and Question No. 59 have not yet been tabled.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman cannot complain very much. Of all these questions only four or five have not as yet been answered. That is almost a record is it not?

QUESTION No. 56. Mr. Browne. (See appendix).

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Premier and to his Minister thank you very much for answering the questions so promptly. I would point out, of course, if they answer all by a "No" or "Yes" it does not take long. However, I will say the Ministers this year have been very wonderful in giving us replies to questions as they have.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thank you!

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment very briefly on the question referred to the Department of Finance, No. 12—That answer was in proof form this morning. The reason for it is not having been presented a little earlier is that it relates to capital expenditures and other matters in connection with both capital and current account in the Department of Finance, and they could only be appropriately answered after the end of the fiscal year, which must have been four days ago, since this is April 4th, I wish to advise the House and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the gentleman who asked the question, I am sincerely hoping to have those

answers for him on tomorrow. I believe they are very important to him. We will gladly get them in just as soon as the staff can produce them.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I call the Orders of the Day, I would like to inform the House that I have been told we have with us two young men, one from Gander and one from Corner Brook who were finalists in the radio public speaking contest. I am sure honourable members would like for me to welcome these young orators. I might too take occasion to remind honourable members that they should be on their "P's and "Q's" today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day I should like in behalf, I think, of all of us, to extend a very cordial welcome to these young men, and to say to them how very welcome they are and how much we hope here that our ranks may be swelled—I mean the ranks of both sides of the House, in the years to come by their presence as elected members in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the House is graced this afternoon by the presence of a very distinguished Canadian Lady who has come here for a very brief visit this afternoon. I refer to Mrs. Smart, the National President of the Imperial Orders of the Daughters of the Empire. I do not know if it is the first occasion on which she has visited Newfoundland but whether it is or not I can assure her that Newfoundland Canadians welcome her very warmly indeed.

The Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire is an extremely distinguished order in Canada, and, as its name would suggest, it has a record that is quite outstanding, a record of service, of public service to the people of Canada. Speaking very personally

now, I like very much the word "Imperial" in the title of their order. I like that word "Imperial" Order, and I like also the rest of the title "Daughters of the Empire." The whole title taken together seems to me at least to indicate a very strong sentimental attachment to the Imperial Empire an Imperial Concept. I think Newfoundland in particular owes a great debt of gratitude to the Imperial Order of the Daughters of Empire because it was that order which brought about the university education of a man who has become a very distinguished representative and friend of Newfoundland. I believe the Honourable John W. Pickersgill, our Newfoundland Minister of the Government Cabinet of Canada was an Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire scholar and that Mr. Pickersgill was educated at Oxford University. Certainly the order never did anything finer for Newfoundland than when they gave Mr. Pickersgill that scholarship.

Now I think we can all join in this, regardless of coming events in the next few weeks in Newfoundland. I assure Mrs. Smart and the ladies who are with her and the officers of the Newfoundland Branch of the Order that they have a very warm spot in the Newfoundland heart. Come back again. You will always be extremely welcome.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support in nearly every respect the words spoken by the Honourable the Premier with reference to Mrs. Smart (or "Miss Smart—I am not sure) of the Imperial Daughters of the Empire. We certainly welcome the lady here. We hope she will come often. I do hope the next time when they give out scholarships it might possibly be to one of the young men

who are here present today in reference to the Rotary Contest. I do hope they are eligible, because we would like the Imperial Daughters of the Empire to consider Newfoundland occasionally for such a high honour. However, we welcome her in the Opposition.

Also from the ranks of the Opposition, the Premier spoke also of the two young men, one I believe from Gander and one from Corner Brook—We also want to welcome them here. I have heard great praise since the Rotary meeting—Unfortunately I did not get an opportunity to listen to these two young men, but since coming here, before the House opened, I heard great praise of the speeches made by these two young men—I do hope the speeches today set a good example for the members on the opposite side and that they will be well behaved while these young men are here.

Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if the Premier would enlighten the House what is the situation in regard to the Ferry on Bell Island—Is the "Elmer Jones" to continue or is consideration to be given to the construction of another ship?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The whole situation of the Portugal Cove to Bell Island Ferry is under serious review. The honourable and gallant member for Bell Island has the matter well in hand, and he and I are collaborating quite closely. I am not in a position to say at the moment—there were four different companies or organizations or individuals, four different approaches to us suggesting that each of them be given the right to operate

the ferry service—In the meantime somebody has the right—The Newfoundland Transportation Company, the owners of the "Jones"—that makes five—Now what will be the outcome of it all I would not venture to prophesy at the moment. But the matter is under very serious consideration both here and in Bell Island. In Bell Island if the honourable gentleman has followed the news, there is a suggestion that the company and the Town Council and the Union jointly should take over and operate the service. We have had no direct formal approach as yet to the Government. There have been informal and indirect approaches through the honourable and gallant member for the District of Bell Island, but no direct approach to the Government—In the meantime there have been other direct approaches, and we are reviewing the whole situation in the hope that this time there will be a permanent and lasting and satisfactory solution of a very, very difficult problem.

MR. HIGGINS: In reference to that answer, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier care to state whether any consideration had been given to the suggestion of a tunnel, advised by one of the councillors from Bell Island, I believe.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Consideration has been given to a tunnel but not that tunnel.

First Readings:

Honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting Policies of Accident and Sickness Insurance."

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 Further to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act."

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

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, if these are money Bills they should be introduced by way of Resolutions.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): No. Actually I can say they are very, very minor pieces of legislation principally designed under the Uniformity of Legislation to bring us in line with other Provinces.

MR. BROWNE: I thought we had done that.

MR. MURRAY: Not in this way.

Honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance."

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, before I continue the comments with which I started yesterday I would like to associate myself with the Honourable the Premier in congratulating the young men who are here and also the two young men who I believe are not here, all four of whom spoke at the Rotary meeting today in the All-Newfoundland Finals of the Public Speaking Contest. The House will of course be aware of the fact that in my personal work in the past I frequently had experiences in connection with

public speaking of one kind and another and with the training of students in that matter. I can say with assurance, with confidence, that never have I heard better speeches from young men than I did today. The Honourable the Premier expressed the hope that perhaps some of them some day would help to swell the ranks here. I could not help thinking, Mr. Speaker, as I heard them today, keeping in mind that self-preservation is the first law of nature—and I suppose that applies to politicians as well as others than you and I, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps some of the other gentlemen here who have expressed their intention of continuing in politics for some years to come, might very well have some serious competition in the not too distant future. It was a great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to realize these four young gentlemen came from widely separate parts of Newfoundland from Curling, Gander, Carbonear, and St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that I had yesterday I referred to my association with the great district of Labrador, and I expressed my thanks to this House, as I felt I should in the People's Assembly, to the people of Labrador who sent me here by acclamation five years ago. I want to take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of the support and the co-operation that they gave me through these years.

I also expressed my confidence in the representation that the newly divided district, the two new Districts of Labrador will have here in this House in the honourable member for Labrador South and the honourable member for Labrador North.

Labrador was only an unknown wilderness, apart from the coastal

fringe just a few years ago. Today, thanks largely to that great airport and thanks also to the tremendous enterprise to which I referred yesterday, known as BRINCO, and an enterprise about which the Right Honourable Winston Churchill used that very term that the Premier has used here today—"Imperial Concept"—thanks largely to that we know a great deal more about that great territory today and about its resources than we did even five years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I also in my few comments yesterday expressed my appreciation and in that I believe I was speaking for my colleague who represents the Northern District, my appreciation of the co-operation and the support and the interest of the Canadian National Railway in providing and in seeking to provide better services particularly to the coastal steamer for the whole of the North.

I also referred briefly to the representation in this House of Assembly. I congratulated the Premier on the success that he had experienced in endeavouring to induce men of standing and prestige in the community to enter this Honourable House. That matter is so important in my estimation that I have been giving a good deal of study to the composition of this House down through the years, and I think I might spend a few minutes on it again today.

I feel that the composition of this House today is of a higher calibre on both sides that it has a more diversified representation than at any time in our history. It is true that our honourable friends on the other side are few in number—Yes—and I am sure I have no reason to flatter them here and I do not intend to. What I have to say is no flattery, yet, as I look

across there I appreciate, as I am sure Your Honour does, what they lack in number they make up in other ways.

We have in the person of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition a distinguished soldier of the 1st World War, a Rhodes Scholar, a Magistrate of many years and a man who I believe during the past few years has given distinguished services in political activities.

The Opposition includes two former magistrates, includes two well-known lawyers. It includes an esteemed and respected businessman of this City. So, as I said, what it lacks in number it certainly makes up, to some extent at any rate, in other ways.

I congratulated the Premier yesterday on having attached to this House some seventeen in all, I believe, new men, fresh men, new with but one exception, I believe in the business of politics. I wish that we could get over the constant references that are made to politics being a dirty business. I regret having read a few weeks ago in a publication put out by our university insinuations that politics is a messy business and perhaps it might just as well be left alone by some of the students who had some activity in mind. I think it is a tragedy, and I think we are to blame for it, we in Newfoundland are to blame for it and certainly nobody else, that opinion should be held. At the end of this Chamber, under the gallery we have portraits of all the elected Prime Minister but one that Newfoundland has had since 1855. Not one of them but was a man of great talent, great ability and they were men who dedicated their lives in some cases to the good of Newfoundland. Not one of them but has had his character smeared by his political opponents, not one but

was accused at some time or other of being a racketeer, a gangster, a shyster and even worse. Now we do not take that too seriously among ourselves. One of my political opponents—and I might make passing references to it—on one occasion got on the radio and said: "Was Rowe receiving a salary from the Government when he went to university?" Well most of the people who heard that knew and took it for what it was worth. There was no Government in that sense of the word when I was going to university, and just about everybody knew that the little education I acquired I got it like yourself, Your Honour, and like practically all of us here. Nevertheless outsiders and our young people hearing things of that kind, hearing sneers and insinuations and innuendos are inclined, and we cannot blame them, to take things at face value.

I referred yesterday to the possibility that our credit in Newfoundland—I was not thinking merely of financial credit—at various times our credit has been destroyed and if not destroyed certainly seriously weakened by this what you might call civil war of character and assassination that has taken place here in Newfoundland down through the years. I feel therefore that because this is so important I should make another reference to the composition, a more detailed reference to the composition of this House. I amused myself just before we started by trying to make some sort of casual analysis of the composition on this side of the seventeen new men which the Honourable the Premier was able to bring into this House of Assembly—No fewer than six are ex-magistrates and without exception distinguished in their magisterial careers. One of them we know, is a distinguished medical

doctor and was one of our Deputy Ministerial heads in the important Department of Health—I refer, of course, to the honourable member who represents the District of St. Mary's in this House. At least five and probably more of the members on this side of the House are lawyers, two of them still young, it is true, but other among Newfoundland's most distinguished legal practitioners. We have here on this side of the House at least nine veterans of two world wars, one or other of the two world wars, and, as I pointed out yesterday, several of them, of course, achieved fame during their term of service. We have over here, and I am very happy to have as my political neighbour so to speak, a man who outside this House is the General Secretary of the Fishermen's Federation in Newfoundland. I think it is highly appropriate that that organization should have some one in here who is connected with it. Speaking of fisheries reminds me too this House is very well represented in two aspects because we have in the Minister of Fisheries a man who is himself a fish merchant and has been through the years who knows the fishery in all its various aspects perhaps better than any other person that we can think of. We have two other distinguished businessmen here on this side of the House—So I might go on—I am not attempting to make an absolute analysis but merely refer to this to elaborate a little on what I said yesterday on the composition of the House. I would repeat, I think our young people in Newfoundland ought to know more about this House of Assembly. As it is a great deal of what they hear is of a more sensational kind, alterations sometimes going on, charges and counter charges made during political campaigns and so on. It is part of their education but I am

afraid the political education our young people receive in this way is to put it mildly a bit one sided.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer for a brief while to the new district which it is my honour to represent here in the House of Assembly. It is new not only to me but it is new in a political sense too because it did not exist a year ago. When the Redistribution Bill was introduced here, two years ago, I believe it was, it was decided by this House of Assembly to divide the great District of White Bay into two parts. At that time White Bay geographically was the largest district in the Island of Newfoundland, and as in the case of Labrador it was recognized that one person no matter how hard he worked, no matter how sincere he was in his endeavour to represent the people, could not do justice to such a great stretch of territory, a territory which stretches right from Cape St. John across the top of the Baie Verte Peninsula into great White Bay itself, up what we have known in history as "The Great French Shore" and into the Straits of Belle Isle, in fact beyond, I believe, Cape Norman. So that that district was divided into two parts—and it is now my privilege to represent the people of White Bay South.

I think I should take advantage of my first speech here as the member for White Bay South to make some references to the district itself. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the people who received me so kindly—There are thirty-four settlements in White Bay South and I visited all thirty-four, and it was my good fortune to be able to visit in twenty-nine of those thirty-four, every home in the twenty-nine settlements and in the other I visited some but not all of the homes. So that I met one way or an-

other perhaps ninety-five per cent of all the people in my district—I want to take this opportunity of thanking them for the support, the confidence they reposed in me by electing me to represent them here in the House of Assembly. Their vote was not a personal vote. I was, I suppose, a stranger to them. At the most I had not met more than a few dozen of them before, and I suppose a few of them might have heard of me in some connection or other. But I was a stranger—Their voting for me and sending me here was again a reaffirmation of their confidence in the leadership of the Premier and in the policies of the present Government.

The District of White Bay South has been until this year or so primarily a fishing and logging district. I would draw attention of the House also to the fact that it included the major part of what is usually known as the Baie Verte Peninsula. I think, Mr. Speaker, on that point we have to get some uniformity, about the name of that important Peninsula. It has never been officially named to my knowledge, and it is called by various names, mostly, I believe, by the name "Baie Verte Peninsula." It is one of our largest peninsulas and it appears to be one tremendous mass of valuable minerals—I think we ought to make up our minds as to what it should be called. I have taken it upon myself, as most of this peninsula comes within my district, to write my honourable colleague, on my left, suggesting that this peninsula be officially named the "Baie Verte Peninsula." I will not go into all the reasons for it, but merely point out that the Town of Baie Verte is the largest town on it and one of the two largest towns in the Bay of Baie Verte, the largest indentation in it, and if all

our expectations are realized that area within a mile of Baie Verte will become one of the great mining areas of Canada.

As I was saying before I digressed there, the District is composed of two parts, the great peninsula lying between Partridge Point and Cape St. John, part of which peninsula by the way falls politically under my young and honourable friend who represents the District of Green Bay, and the other part of it is White Bay South, the other part, is White Bay Proper, the Bay of White Bay—I want to take a moment, if I may, to say a word about the resources of that area, because they are extremely important.

We know that for years this has been one of our most prolific fishing areas around our coast. It continues to be that. And so when there is new development for the fisheries in Newfoundland it must inevitably include some reference to White Bay South. It is a matter of much satisfaction to me that in the Government policy of fishery development one of the most important enterprises, one of the most important aspects of that development is taking place in LaScie. I make no pretension to be an expert in fishery matters, but I am convinced that, from the evidence, LaScie will become one of the most important fishing towns in all Canada.

A great many of the residents of White Bay South are loggers as well as fishermen. Many of them are loggers almost on a twelve month basis. Because in that area of the Baie Verte Peninsula Bowaters have some of their most important holdings in Newfoundland. It is rather interesting to note that in that peninsula and up the Great Northern Peninsula, running from my district up into the district

of my honourable friend from White Bay North there are some of the few untouched timber areas of Newfoundland, some of the finest timber stands in all Newfoundland are in the great Northern Peninsula, the eastern side of it and in the Baie Verte Peninsula. Which again lends emphasis to the matter of roads, because some of these areas cannot be exploited until the areas are opened by roads.

I want to make just a passing reference to mineral exploration going on in White Bay South. My honourable friends may have heard of some of the discoveries that have been made of asbestos. It appears from all the evidence that this Baie Verte Peninsula will see a mining development in the next few years which perhaps will be the equal of that which occurred in Ontario between twenty-five and thirty years ago. It appears that Baie Verte Peninsula has some of the largest and richest deposits of asbestos known on the face of the earth. It is common knowledge that some of the greatest deposits of copper in Eastern Canada, in Eastern Canada, in Eastern North America are on that peninsula running from Green Bay to Tilt Cove right into the heart of the peninsula. Other minerals are there, too. We may expect, therefore, that this whole area will be developed very rapidly. I think it is estimated that the Town of Baie Verte will become one of the most important towns in the whole of the Province of Newfoundland.

I wonder if we could revert for a moment back to the matter of fisheries—Every member in this House, without exception I think I can say, was for years concerned over the what you might call the gap that existed in the various provisions, social and economic, which remained to look after the peo-

ple of Canada. Our Old Age Pensions, our elderly people benefited from Old Age Pensions, the people with small children benefited by Family Allowances, our War Veterans were well looked after, men who worked in industry could, if they lost their job, go and take unemployment insurance, so that almost every group in every category had a reasonable amount of security. All but one group, one category, and that group was the fishermen—and since the fishermen made up a large section of our population it meant that we had a disproportionately large group in our Province with no provision for security. Every member on this side and I am sure every member on the other side was concerned about this group. The other day I was interested when my honourable friend from White Bay North paid a tribute to the Government, to the Premier for the stand which he took last year when the Premier announced that if the Federal Government did not introduce unemployment insurance for the fishermen then the Government of Newfoundland would take steps to do so. My honourable friend attributed the decision of the Canadian Government to that decision announced by the Premier. I would like to believe that certainly the decision of this Government, the effort made by all of us here and by our representatives in Ottawa as well, did have some effect, and I have no doubt that the decision announced by the Premier last year helped to precipitate a decision on the part of the Government of Canada. I do believe that my honourable friend was being a little bit perhaps over generous or perhaps a little bit over modest in attributing the great decision to introduce unemployment for fishermen to this Government. We did all we could, it is true, in my opinion, and needless to say, Mr.

Speaker, I am speaking personally, I have not consulted with any of my colleagues in the Government on this matter, in my opinion there were two men in Canada, above all others, two men in Canada to whom credit for introducing unemployment insurance for fishermen must be attributed—First of all I would make that of Newfoundland's representative in Ottawa, in the Government of Canada, the Honourable J. W. Pickersgill. Because I feel certain if we had not had him in the Government of Canada we would never have gotten unemployment insurance for fishermen. Secondly I want, because I represent fishermen in this House, to express my own personal appreciation and I believe in that I will be joined by all on this side, of the active efforts, the unceasing efforts of the General Secretary of the Federation of Fishermen in Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister a question? Does he know there are more fishermen besides the fishermen of Newfoundland and that agitation had come from other parts of Canada besides Newfoundland, and it had started before Mr. Pickersgill was elected to the House of Commons?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was finished when he was elected.

DR. ROWE: I am aware of what my honourable friend reminded me of, I am well aware, I repeat, in my opinion if we had not had the Honourable J. W. Pickersgill as our representative in the Government of Canada we would never have gotten the decision we did, and from Newfoundland's standpoint from the local level if we had not had the unceasing effort and leadership provided by the General Secretary of the Federation of

Fishermen, for our part we would not be in the happy position where our fishermen are about to face the future with confidence and with peace of mind, which was denied them until this year.

Before I leave my reference to my constituency I want to say a word about roads: In that area there are thirty-four settlements. In White Bay South only four are connected by road. It is true that that may be a little misleading, because in order to connect two of these the Government has had to spend a great deal of money, I am referring, of course, to the road which runs from the Trans-Canada Highway down to Baie Verte, a road which has not yet been open for travel but which will be open, I believe, this summer. This road is the great trunk line running through that area. With that trunk line it will now be possible to send branch lines, feeder lines, to link up all the important communities both in Green Bay and in the Baie Verte Peninsula itself. My honourable friend on my right here reminds me that the building of that road has helped very significantly in the discovery of various mineral deposits. I might also add it has made possible timber exploitation, because that road was built with the co-operation and in conjunction with the firm of Bowaters who are, I have from the General Manager himself, are willing to co-operate and continue their co-operation in the building of other roads in that area. That road has helped to open up great timber areas which were previously known to exist but which could not be exploited. I am reminded by the Honourable the Premier that the effort to build that great road was not only joined effort on the part of the Newfoundland Government and

Bowaters but also included the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company. The important point is, Mr. Speaker, that both companies have adopted a principle of co-operating with the Government in building new roads wherever they have timber interests. It is my belief that within the next three, four or five years we shall be able to open up areas which a few years ago were considered unexploitable. Before leaving this matter of roads I want to make another quick reference to the additional need for roads in that area, in that part of Newfoundland. As I see it there are three in addition to the one I have mentioned, the trunk line I have mentioned. There are three other main lines which have to be built in White Bay South and which I believe will be built during the next four or five years. I have every reason to hope that some of them will be started this year—On the Western Side of White Bay, my honourable friends can visualize the Bay—On the Western side of White Bay, starting from Hampden at the bottom of the Bay we have two important population centres. We have Sops Arm which have two settlements and a settlement made up of people who moved in from Sops Arm some years ago, and the growing community of Jackson's Arm. It is my hope that the people on the Western Side of White Bay will continue as they have in the past to move into these areas so that we can build up two centres of population. Already we have a road out to Hampden from the Trans-Canada, again a jointed enterprise, our hope is, and I believe the Government has taken something of a formal decision that in the near future this road will be extended down to include Jackson's Arm, and this will then link up the populations of these two areas, Sops Arm and

Jackson's Arm with the Trans-Canada Highway.

On the other side, on the Baie Verte Peninsula itself, in addition to the great trunk road I mentioned which runs from the Trans-Canada Highway out to Baie Verte, another great line has to be built—I believe it is about thirty miles, and that is the link which will run from that Baie Verte Road right out to LaScie joining up as it goes along settlements on the White Bay Side and other settlements on the Green Bay Side. As well it is my hope that in the next two or three years it will be possible to extend the Baie Verte Road from Baie Verte out towards Partridge Point and thereby link up two of the most important fishing, logging centres in that part of Newfoundland, Fleur De Lye and Coachman's Cove. These are of course trunk lines I have referred to Mr. Speaker, and I hope no one will assume that will be a whole programme for White Bay South, when these trunk roads are built, it will be possible to put out feeder lines in much the same way, in fact in the same way as was done on the Burin Peninsula. When the trunk line was built down the Burin Peninsula it was then possible to put out feeder lines to places like Bay L'Argent.

I want to make a quick reference to the salt cod fishery in White Bay South. I was interested, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the House will be interested to hear that last summer in visiting settlements like Wild Cove on the Horse Island and other centres we found what I consider extremely high standards of living existing amongst people whose main occupation was the prosecution of the cod-fishery. I visited all of the homes, I found, I might say to my intense surprise as I was not familiar with

that area, not only in the great majority of homes were they good homes, in the Newfoundland sense of the word, they were well furnished, well equipped. For example it might surprise this House to know there are more homes equipped with automatic washing machines (run of course by kerosene motors) just as efficient as the ones our wives use today here in St. John's. The standard of living amongst those people is extremely high. The interesting thing to me is that they are able to maintain that standard of living on a codfishery basis. That is the basis of their economy, the codfishery. Now it is true that they do not depend entirely on the fishery, and this I think is the important thing, because if they had to depend on the fishery as most of our ancestors they could not maintain in this day and age the standards they are maintaining. They supplement it in various ways. Many spend a few weeks or perhaps several months of the year in the lumber woods. Many prosecute not only the codfishery but also the salmon fishery. Many are able to take advantage, as they have this year in some places, of the migration of the seals, and without any doubt not only in White Bay but all around our coast there are men this very day, and during the past few weeks, able to make the equivalent of two or three months good wages from seals alone. Whatever the reason, using the fishery as a basis in a number of these settlements they are maintaining a good standard, and improving their standard of living.

Another interesting fact which I observed, and I think I should pass on to the House is the reluctance of a great number of our people to leave the fishery. There are a great many

people in Newfoundland who if they could be reasonably sure of some security will want to carry on the fishery. I must confess I was a few years ago pessimistic about the future. My father spent years of his life in the fishery and ended up, after thirty years of struggle and privation, in abject poverty. Nevertheless I am going to say this—We should not in our thinking we should not write off the codfishery, including the salt codfishery of Newfoundland—I think that goes for a good many other districts besides my own.

Mr. Speaker, I will only take a few minutes, if I may, in my brief time, to refer to the Throne Speech. I was rather interested to notice that my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues seemed to have some difference of opinion as to the importance of the Throne Speech. I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition spoke of it as being "inocuous" and containing nothing. I think these were his exact words. Whereas the honourable member for St. John's South only yesterday said that the Throne Speech contained a number of important matters. To me it does contain a number of important matters. I do not think we can dismiss the reference which is made, for example, to the university, to the decision of the Government — I am not going to go into detail on the Throne Speech, but I would like to make one or two comments about this aspect of it— The Honourable Premier announced some time ago, outside this House, that the registration of the University was nine hundred. Mr. Speaker, you and I can remember when the registration, and probably attended when the registration was a hundred and fifty or a hundred and sixty and certainly no more

than two hundred. In addition to the nine hundred up there, according to the calculation in our Department of Education, there are between three and four hundred students, under-graduate students of Newfoundland, attending university on the Mainland of Canada. Some of them are there without any doubt because of the lack of facilities and because of the cramped quarters which now house the present university. I believe that within ten years Newfoundland can have the largest university this side of Montreal. There is not only, of course, the increasing demand from all segments of our population for educational opportunities at a higher level—the word “higher” is in a technical sense—the demand for higher education from all segments of our population—Twenty-five years ago when I decided to go to college, when I came here to do Grade XI at Prince of Wales College who were my friends from the outports? The magistrates' sons, the doctors' sons, and the businessmen's sons. That is who they were. Even at the university apart from the odd scholarship winner and a few teachers the students there were representative of one class of our people. That situation no longer attains. I was not surprised the other day when a taxi man told me that his son will receive his medical doctors degree next year, but I would have been surprised twenty-five years ago. It does not surprise me that there are fishermen around our coast today who have sons graduating from McGill and other universities in engineering. There were a few in the past but today it has become the normal thing. So that, Mr. Speaker, we can expect an increasing demand for higher education. We know of the need for trained teachers here in Newfoundland. We know that right at this moment we lack fourteen or fifteen hundred trained teachers.

We know that if our schools are going to be even staffed by the minimum standards and not an idealistic standard nor an ideal standard but just a minimum standard at least fifteen hundred more teachers will be needed than we have at the moment. We need to double and treble the number of teachers in training in the university. We cannot do it as things are at the present time. So I know as every member of the House knows the Government at last is in the position to begin that great project which will, I believe, be of incalculable benefit to the people of Newfoundland.

While I am on the topic of education I want to refer also to one aspect which I think should give us increasing concern and that is the need both at the adult level and at school level for increasing emphasis on vocational education. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are words very easily said, but it means more than that, it is absolutely vital to the future of Newfoundland if we are going to progress. If we are not going to stay still, it is absolutely vital that we train more and more of our people in vocational activities of one kind or another. We set up here on a modest scale, as Your Honour very well knows, just a few years ago. Actually there was a nucleus before this Government came into power. But we set up here a vocational institute under the Department of Education. It may surprise the House to know that this very year eight hundred and six young men, for the most part over sixteen, will have secured certificates from that institution in such things as electricity, diesel engineering, navigation, radio technology of one kind or another, drafting, auto mechanics of one kind or another, welders, etc. I could go on—over eight hundred. They are only scraping the surface. When

I was in Corner Brook a few weeks ago I talked with, and I am sure he won't mind my making reference to it, I had occasion to talk with His Excellency Bishop O'Reilly, as I did with all other educational heads and leaders in that area. The thing on his mind as was on mine and the minds of others—the City Council brought it up when I met them along with my honourable friend, the member for Corner Brook, the need for vocational education, vocational training in Newfoundland generally and over on the West Coast. I am very happy to be able to say that we have been renegotiating an agreement, a vocational training in Newfoundland generally and over on the West Coast. I am very happy to be able to say that we have been renegotiating an agreement, a vocational agreement with the Dominion of Canada. It has not yet been finalized by either Government but I hope it will be within the next few weeks. As a result of that we anticipate increasing help at the Federal level for this important part of education. But there are two things I think we need to notice (1) this vocational education is today the work we want to do—We must decentralize it—We cannot continue extending the St. John's Operation. We must decentralize it. There are two great crying needs today, in western Newfoundland and one in western Newfoundland and one in the centre of Newfoundland, for vocational training of one kind or another. Now they are primarily at the adult level. But we must also face up to the fact that our education has been in Newfoundland and still is at school level a one-sided thing. We are denying at least one-half of our high school population the right to get the kind of education for which they are fitted, towards which their inclination is, and I might say, the

kind of education which will make it possible for them to make a contribution to Newfoundland, to a growing Newfoundland.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that are left to me I would like to make just a passing reference to one or two other matters mentioned in the Speech from the Throne.

We have heard a great deal in this House this year as indeed in past years on the matter of new industries. I am not going into that now. But it seems to me that some of the criticism and the comments to be heard this year, however valid they may have been last year or in previous years, when heard this year, are altogether unnecessary, altogether out of place in the light of the fact, as the Throne Speech pointed out, the Government has engaged the best known firm of its kind in the United States to examine at least some of the industries, some of the so called new industries in Newfoundland. I do not know how many of the honourable members here saw last week's issue of "Time" magazine. If they did not I would certainly refer them to it because in the business section of that widely read magazine there is a short article on the firm of Arthur D. Little Incorporated of Boston, where it relates some of the activities of that firm in all parts of the world. It seems to me that the Government could not at this stage do more than what it has done. It seems to me that for the present at any rate we have to wait.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the Honourable Minister answer this question? Who is

going to investigate what happened to the Superior Rubber Company?

DR. ROWE: I want also to make a brief reference to the decision of the Government, as indicated in the Speech from the Throne, to look into the matter of the huge tracts of land in this province which have been tied up. My honourable friends on the other side frequently speak about giving away. We have given away nothing apart from the normal grants the Government makes for buildings for residential purposes, for schools and things of that kind. I do not think we made any grant of any significance at all. If you want to speak of giving away you have to think of what happened in previous Governments when huge tracts of Newfoundland were alienated, some of them no doubt for good reasons and others for no reason at all. These are now being denied to the people of Newfoundland, the Government and the people of Newfoundland who need them for different purposes. I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the decision of the Government in that connection will have far-reaching results.

It has been said that this Speech from the Throne is an innocuous document, that it does not contain very much. I suppose there is no law which says that every Speech from the Throne has to contain great and earth-shaking announcements, no law which says it must contain the intention to bring in great pieces of legislation. Nevertheless this Speech from the Throne does in my opinion contain a number of very important matters which will have perhaps no immediate effect but which will have some effect. Mr. Speaker, I sat here in this House for some five years and I have sat and listened to the Opposition, present members and other members, and all

I can describe it is in a term I heard a "Cockney" sailor use in my home in 1930 when he came here on a coal ship and visited several parts of Newfoundland, Clarenville, Humbermouth, St. John's and Lewisporte, and he used the appropriate "Cockney" adjective when he said—"All I have heard since I came here is a tale of woe"—All that I have heard from the Opposition in effect, in essence, in the past five years is a tale of woe. I admit there have been some legitimate points of criticism uttered but in essence it is a tale of woe. That might be regarded over there, Mr. Speaker, as the second wailing wall where all you can hear is a dismal dirge for five years. It is a beautiful alliteration of course, starting with the dismal dirge of disaster, depression, discouragement, dismay, and, of course, despair.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you, if the Opposition had been correct in the last eight years in all their dire predictions and all their prophecy then we should have all left Newfoundland, we should have done what we were told we would have to do in 1948 when I heard a political opponent of the present day, then opposed to Confederation, on the radio say that if we get Confederation we will all have to get up and leave the Province "Flee from it" I believe was the term he used, "like a pestilence stricken people."

MR. BROWNE: What is his name? Is he employed by the Government now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Minister of Self-Defence.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I submit that this Government by and large has endeavoured to implement a policy based on faith in the future of Newfoundland, based on a belief, a

conviction, that Newfoundland could achieve something, that Newfoundland did not have to go on being the Newfoundland that we knew in the twenties and in the thirties. I want to end my speech in the same way as I did the first speech, I made in the House of Assembly. I want to say as I said then that I believe in the future of Newfoundland, and I believe in the policies which have been adopted and implemented by the Premier and by the Premier of Newfoundland in his past eight years have carried almost an intolerable burden which has not been made any easier by the criticism the Opposition hurled against him. He could, as any other Premier could, have coasted along and the Government could have done so on the social benefits, the money being spent by the "Canadian National Railway," the War Veterans and Pensions and all other things that came to Newfoundland, unemployment insurance, etc., as a result of Confederation. The Premier chose the hard way. I want to say now that I still have confidence in his leadership and faith that his policy, the policy of the Government, while admittedly mistakes will be made, I still have faith and confidence that these policies are helping to build up Newfoundland and will make Newfoundland the kind of place we want it to be.

MR. JONES: Mr. Speaker, in adding my word of congratulations to those of other honourable members I take a personal pride in doing so. As you are well aware, Sir, I have spent the most of my adult life on the South west coast of Newfoundland, in a district which it is Your Honour's privilege to represent in this House. I think that coming from what was possibly the smallest community not only of the South West Coast but of

Newfoundland, at your early age to be elevated to the high position of Speaker to this House should be, and I know it is, an inspiration to many young men who are still living on that coast and hoping some day to find a wider field and a better livelihood elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, as you all know, I represent the District of Burin, which is a part of the South West Coast. It is a peninsula on the South West Coast and honourable members are quite familiar with its geography. The Burin Peninsula and the Burin District is possibly today the greatest producer of natural wealth in the whole province. For a small unit of population composed of a very small area from Grand Bank around to Burin and again back to Grand Bank is just slightly over a hundred miles. We have there three fish plants and two very active mines. I think honourable members will agree with me that outside of the larger centres of population that, for an outport area, is one of the most industrialized areas in the Province.

Unfortunately the entire Burin Peninsula is not industrialized. There are dark spots, there are spots that are not so fortunate, not so well off as the larger centres of Grand Bank, Fortune, Burin and St. Lawrence.

If I could go back for a few minutes this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I would like to trace a little bit of the history of not only the Burin District but of the South West Coast. If we would go back to the late twenties when the area was stricken by an earthquake and a tidal wave. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows only too well what an impact that had on the district. Before the seaweed, you may say, was dry on the

marshes Burin Peninsula found itself in the depths of a depression. It has been said by economists who studied the depression of the early thirties and the late twenties that it struck the South West Coast earlier, it hit harder and lasted longer than it did in any other area—As I say, that is the view of an economist.

Before the depression was properly over the bank fishery began to decline, the fleets were disappearing out of Burin, out of Fortune and out of Grand Bank and for that matter all over the coast until today, Mr. Speaker, we have one solitary banker fisherman left on the entire South West Coast. I do not recall at the moment how many bankers were out of the South West Coast when I went there in 1944, but off hand I can remember, I would say, the names of twenty-five—Today we have one, and that operation, Sir, is just by pure stubbornness and pluck and determination to succeed and faith in the people he is dealing with. He maintains he will make a success of it.

The bank fishery, as I said, disappeared. Following that the herring fishery disappeared. I can recall when Long Harbour, Fortune Bay, and Grand LaPierre people were going out chasing them. They were thick enough for that. Today there is not one herring on the South West Coast, literally and there has not been a herring for the past three years. The people in the area were not prepared, they were not ready to change into other occupations. Finally, Mr. Speaker, a blow much nearer home, the Fortune Fishery Plant failed. Now that may be a tale of woe. It is or it is not. But in spite of that chain of unfortunate circumstances Burin District has continued to be one of the primary producers of not only the South West Coast but the fish plant at Burin is

second to none in size possibly of any on the North Atlantic Seaboard, the mines at St. Lawrence employ upward I would say of three hundred people. We have not three fairly staple units of economy, the plant at Grand Bank is not working at full time, and as we all know the one at Fortune is closed. Let us hope, and here again, Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to hear the Honourable Leader of the Opposition say a few days ago that he was looking forward and he would assist the Honourable Minister of Fisheries in every way possible to have that plant opened. I know that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was sincere. He is a native of my district, and I thank him very much for saying that, and I feel sure the people I represent were very happy to hear him say it.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the South West Coast do not want talk neither do they want sympathy. They want a practical approach to their problems. Their problems have been generated over a number of years. There is great isolation still in spite of our network of roads. They need a practical approach to their peculiar problems. We have on the Burin Peninsula practically sixty-eight per cent of the people living within municipalities. Within the past five years the municipality of Burin has increased in size by thirty-eight per cent and the Town of Fortune has increased thirty-nine per cent and the Town of St. Lawrence has increased to a lesser degree, I think it is twelve per cent, for the simple reason that the large number of people who live and work in St. Lawrence still commute from outlying places.

Our municipal setup today is literally bursting at the seams. Our municipal services are far behind what is

required by the people concerned. These places that I have mentioned are growing so fast and so rapidly that it is hard to imagine. You can go into Burin and into Fortune today and go back tomorrow and you will see a number of houses. Something will have to be done, Mr. Speaker, if that Burin District is to maintain its status as an industrial area. If it is to continue to attract people from the more isolated and less fortunate places something must be done to improve the municipal services. Otherwise people will find moving into these areas that they are moving into the area where conditions are little better than where they left.

Mr. Speaker, between the mining town of St. Lawrence, which as you know is situated on the heel of the boot and Fortune, which is on the toe, we have a group of communities amounting in all, I think, to sixteen hundred people. It is that area that I would like to speak about for a few minutes this afternoon because if I can be permitted to say it, and I do not say this in criticism of any other part of my district but I say it as a statement of fact, I have a feeling that the area along the South West Shore of the Burin Peninsula has been for a number of years overshadowed by these larger municipalities. When the hydro power was developed, or as my honourable colleague from Placentia West would say, when the hydro power was under developed on the Burin Peninsula many of these people were not connected with it. Their harbour facilities there, I speak of natural harbours, are poor. Lawn has been improved, Lord's Cove has a poor harbour and I think possibly Lamaline has a slightly worse one. Point May has no harbour at all. These men but for the percentage employed at Grand Bank and were employed at

Fortune go to St. Lawrence to earn a living. But a percentage of them last year, approximately a hundred and sixty of them, were engaged in the inshore fishery. These fish that are caught on the southern coast of the Burin Peninsula must be because of poor harbour facilities handled by truck and by road. All of the fishery supplies practically all of the fishery supplies go into that area by road. It is not unusual to see a three ton truck load of fishery salt going down Hungry Pond Road on its way to Lamaline. The road in the area is not particularly good. There is a possibility, a probability I would say, that salt fish, the inshore fishery in this particular area will be revitalized. Men are gradually going back to the fishing boats. Men from Lawn who can no longer work as hard rock miners are gladly returning to their boats. Men from Lamaline, although they are fishermen must depend on a road for their livelihood to sell their fish to bring in their salt to get supplies to their communities. I respectfully ask this House to consider this—It is a definite request on behalf of these people—the fishery will be revived in the area and the entire Burin District which today is chiefly interested in the fresh fish industry will gladly support any effort by any party to go into that area and get the salt fishery going. We cannot hope to maintain all these people indefinitely on the two mines that we have in St. Lawrence nor can all of the growing population be absorbed into the fish plant. Furthermore, and here again I wish to refer to the Honourable the member for Placentia West, in his reference to the lack of hydro development.

Yesterday afternoon the honourable gentleman said that sixty-eight per cent of Burin District, of the popu-

lation of Burin District were supplied with electrical power. The figure is correct. Sixty-eight per cent of the inhabitants of the area have electricity. But, Mr. Speaker, the electricity that the people of Burin District have is insufficient today for the needs of the people. The mines at St. Lawrence must depend on expensive diesel generated power for the greater part of their electricity, their operation, their machines. The salt plant at Burin, I understand, does the same and the fish plant at Grand Bank and at Fortune. In every way every person who is interested in the industrial development must supplement the power supplied them by the United Towns Electric Company. While sixty-eight per cent of the people in the Burin District are supplied with electricity that power is inadequate, and I heartily support and the people of Burin District will heartily support any reasonable approach to the problem which the honourable member for Placentia West or any other honourable gentleman would make to solve the problem. It is a problem to which I have given much study. We look forward eventually to having this power developed. The water power is there, as the honourable gentleman said, and we need more power. Furthermore, and again this applies to the District of Placentia more than it does to the Burin District, we find that it is impossible to get into or out of the Burin Peninsula by telephone after eleven o'clock at night. Apart from the switchboard at St. Lawrence, which I understand is operated on a twenty-four basis through the co-operation of the Town Council and the mines. In industrial areas such as the Burin Peninsula we need a twenty-four hour telephone service.

I would speak for a minute or two, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the

Honourable the Premier's five year plan. Now in the long winter evenings a number of years ago in Harbour Breton when we had nothing else to do a couple of us would take our pencils and paper and listen to the radio and we would spend a very enjoyable evening listing down the number of things and the number of names that the Honourable the Premier was being called. Well now I do not want to shock this House this evening by calling him something new. I hope he will excuse me, but I think I hit upon an original term—I am going to call him a realist, for once. I think that many of our problems in Burin District have resulted, as I said from a chain of unfortunate circumstances many of which were beyond human control. But many of them have been caused by a policy of expediency, a stop-gap policy over not eight years but probably eighty or a hundred years. The Honourable the Premier has asked me as well as others to outline for him what in all seriousness I think are the most pressing needs of my district. I have done that. Now if I fail in representing these problems to the executive Government I do not think that the Honourable the Premier should be to blame. I think I would be to blame. Along the same lines I am very happy to learn, Mr. Speaker, a short while ago that at last some serious consideration is to be given to this problem of centralization. Now there is no subject under the sun in my estimation where there are so many experts today as there is on this one topic of centralization, or the word I would prefer to use, Mr. Speaker—I do not like the word centralization—would be rehabilitation. There are probably more people interested in centralization or rehabilitation today than ever in any other topic. Now I lived for

twelve years in the dead centre of the South West Coast. I know some of the problems of isolation. I know some of the difficulties in trying to read and educate a family. I know too that centralization is not just simply a matter of taking a family from one place and putting it into another. There are more problems involved in it than that. And I was very happy to learn that finally a special committee of Cabinet has been appointed to give this aspect of our outport life serious thought and consideration. Mr. Speaker, you can take it from me it requires very, very serious thought and consideration. There is a grave danger that, if it is not studied closely, but solving one problem we may create ten others.

Mr. Speaker, there were several other things that I had intended to say this afternoon, but as I remarked earlier, I am happier behind a desk writing a speech than I am making it.

MR. HOLLETT: You are doing all right, keep on.

MR. JONES: Thank you! There is one other thing I forgot when referring to the Lord's Cove-Lamalaine area. An effort is being made in that area to centralize the schools by means of a bus service. Now we have living at Lamalaine eight hundred people, with two large high schools. We have in the outskirts of Lamalaine an additional 800 people. The Anglican and Roman Catholic School Boards have decided that the best way to tackle the problem of education in this area is to get the children out of the small schools into the two central high schools. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is the only outport area, I will say on the South West Coast, the only place this has been tried. It is an experiment that is well worth watching. It

cannot succeed unless the roads are kept open for the twelve months of the year. It cannot succeed without the sympathetic support of the Government. I may say this is an experiment which I am myself watching very, very closely. In two years time we may be in a position to assess it. I would recommend that the Honourable the Minister of Education keep a watchful eye on this project. It may be the means of solving some of our educational problems without going to a very, very heavy cost of establishing large regional schools.

Mr. Speaker, probably the honourable members would be a little bit disappointed if I were to sit down this afternoon without making some reference to the fact that I was once a magistrate. I have just this to say: During my first political campaign I was asked the question—Why would I leave the magistracy to go into the House, to run for a district? I will say just this, as I said then—I look upon being a representative for a district as nothing more nor less than an extension of the civil service, a step higher, if you wish to take it. I do not think there is any indignity in coming in through these portals. I am sure no honourable member here thinks it is. I do not think I will lose any of my prestige or reputation by being here. As I said then I will say now—I look upon it as being an extension of the civil service. If I can serve any group of Newfoundlanders—Mr. Speaker, I have been in the public service of Newfoundland since I was fifteen years old—if I can serve any group of Newfoundlanders as a civil servant, as a magistrate, I think I can serve them more fully and more efficiently as their representative in this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, if at the end of the five years or at the end

of ten years or at the end of fifteen years if I fail the people I represent or if I fail myself, I leave it in their hands. Let them the people who sent me here, let these self same people take me out.

(Applause from both sides of the House).

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate on the Address in Reply.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Public Works."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is, I think, the brother or sister to the other Bill dealing with the Department of Highways. It takes the two Bills, I understand to be passed by this House to separate the present Department of Public Works into two making a Department of Highways and still a Department of Public Works. It is a straightforward departmental act exactly similar to other acts that created a Department of Government.

Mr. Speaker, 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 Respecting Notaries Public."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, it may surprise the House to know that from time to time from time immemorial we have been appointing notaries public but when we began to question our authority for so doing we found there was no real authority in Law for making such appointments. The object of this Bill is to regularize the appointment of those notaries public that are at present acting and to provide for

the appointment of new notaries from time to time.

It seems strange that over so many years we should find now there is no actual legislative authority for the appointment of Notaries Public, and that those of us who are notaries have been acting for years and our authority has never been questioned.

MR. HIGGINS: You want to legitimize yourself.

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we better not go into that in too great detail.

I move the Second Reading of the Bill, which is a standard Bill similar to the Notaries Acts in other Provinces. I do not think there could be any objection to it.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister replies he could tell us—Do not Notaries Public pay a fee now to get their appointment?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, twenty-five dollars.

MR. BROWNE: This could be reduced now, I suppose?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is this to take our revenue from us?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, there is only one particular point which I would make when we go into Committee of the Whole, under Section Five, Revocation of Appointments may be made by the Minister of Provincial Affairs without reason assigned. That we can go into 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 St. John's Fire Department Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, for some time past now the Fire Department and the Police Department have been operated separately. It is true that the Chief of Police has been the nominal head of the Fire Department but he has been head nominally only, and to all intents and purposes the Superintendent of the Fire Department has been the Chief Administrator of that Department.

We find on looking into the legislation that there is a Fire Department Act, as my honourable friends in the House well know, and the only reference to the Fire Department Act is in one of the earlier clauses it says it shall be in connection with the Newfoundland Constabulary Force. These seven or eight words are the only link between the Fire Department and the Constabulary. Now, Mr. Speaker, we feel that the fire fighting is a very important branch of our Department, and we find that it requires specialized people to manage it and handle it and it requires experience and practice and that the Constabulary as the Constabulary does not have. For that reason the present legislation is designed to divorce completely the two Departments, the Fire Department and the Police Department. The immediate effect will be that there will be no change but nominally the Superintendent of the Fire Department will be his own boss and will not have to make any recommendations he makes through the Chief of Police but will be able to make them direct. Actually that has been the practice that has been followed for many years, since I have been in the Department, and this legislation will just regularize that. The Chief of the

Fire Department will report direct to me, the Attorney General. I do not anticipate any change in title. It is just an administrative change, which means the Superintendent of the Fire Department will come directly under the Attorney General instead of through the Chief of Police.

MR. BROWNE: I know, as far as I can remember, the Chief of Police was always on duty every time a fire took place, and supervised the operations.

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 Bulk Sales Act, 1955."

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that last year we put through a measure called "The Bulk Sales Act," or two years ago. As I recall the object of that was to prevent fraudulent disposition of sales and to give creditors some protection. As the provisions of the Act are when compiled with a buyer can have a right of action hang over him from a creditor. So there was a little limitation put on this, for six months, but in Committee of the Whole, somehow or another, it was moved stricken out. As it stands now there is no limitation on actions except the ordinary six year limitations, and we figure that is too long a period for say an innocent purchaser of value to have the right of action hang over him. Now in all the other Bulk Sales Acts all across Canada there is a provision which says the limitation of action be six months. We ask that this be reinstated in the Bill as originally drafted and brought in—that a six months limitation be put on the right of creditors.

MR. BROWNE: Do I understand we did not follow the usual form approved by the Law Uniformity Committee?

MR. MURRAY: We did follow it except in this section.

MR. BROWNE: Was this an oversight?

MR. MURRAY: No, what happened is that we got into an argument in Committee of the Whole and some objection was raised to this period of six months. It was stricken out. Now we want to rectify what we did foolishly.

MR. BROWNE: It does not make very much difference.

MR. MURRAY: It is a question of six years or six months that is all.

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 Dental Act."

HON. DR. J. McGRATH (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is, as it says, to amend the Dental Act.

The matter in the Bill is not all new matter, a good bit is simply a restatement and simplification of matter already existing in the original. However, there are a few particular things it is designed to do: One is that there is no definition of dentistry in the present Act. That is included in the present Bill. Also it facilitates the registration of dentists who come to Newfoundland not only from other countries but our own Newfoundland boys coming back from colleges of dentistry. At present the Act requires that dentists coming to Newfoundland sit for an examination on arrival here.

Now a qualified doctor in any part of the world can send documents and get registration on these documents. This would bring into the Dental Act provisions that dentists, before leaving England—say—or anywhere else, can ascertain whether or not they can get registration. They do not have to come here and pass an examination after arrival. There is still retained, of course, the right of examination if it is felt necessary for any reason. That same right exists also in the Medical Act.

It also establishes the status of dental mechanics referred to in the present Act not very clearly. It also provides for the licensing and establishment of dental laboratories and provides also for the licensing of new types of dental work not in existence when the old Act came in, i.e. a dental hygienist.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask the Honourable Minister a question? I wonder has this Act been presented to the Dental Society and approved?

DR. McGRATH: Yes, it was prepared in complete co-operation with the Dental Association and the Dental Board.

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 St. John's Housing Corporation Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to authorize and to effect the transfer of all streets, highways, bridges, roads, etc., in the housing area from the St. John's Housing Corporation to the St. John's Municipal Council.

The effect of this legislation is to do just that. I do not think there

will be any objection to the principle of the Bill, which in addition to transferring the streets, etc., in the Housing Area to the City Council also transfers the corporate interest in the tunnel which is, as you know, now a sewer connection between the Housing Area and the Harbour. Also there is a sewer pipe from Quidi Vidi Lake to the Housing Area.

The whole effect of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to vest in the City Council all the public works that have hitherto been the property and which were constructed by the St. John's Housing Corporation.

There may be a little dispute, which perhaps we can deal with in Committee of the Whole in the last clause of the Bill. That matter is simple and I suggest might stand until then. That is the clause which indemnifies the city and the corporation against any claims that may be made against either of them for damages arising out of improper construction or installations. I understand the City will not accept the responsibility unless that clause is in. So that I think we are forced to put it there. However, I would suggest that any debate on this clause might well stand until we get into Committee.

The principle of the Bill is really vesting of this property in the St. John's Municipal Council.

Mr. Speaker, I move the Second Reading of this Bill.

MR. HIGGINS: Actually that formed the subject of considerable discussion between the Council and the Corporation over some time. This thing now really does codify the result of these discussions. With the exception to which the Honourable the Attorney General made reference, I can-

not see how there can be any objection to the principle.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if the only principle is transferring the works formerly in the name of the Housing Corporation to the City, of course, there can be no objection, as far as I can see. But I do agree with the Attorney General that there might be some exception to the last clause. It seems to me we are taking away the right of access to the Law of the Land from that particular section. But as the Attorney General well pointed out, we can discuss that in Committee of the Whole.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Attorney General did not mention—I suppose it may not be necessary as it may be defined in the original—the definition of the Housing Area, how far that extends now. That has been extending since the original Act because a lot of new houses and new streets have been set up.

I do feel that Section (6) is objectionable. To say in advance that no matter what happens in the future neither the City nor the Corporation should be liable to damages caused, as a result of what well may be negligence. But, as the Attorney General said, it can be dealt with in Committee. I hope that will be given careful consideration in Committee. I do not think it is advisable for the House to say in advance that the City or the Housing Corporation shall not be liable in that case.

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 Department of Fisheries."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill merely to take from the

Department of Fisheries the activities and the jurisdictional responsibility for the activities of the Co-operative Section or the Co-operative Division of the present Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives, and to fix the responsibility and jurisdiction in co-operative matters in the Department of Mines and Resources.

Now the reason for that will be pretty obvious, I think, to the House. It is the fact that while the honourable member for St. George's was the Minister of Fisheries it was peculiarly appropriate that co-operative matters should be under that Department. By the same token when he moves from the Department of Fisheries to another Department it is equally appropriate that the co-operative activities, or at least Governmental jurisdiction in co-operative matters, should follow him to the Department to which he goes.

As the House is aware, some few months ago the honourable member for Burgeo and LaPoile, the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives and the honourable member for St. George's who became the Minister of Mines and Resources—It was back about thirty years ago when the Honourable Minister of Fisheries was the member for Burin. That is quite a while ago—So that it has been thought wise, thought sound, that co-operatives should continue under the jurisdiction of the honourable member for St. George's. I think that is the purpose of the present Bill—If it is not it should be—I hope that what I have said is correct. I have not had an opportunity to read the Bill—But I think that is what it is about.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, there is not very much to be said relative to the principle of this Bill. It is just a divorcing of the Co-operative Divi-

sion from the Department of Fisheries. I am not so sure whether it is so wise to allow the Co-operative division to follow the former Minister of Fisheries on account of the fact that I have here before me an answer to a question relative to live lobsters and salmon where the Co-operative Division of the Fisheries Department co-operated to a great extent in enticing—I say advisedly—fishermen, lobster fishermen and salmon fishermen in this country to sell only to a corporation in the area where they resided, with the result that in addition to a loan of one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars which had been given to a certain individual we, the people, have to pay an additional, oh, I believe, forty thousand dollars (\$40,339.55) for lobster and for salmon. I think this is for lobsters only. Now I have some doubts as to whether it is advisable to allow that division of the Department to follow the former Minister of Fisheries because if it is he will have to be very much more careful than he has been in the past and not be advising the co-operatives all over the country, or at least to advise the fishermen of the country to sell only to certain merchants who happen to have a loan from the Government. That to me is most unfortunate. I do hope the Cabinet will see to it that at least the Minister of Mines and Resources in that capacity will be a little more careful in his advance to fishermen.

There is one other objection to it, of course, i.e., the idea most of our co-operatives have to do with fishing communities and the production of fish and the transfer of this from the Department of Fisheries to the Department of Mines and Resources seems to me a little off colour. I see no justification whatsoever for allowing it to go on with the present Minister of Mines and Resources because the divi-

sion formerly came under him when Minister of Fisheries. Judging from the result of the several years back relative to co-operatives say perhaps it would be more advisable to put it under some other Department. However that may not have too much to do with the particular principle of the Bill here, which divorces co-operatives from the Department of Fisheries. I am all in favour of that. I think the Minister of Fisheries is going to have his hands full as far as fishery matters are concerned, and I agree with the various people who have spoken relative to our fisheries. If I am a little off the principle, Sir, I hope I will be excused—I want at this time to congratulate the honourable member for Burin for the very excellent address he gave relative to our fisheries in that particular area. I am very proud to hear him talk as he did about the district where I was born. I can only congratulate the Premier on having acquired such an individual as a member for his Government.

I do approve about the division in the Department of Fisheries but I am not too happy about allowing it to follow the Minister of Mines and Resources. He may be a good man for Mines and Resources, but history has not proven that too much success has followed the Division of Co-operatives since its inception.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I notice that in this Bill, there is a clause which is also in the Bill connected with the Department of Highways which gives the Minister power to establish boards, committees and councils as he may deem necessary, to advise the Minister in carrying out this Act. I do not agree with the insertion of that. I think it is an unwise step to take.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If that were stricken out he could still do it.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, but it would have no legal authority—Here they have. If you can do it without putting it in, why put it in?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I agree. I am quite happy to have it stricken out.

MR. BROWNE: There is another remark I would like to make, that is in connection with the removal of the division of Co-operatives—Possibly this is being done because the present Minister of Mines and Resources was for such a long time so closely associated with the co-operative movement. I gather that is the reason. It is, of course, a very good reason. On the other hand it is certainly regrettable that it is being disassociated from the Fisheries, because, it seems to me, if there are any body of men who should profit by co-operative methods it is the fishermen. It would be my wish, and I have told the present honourable member for White Bay North on many occasions, on several occasions at any rate that it is through the co-operative movement that his Federation of Fisheries would make its greatest advancement. After all we have to lay the foundations well. It is only six years in operation now and it may have six hundred years—God only knows how long it has to go. Six years is not very long and it is still not too late to give more consideration to that question of the encouragement of co-operatives among the locals of the Federation. I know that in many places particularly in the northern section there is a close relationship between the locals and the co-operative societies that have been established in the areas. But I would like to see the Co-operative Movement operate to

a far greater extent, to a far greater degree, than has been done in the past. In connection with the fisheries it is recognizable that the locals could by co-operative methods make considerable savings by acting as a sort of buying club and buying wholesale. I imagine they are doing that already. I also believe there are co-operative societies that are buying and the men are connected with the Fishermen's Federation.

Now that it is going to be divorced from the Department of Fisheries I hope that won't mean any changing of the idea that the fishermen in the Fishermen's Federation should adopt co-operative principles in connection with their work and their aims. I hope that the Minister of Mines and Resources, although he is not connected with the Department of Fisheries any longer, will do all that he can do—and I am sure that he will—I know that he is interested—to encourage fishermen to form co-operative societies in addition to joining the Federation of Fishermen.

As I forecast in a speech I made in the House of Commons back in 1951, I would like to see the fishermen develop their ability to import their own salt. I know they could import their own salt direct and if so they would have many thousands of dollars every year.

MR. MURRAY: With the rebate.

MR. BROWNE: No. They would save far more than the rebate, I believe, if they were importing their own salt. They would make so much money on this that it would be better for them than the rebate. After all it would be more desirable to see the fishermen get such a command of the situation they would be able to carry on that way and not be too de-

pendent on the Government. We want to see the fishermen become prosperous, and that is one necessary article in connection with the fishery that is very expensive. The cost could be reduced very considerably—I know because I have had a good many conversations with the representatives of the salt exporters in Spain and I know how much profit there can be made on it, and I know that the fishermen could make great savings if they could bring an organization to the stage where they could import their own salt.

MR. SPENCER: Is that suggestive of exploitation of the fishermen, the difference in what they could import their salt for and what it costs them now?

MR. BROWNE: I do not know what is the point of my honourable friend's interjection. I would not say at the present time anything about exploitation of fishermen. I do not know if it refers to any previous remark I made.

MR. SPENCER: I am only thinking of the statement made by the honourable member that the fishermen could import salt and save themselves very much, very many thousands of dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Well there is, of course there must be difficulties somewhere. There is of course a lot of expense involved in the handling of salt. It is not all profit. The distribution of the salt costs a good deal of money of course.

MR. CHEESEMAN: The system is four hundred years old.

MR. BROWNE: Yes. If it could be imported direct—Anyway that is something the fishermen will be able

to do when they develop their organization to the stage where I would like to see it. But, of course, Rome was not built in a day—and the Co-operative Movement, as we all know or those of us who have been connected with it, is largely a matter of education. I feel sure that the Minister of Mines and Resources will do his best to help the fishermen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I regret as the time passes I cannot give the honourable gentleman's comments the amount of answer I would like to give it and also the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Let it not be forgotten that the Co-operative Movement affecting agriculture is at least as much as the fisheries in Newfoundland, indeed it affects more farmers than fishermen, as it is presently carried on. It seems to me it appeals more to farmers than it does to fishermen. So that there is nothing inconsistent in moving the jurisdiction of the Co-operative Movement to —

MR. BROWNE: We have more fishermen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have more farmers interested actively in the Co-operative Movement. There is nothing inconsistent in moving it to the Department of Agriculture, because that is virtually what it is amongst other things. I do not think it would be fair to blame any relative lack of success of the Co-operative Movement in Newfoundland in recent years on the Minister under whose jurisdiction it came. I do not think that would be a bit fair. I know, I think, some of the causes of the relative failure of the Co-operative Movement to prosper, to grow, in Newfoundland, and I do not think that any of these are to be laid at the door of the Honourable Minister.

I would like to talk about salt, but there is just not the time. We have a lot of knowledge about salt, a lot of information. I do not think the answer lies in individual or even groups of fishermen importing their salt. It is a much bigger thing than that.

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

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House, on the motion I should like to give notice of a motion:

I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that a Select Committee be appointed to consider whether any amendments are desirable in the legislation relating to weekly closing days in shops and such establishments, and to report to the House.

On motion of Mr. Smallwood, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday at 3:00 of the clock.

FRIDAY, April 5, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to present a petition from all the residents of LaScie in the district of White Bay South.

This petition asks for the construction of a highway to link up LaScie with the Baie Verte Road which in turn is linked up with the Trans-Canada Highway. The petitioners point out that at LaScie there is now going ahead perhaps the most impor-

tant single fishery development in the province and that LaScie is growing and that it will in course of time become still more important as a fishing community.

In supporting this petition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out also that this road which would be approximately thirty miles long from the Baie Verte road would have the merit of making it possible through short spur roads of two or three miles in length of linking up a dozen other communities big and small. The road which would follow a ridge of land going out towards Cape St. John would make it possible to link up Pacquet, Woodstock, Harbour Round and Brent Cove with the bay side and possibly Mings Bight on the White Bay side and also have the merit of linking up through short spur roads of perhaps half a mile to two miles in length a number of communities in the district of Green Bay on the other side of Cape St. John. In particular this road would link up the important area of Tilt Cove with Baie Verte area and from there with the Trans-Canada Highway.

I need not point out that at Tilt Cove and in the hinterland of Tilt Cove we have one of the most important timber, and copper areas in Canada and at Baie Verte we have what we believe will be one of the most important asbestos areas in the world. It will be absolutely essential that these two areas be linked up if for no other reason than to facilitate the interchange of labour from one to the other. There are other reasons too—One is to make possible the exploitation of one of the virgin forest areas of Newfoundland, an area which is held principally by Bowaters. I have had too, discussions with the principals of Bowaters on this matter, and

I found they would be willing to cooperate with the Government in the building of that road, since it would enable them to open up a number of important forest areas as well. So that from the standpoint of fisheries and from the standpoint of forest development and from the standpoint of mineral development this road is, I would say, an absolute necessity.

Now obviously, the Government and the Department of Public Works particularly would not be able to construct such a long road as this in a short time. It would call for a survey. My personal hope is, as the member of the district, that the Government will find it possible, through the Department of Highways, this summer to do the necessary survey work in that area. I would like in this connection to point out that there have been some erroneous opinions held in so far as the building of roads in Northern Newfoundland. One was an idea derived from the people who passed down the coast and saw the forbidding headlands and said it was impossible to build roads in that area. What happens in places such as that is that by going back a mile or so from the coast the terrain becomes fairly level and is no more difficult than any other part of the province from the standpoint of roads. And from that road it is always possible to run out spur roads to connect up the settlements.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present this petition, and I give it, as I am sure the whole House will, my entire support.

MR. M. LANE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by the honourable member for White Bay South. He has explained the whys and wherefores. In that area

we have quite a number of fishermen and also a great mining development. I personally feel that with a road connection we will be encouraging some men further north to move from the isolated areas where we can never expect to get road connection with the outside world. I do honestly on behalf of the fishermen of that area and on behalf of the people looking forward to removal to that area, support this petition.

MR. W. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I too rise to support this petition. Now, Sir, when this road is finished from Baie Verte down to LaScie it would only then be a short distance to connect LaScie up with the settlement of Shoe Cove which is the northernmost settlement in Green Bay district. Also, Sir, just south of Shoe Cove there is the important mining settlement of Tilt Cove, which undoubtedly sooner or later will be connected with the LaScie road and from Tilt Cove I understand there is now being built a road, by the mining company down to Snook's Arm, where I understand a hydro-electric project is being developed. Now, Mr. Speaker, the settlements of Shoe Cove, Tilt Cove, Snook's Arm and Round Harbour, I think, when this road is completed from Baie Verte to LaScie will then have means of communication with the Trans-Canada Highway and the hospital. I strongly support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by the honourable minister of Education and supported by the honourable member for White Bay North and the honourable member for Green Bay. I do so because of the great expenditures which have been made in that

area not only by the Government, the two Governments, the Federal and Provincial, but also by the various private mining companies which are laying out a lot of money there. There must be a good many people there in the neighbourhood of LaScie who are isolated and the people of LaScie themselves are isolated. I understand at the moment that the two Governments have spent three quarters of a million and I think will have to spend another three quarters on the fish plant in order to complete it. And if you are going to build plants like that in areas like LaScie it is absolutely essential that a good road connection be built with the Trans-Canada Highway. We on this side support the petition, after a survey has been made of the terrain.

MR. G. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support that. At the same time I would like to say that there are many of these roads in these cases too narrow for traffic. I know the minister will look after the thing, but in many of these small settlements these roads are too narrow and great stress should be laid on seeing the roads run around the settlements rather than go through the settlements and narrow out to nothing by the properties they have to go through.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

MR. A. MIFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Kerley's Harbour for a road from that to New Bonaventure. In supporting this petition I would like to say that the distance is but one mile, but instead of there being a decrease in fishermen in that community there has been an increase. They are good

fishermen and they have been industrious fishermen right down through the years and I understand from the Department of Fisheries even through the time of the depression not one of them were recipients of dole.

I would ask leave to present this petition and ask that it would be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. LANE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the fishermen in that area I would like to support this petition. It is a great fishing area with a great bunch of industrious fishermen, and I doubt whether they ever received very much from the Government. I do honestly and sincerely hope that the petition presented by this community will be received and that due consideration will be given it and action taken this year.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices of Motion and Questions

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines & Resources): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table a copy of the regulations made under and by virtue of the powers in Section 1 of the Regulations of Mines. The actual regulations appear in the current issue of the Newfoundland Gazette and take effect from July 1, 1957, and concern the safety of workmen in mines. They are concerned with an upgrading of the present regulations which were passed in 1951. Because there has been such a rapid and continuous mechanization

in Newfoundland mining during the past five years it is necessary to upgrade the regulations now. In tabling the regulations I would like to draw the attention of the House particularly to this fact, the code for the use of electricity in Newfoundland mining has been thoroughly overhauled and when these regulations come into effect this province will have one of the finest electrical codes in North America.

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 City of Corner Brook Act, 1955."

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if I may ask a subsequent question relative to a question tabled yesterday?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on questions asked the day before—a subsequent question should be put immediately following the giving of the answer or else notice be given in the regular way. I do not think we ought to begin that. If the honourable gentleman would put it on the Order Paper he would get his answer no doubt, but I do not think a subsequent question ought to be asked on the day following the day the question is asked.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would like to give notice.

MR. HOLLETT: Will I give notice now, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable minister take that as notice.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, in connection with question 12 on the Order Paper of March 26, in the

name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I have obtained some of the figures. There are no copies for distribution but I have obtained some of the figures which I propose to give for the benefit of the House. In doing so I shall, as I did yesterday afternoon, endeavour to repeat them so that members interested can get the figures down. I did that yesterday but I regret to say that in both reports that I heard from the radio neither had the figures taken down correctly. I am not at all worried about that, Mr. Speaker. I merely mention the fact that both radio reports with regard to the figures presented by me yesterday were given a slight twist in some form or other—not intentionally—I do not mean that in that sense—but they were certainly not taken down correctly. In saying that, I am not pointing out any particular reporter, because the figures were actually tabled as well. However, in this case I am going to endeavour to give the figures, and I do hope for the benefit of accuracy I shall be properly reported. (See Appendix).

QUESTION No. 63: (See appendix).

QUESTION No. 65: (See appendix).

QUESTION No. 70 (See Appendix).

QUESTION No. 73 (See Appendix).

MR. BROWNE: Does the Minister know? Mr. Speaker, I do not remember an answer being tabled including information such as is being asked before.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, that is why I intend to ask the House later if the House would agree to vote a sum of money to the Opposition to enable them to engage and pay for stenographical assistance. They are always asking the same questions over and over. In the same day the Honourable Leader gets up and asks a

question and then one of his followers gets up and asks the same question or another which overlaps it. Then they do not seem to file their answers and keep asking the same questions over and over. And we are just a little tired of answering over and over.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I take exception to that statement by the Honourable the Premier, because it is simply not true.

MR. SPEAKER: Was question No. 69 answered, addressed to the Honourable Minister of Finance?

MR. SPENCER: I note, Mr. Speaker, that question was on the Order Paper for today, and having read it now I am reminded that this too is in the category of several questions that have recently been answered, where the House has been told the question was previously answered. That is definitely the case in this instance here.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister if there is not a considerable amount of indebtedness to the Canadian Bank of Commerce.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, may I table the answers to questions Nos. 61, 62 and 72.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Minister has any answers to Question No. 21, I think it is? No: It is not No. 21, it is No. 23 on the Order Paper of March 28. Perhaps the Clerk could say whether Question No. 23 was answered.

MR. SPEAKER: We will settle that point during question time tomorrow.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the answers to several. Question 71 on today's Order Paper, asked by the honourable member for St. John's South:

QUESTION No. 71: (See Appendix).

MR. BROWNE: What is the name of the construction company?

MR. HEFFERTON: I said it was divided into three.

MR. SPEAKER: According to the Clerk's records question No. 23 has not been answered. Are there any other answers to questions?

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines & Resources): Mr. Speaker, QUESTION No. 59 on the Order Paper of April 2, asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. (See Appendix).

QUESTION No. 83. (See Appendix).

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Honourable Minister of Finance—He did make a comment on the question which I asked—I was not following—I wonder if he could give further information. Question No. 69.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have to try and get the Opposition to listen to the answers when we give them. It is making it awfully hard for this Government. We are governing under awfully hard conditions if this sort of thing goes on.

MR. DUFFY: I asked the Honourable Minister of Finance, not the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am sure he will do it. He wants it again.

MR. SPENCER: The answer merely was that the question had been previously answered. I did comment while I was on my feet, that there was a similar answer given in connection with the agreement in another question. In that case, I repeat, the answer has been previously given.

MR. DUFFY: I wonder would the Minister direct me as to how to get that answer?

MR. SPENCER: I am not responsible for the records of the Opposition.

MR. DUFFY: I do not want to belabor this point, but I am here about a week, I think, and to the best of my knowledge this information has not been available since I came to the House. If the Minister would be good enough to tell me in what year or month or how I would be able to get the information. I am not concerned with the records of the Opposition up to now.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder would all ministers who answer questions make certain that there are enough answers to go around. That has been the practice in former years.

Orders of the Day

Honourable the Premier to move that a select committee be appointed to consider whether any amendments are desirable in the Legislation relating to weekly closing days in shops and such establishments and to report to the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial subjects in the city of St. John's today and in a good part of the remainder of the Province is the question of the weekly closing day in shops and offices and such establishments.

A few years ago, in this House we passed legislation providing for Saturday closing (or at least providing authority to the Government, I believe, to declare a weekly holiday). The actual practise of the Government since that legislation was passed has been to declare Saturday as the whole holiday for so many months of

the year. I do not remember the actual dates, but the months of June perhaps and July and to the end of September, and for the remainder of the year, that is to say for that portion of the year other than the summer the trade in St. John's have been permitted by the Government to select the day, and the day they have selected in fact is Monday. So that up to the present time, for the last several years, in St. John's there have been two weekly closing days, Saturday for the summer months and Monday for the rest of the year.

Now periodically there are letters in the papers and there are resolutions and there are letters to the Government and there are letters and appeals of one kind or another to the individual ministers of the Government all on this same subject of the weekly closing day. Now most of that, I will admit, is with regard to the city of St. John's, but honourable members in this House from districts outside St. John's would be able to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that at least some of the outport districts think this question is of considerable importance too. It seems to the Government that it ought if possible to be taken out of the realm of controversy and settled one way for all.

Now this procedure that we are proposing today, that a select committee be appointed to deal with the matter, i.e. to consider the matter and report to the House, is, I believe, the most democratic and the most practical way this House can go about it. We might, for example, as a Government introduce legislation here fixing Saturday by name for the fifty-two weeks of the year or for any number of weeks of the year. Indeed we might by statute of this House pass any day to be the weekly closing day.

MR. MURRAY: No such statute is necessary. We can do that under existing legislation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We can as a Government, under existing legislation, fix any day we like. That is the authority the House gave to the Government in an Act passed some years ago. Or this House can amend that existing legislation not merely giving the Government the authority to fix the day but fixing the day in the legislation. It can be done either way. But I submit that neither way would be so democratic as the way we suggest in this motion today, because this select committee—and I would suggest that the maximum number allowed in the standing orders of the House be appointed, i.e. seven—and my suggestion would be that the convenor of this select committee be the Minister of Provincial Affairs under whom the matter of holiday closing comes in so far as these are public holidays. My further suggestion is that three of the St. John's members, the honourable member for St. John's North and the honourable member for St. John's East and the honourable and learned Member for St. John's Centre be members of this committee. Then I would suggest further that the honourable member for Carbonear-Bay de Verde be a member of that committee and the second member for Harbour Main be a member of that committee and also the member for Humber East—and that such a committee, meeting at certain fixed times of the day and for over a number of days, holding public sessions, could invite anyone with any representation to make to come before them and make that representation. In that way the Board of Trade, for example, could send representatives so that their point of view, the Importers Association, the

Employers Association or any organizations there may be or that may be formed for the purpose representing the employers of St. John's or of any other part of the Province could appear before the select committee. They could even come in through the front door if they come representing the employers. Then similarly the representation or the organizations of the employees of the shops and office workers—they have their unions and they have other organizations, perhaps they could come in and make their representations at the same time or during the same general period. Then in addition to this, employers and the shop owners and employees on the one hand, any member of the public, any citizen at all, whether he spoke only for himself or herself or for any number or any group of citizens could likewise appear before this select committee. These sessions would be very informal, they need not necessarily sit too much on their dignity. It could be quite friendly and informal and there could be questions and answers, and the members of the Select Committee not acting like one of these beastly senate committees that recently caused the death of a great Canadian, but acting like good decent British subjects like good decent civilized Christians could meet with their fellow Newfoundlanders and bring out the facts about this question of the weekly closing day.

Now the House itself is not bound to accept the recommendations of the select committee, although I do feel that the honourable gentlemen opposite, if they were represented on the committee by the honourable gentlemen I have named here and if the members on this side were represented by the honourable gentlemen I have named, I do feel that the House pretty generally would be apt to accept the

recommendations of that select committee, but there is no obligation on the House to do so. If they come back here after sitting for a week or ten days or two weeks, amply long to give everyone who wishes to make representation the opportunity to do so. If they come back here with a hard and fast unanimous recommendation it might be the solution to what has become a vexing situation. We all had, every one of us in this Chamber, without any exception, I fancy, strong beliefs and opinions as to what the day should be. I for instance personally believe and am strongly in favour of Saturday closing, and I for one would make Saturday the closing day for fifty-two weeks or perhaps make an exception here or there where there is some fixed Statutory holiday such as St. George's Day; St. Patrick's Day; St. Andrew's Day; July 12th; Christmas Day; Good Friday and the like, where these fixed days occur in any week perhaps Saturday of that week would not be the holiday, otherwise every day of the year, every week of the year, Saturday would be the closing day. Now that is my own personal feeling. I do not feel that I have the right as an individual just because I happen to occupy a seat in this House to impose my feelings on the House. I do not feel I have that right. And I doubt that any honourable member feels that he has that right. But all of us collectively having had a representation of us, i.e. a select committee go democratically and thoroughly into the question, all of us, I believe, are likely to accept the recommendations of this select committee. Let us if we can, Mr. Speaker, let us if it is practical get this matter out of our way, out of our hair, let us get the matter settled so that not like the Dog Act it will become an annual subject of discussion here in this

House. Let us please the people in this matter if there is any practical way of doing it. I have pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving the motion.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have not much to say on the subject moved by the Honourable the Premier, I strongly suspect the question will be something like the Dog Act because I don't think you are ever going to get Newfoundlanders in Newfoundland or any other country to be satisfied with any particular part of the week as a whole holiday. I regret the Honourable the Premier had to give away the secret of his heart when he suggested Saturday as the whole holiday, I am afraid it might have some influence on the select committee. I want to say this is one case where the Premier is giving carte blanche, go ahead and don't mind my personal opinion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: As it would not be a party measure, not a Government measure brought in by the Government every individual member is free to speak and vote as he likes.

MR. HOLLETT: That is quite correct. We are not forgetting the fact that the Honourable the Premier is not without influence in the Government, not without influence at all, Sir, and a statement like that from him might be credited by some members of the select committee before any suggestion I would make. It is a vexing question amongst all the people, it is a very difficult question. The Honourable the Premier spoke of two weeks in which they ought to be able to do it. I have grave doubts whether the select committee can handle the Province of Newfoundland in two weeks, to find out just what they want in Corner Brook or Grand Falls Area or down in LaScie or Sel-

dom-Come-By or Burin or what not. We must not only think of St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. HOLLETT: We on this side are usually thinking of St. John's. We are glad to see at least one man on the opposite side has some influence in St. John's and will back us in the future. But I was saying it will be difficult for this select committee to obtain the evidence, if you like, from people all across Newfoundland in a short space of two weeks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well let it take five or six weeks.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words it is elastic. It is not an easy question to settle. As I said the other day, I do not think this House ought to have to decide what particular day is required as a whole holiday. I think it ought to be a matter which could be decided amongst the employers and the employees, with a Bill being passed by this House authorizing such holidays as deemed necessary by the people in the various areas of Newfoundland. Because what suits the people in St. John's, Mr. Speaker, may not suit the people in other areas of Newfoundland. Now I am glad the honourable the Premier introduced this. We are heartily in favour of it and we hope it will put an end to the question.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, as proposed Chairman I would like to ask Your Honour for some guidance. The Speech From the Throne says the Committee is to have the power to conduct public hearings and take evidence. I want to know is such power inherent in any select committee.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I believe there should be some instructions given to them.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that a select committee be appointed to consider whether any amendments are desirable in the legislation relating to weekly closing days in shops and such establishments and to report to the House, and that the members of this committee be the Honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs as convenor, the Honourable member for St. John's North, the honourable member for St. John's Centre, the honourable member for St. John's East, the honourable member for Carbonear-Bay de Verde, the honourable the Junior Member for Harbour Main and the honourable member for Humber East. That is the motion, and naturally being a select committee of this House the committee does have the right to hold hearings, to hear witnesses who wish to appear before it and if necessary to call witnesses.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I think they are not permitted to sit while the House is in session, is that correct? It used to be so, I do not know if it is so now.

MR. SPEAKER: No, that is not correct. They do sit while the House is in session.

MR. BROWNE: By leave of the House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do hope these honourable gentlemen will endeavour to have hearings not in the afternoon, after three o'clock, when the House is in session, but before that, in the forenoon each day for five days a week. They can get through a lot of evidence in that way, and then again during the Easter recess, I think they should get their noses to the grindstone and see what they can do.

Motion, that a select committee be appointed to consider whether any amendments are desirable in the Legislation relating to weekly closing days in shops and such establishments and to report to the House, carried:

Address in Reply

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I should like to associate myself with the remarks of previous speakers in extending to you, Sir, hearty congratulations on your election to the Speaker, Sir. I feel sure, if that great Scottish poet, Robert Burns were alive today, as I think he is alive in spirit although not in bodily form, he would say that the poem, "A man's a man for a that", should not apply to you, for you certainly do possess the integrity which goes with the filling of that very exalted position as Speaker of the House. I feel sure that you will conduct the orders of the House with dignity and decorum.

I should also like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Speech in Reply to the Speech from the Throne in the persons of the honourable and gallant member for Harbour Grace and the honourable and gallant member for Bell Island for the splendid speeches which they gave on opening day of the House. Both these gentlemen have contributed to a page in this Island's story, which indeed will be remembered with great pride in the days to come, for I am sure their war services will not go unnoticed.

I also wish to thank the honourable members of the Opposition, on behalf of the ex-magistrates on this side of the House, for their very complimentary remarks respecting us. I do believe they were sincere. I believe they have a great sincerity of purpose, and I feel sure that they will indeed do all

they can, as they have said, to assist the Government during the years in which the Government is in power.

As you all know, I represent that part of the district which formerly was a part of Grand Falls district and is now known as "Gander District." **Gander itself is a very beautiful town, as a matter of fact it is one of the finest towns in Newfoundland.** During the war years men moved into Gander area from different parts of the country, from the different bays. They were engaged in the work of construction and after the war they settled there. **Then families moved in and became established.** Most of them have been employed with the Department of Transport of the Government of Canada and the various airlines moving in and out of Gander.

During the past three years the new townsite of Gander has blossomed into existence, and within a very short time we will have in Newfoundland a very fine town, a town which is being well-planned existing around the airport. The people who are in charge of the town planning are men who are giving **their time, men with vision** and I do feel that the Town of Gander will, with its educational institutions now going up, make a great contribution to the youth of this province.

The adjacent settlement to Gander is that of Glenwood, which a few years ago was just a mere settlement whose people were engaged in hunting, trapping and guiding for sportsmen. But today we find the two industrial companies carrying on logging operations there, and these operations employ hundreds of men, so much so that the people from the bays, Gander Bay and that area and those from Fogo Island have moved their families to Glenwood. So that today you have Glenwood a very coming settlement. You

have local Government there. The men of the settlement visualized what was about to take place with an influx of people from other areas, so they did get their heads together and today they have their own local form of Government, although only in its infancy, yet we can see great improvements in that town already. Some splendid homes have been built, bungalows of the most modern type, fitted with water and sewerage and the modern conveniences. They have their theatre there and some very fine business houses have gone up. So that I do visualize that in a few years' time the settlement of Glenwood will have a population of a thousand people or more as people move in from other parts of Newfoundland.

Then we move on to that settlement of Lewisporte: Lewisporte has increased in population seventy per cent over the past eight years. It has a very fine local Government, Town Council there. It is a Town Council made up of men with vision, men who take great pride in their town and who are doing a very fine work. Lewisporte too has had quite an influx of people from the various islands in Notre Dame Bay. The people have moved in there, and naturally they have created problems, especially in schools and churches. But the people saw those on the horizon and they decided that they would get together and amalgamate into one great amalgamated school. That has helped considerably in solving their educational problems. One new denomination moving in there has built one new and very fine church. The people have built some very fine homes. The town has its own electricity, not through hydro-electric power but

through diesel power. And it has its water and sewerage. It has very fine business houses which have gone up. It has its own theatre. Splendid schools have been erected, and the Town of Lewisporte has taken on a new life.

Then we go over to the settlement of Norris Arm. The people of Norris Arm are loggers. It is a very pretty settlement, as you know, flowing into Exploits Bay. It is one of the prettiest sites in Newfoundland. The people are engaged in the logging industry with Bowaters and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company. And as I looked over the relief statistics this morning I discovered that we have only four families on relief in the settlement of Norris Arm.

Now in the logging industry, of course, they do make good money today, much better than they did years ago. But the people themselves have a different outlook on life. They realize that the logging industry in order to make a living from it they must keep at it, and they are now professionally, if you may call it that, loggers, and they are making a very good living indeed.

As we cross the Exploits River (there is no bridge yet but we will go across on the ferry). But I should like to assure this House we are going to have the bridge. The bridge is going to be a reality. We will have it within the next twelve months, I hope—as we cross the Exploits now, on the ferry, we find in the settlement of Bishop's Falls a very different picture. Bishop's Falls, as you know was a great railway depot, which existed there some years. But this year, with the dieselization of the Canadian National Railway a great many of our men have been laid off, and the economy

of that little town is being seriously hit. And the Anglo-Newfoundland moved their pulp operations to Grand Falls. They too have pulled out and the only industry carried on there today is that of logging. The Anglo-Newfoundland still carry on the great logging industry of Bishop's Falls. It is a logging depot, and there is a small company there from the mainland which employs about ten families.

I wish it were possible to establish some industry at Bishop's Falls in order to take care of the people who have been laid off by the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company and the Canadian National Railway. A lot of these people have spent their lives working with these two companies, and they find it very difficult to take up some other occupation. However, as time goes on, there may be something turn up, some form of employment may be available whereby the people will be employed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we know what the occupation of the people of Botwood is. We know that the people there are employed, a great many of them or most of them, by the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, it being the shipping port of that great company. And I am pleased to hear that the Newfoundland Great Lakes Shipping Company is going in there this spring and that ships will be plying between Montreal and Botwood. That, I hope will give a much lower cost of living for the people of Central Newfoundland. I do know it will indeed create a certain form of labour, it will bring to the Town of Botwood an increase in employment and what benefits Botwood benefits the adjacent settlement of Peter's Arm, Northern Arm and Phillips Head.

Mr. Speaker, that covers most of my district apart from other small settlements such as Little Burnt Bay and Salt Point, Stanhope and a few other small settlements, Lawrencetown included. Now the people in these settlements are engaged in the lobster fishery during the month of June and part of July. The lobster fishery is as we know, when carried out properly, quite an industry whereby our people make good money in a very short time.

Speaking of the fisheries, I should like for a few minutes to speak on certain aspects of our fisheries. Very often we hear in this House the word "industries." The word "industry" has been heard and repeated so many times that one is very reticent in referring to it—but I should like to mention this in connection with the fisheries. Sometimes our people are apt to think that the present Government in its policy and in its spending has forgotten the fishing industry. When I tell you that during the past seven years this Government has built up fish empires in Newfoundland, has given to the merchants in guarantees and otherwise over sixteen million dollars for fisheries, I am sure you will agree with me that the fisheries have not been neglected, have not been overlooked, if you may call it. For one industry alone to receive that much money is indeed indicative of the Government's interest in the codfishery.

Now the codfishery has a great history in Newfoundland, and I speak with thirty-four years in the appointed public life of Newfoundland. And when I decided to enter the elected public life I did so because of my rich experiences in the appointed public life of Newfoundland. I lived in settlements where the codfishery was carried on in vessels. I saw forty-five vessels going to Labrador in one day. I

remember at that time hearing a very prominent merchant make a remark, telling about all the money he had invested in the Labrador Fishery. And my remark to him, Mr. Speaker, was this: "Yes, you have invested your money, but do you realize the men who have gone in your vessels have invested their lives." Now dollars and cents cannot be compared to human life. And I know when a man leaves home in the month of May to go to Northern Labrador he is taking his own life in his hands, he is risking his life. It is true that a businessman risks his money, but the fisherman risks his life. And many of them did that, and many have paid very dearly with their lives. The chapter of Newfoundland History of the Labrador Fisheries is one in which both merchants and fishermen lost dollars and cents. I recall the days in Newfoundland when ten men would go to Labrador in a vessel of seventy tons, and they would bring home fifteen hundred quintals of fish. It was quintals then and not one hundred pounds. And they were sharemen and that fifteen hundred quintals of fish would give seven hundred and fifty quintals for the ten men, seventy-five quintals per man. Fish at that time was one dollar and ten cents per quintal. The result was that the men came home one day and went to the welfare officer or relieving officer of that time the next day. If they squared their account they did very well, or if they had not squared their account they were told to go to look for relief to the magistrate or to the welfare officer. And at the time the same men, Mr. Speaker, did leave their homes, I know for a fact, they left their homes and their little families with nothing but the ordinary food such as flour, tea, sugar and butter and not even a shilling for the wife to buy a reel of

sewing thread, not even a half dollar to buy a bottle of medicine if the children happened to become ill. Nevertheless, they came back and they went to the welfare officer and they received their relief. These were hard times. They received six cents a day. They were told to tighten their belts. Some of them had very little to tighten. These were hard days. These were the days when the old age pensioner lived on twelve fifty a quarter. Those were the days when the widows lived on six fifty a quarter.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, at the time of recess I was speaking of the Labrador Fisheries becoming extinct due to the fact that the fishery was not and could not be carried on in economical manner. The people who owned the vessels and the fishermen themselves became hopelessly in debt. The result, of course, was that the fishery was abandoned altogether.

As to the shore fishery, Sir, we all know that during the war years the people were attracted with so much employment on the bases and elsewhere and they abandoned the fishery in so far as they failed to repair their nets, their boats came into a state of disrepair, and the people could see that the money they were earning at base construction was more beneficial to them than the returns from the fishery.

At the time of union with Canada and this country there was in evidence fishing property in a state of disrepair and schooners were no longer fit to carry on the fishery and the people themselves had very little hope, very little morale as far as the fishery was concerned. So we find no enthusiasm

only that which the Government sought to infuse into our people. They did so by subsidizing and guaranteeing loans and giving loans to fish merchants. Merchants then concentrated on the fresh fishery rather than the salt fishery and that eventually too became in such a state that the men felt that to carry on even the fresh fishery was uneconomical.

So we have the whole fishery of Newfoundland today, despite of what monies have been paid by the Government and by private enterprise, is problematical. But this year we are told the salt fishery, the salt cod, the markets are in a better condition. I feel, Sir, that my colleague on my right will be able to tell us before this House closes something of what we are to expect from the salt cod fishery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to the industries. I shall briefly touch on the industries. I am not here to apologize for what monies have been spent on the industries. I do know that the Government in the past seven or eight years have been very diligent. The Honourable the Premier has worked very hard, harder than any man I know of in the interest of Newfoundland. And I know of no greater compliment that can be paid any man than that which was paid him by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition a few days ago when he said: the Honourable the Premier should have been a preacher. Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend that one of the great qualifications of a preacher is to have converts. And the Honourable the Premier has had many converts during the past seven years.

MR. HOLLETT: Fallen away.

MR. ABBOTT: He has preached throughout the length and breadth of

this land, over the air, and there have been many converts—many sinners, you may call it, who came home.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is because, while the light holds out to burn the vilest sinner may return.

MR. ABBOTT: Right you are!

MR. HOLLETT: You have the vilest sinners, what?

MR. ABBOTT: Furthermore, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition visit the Honourable the Premier's office and he will see there photographs of one of the greatest preachers that the eighteenth century ever heard of or even the nineteenth century, the greatest preacher we have heard of—you will see photographs of that preacher on the wall in the office of the Honourable the Premier. Whether or not he receives his inspiration from that photograph, if so I would suggest that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition accept the same inspiration.

Well now, we all know and we have all heard the story of the industries. It has become a swan song now, the stories of the industries. Some of it I must agree is not very pleasant reading. But this we must say, never has this Government stifled private enterprise. It has always encouraged private enterprise. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, in giving all the encouragement possible to private enterprise. And that is the very thing that this Government has been doing for the past eight years.

MR. HOLLETT: What about the O'Brien Fisheries?

MR. ABBOTT: The O'Brien Fisheries may be one of the dark pages.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A case of private enterprise not enterprising enough.

MR. ABBOTT: But this, Mr. Speaker, I can safely say, we are bound to make mistakes. We know firms that have carried on business in this country who have loaned money and invested money, we know individuals to whom banks have loaned money and the people to whom they have given the money failed—the same thing applies to the Government—All Governments are more or less responsible for that and have had that sad experience. But this we can safely say, that the industries, although some of them, as I have said before, make unpleasant reading, nevertheless the Government has tried to do something, they have kept people employed. And now they have made an honest attempt, from the Speech From The Throne we do see where an attempt will be made to assess the industries, to enquire as to their future. And I feel assured and should like to assure the honourable members of the Opposition that steps will be taken to reassess the industries as set forth in that speech.

I was somewhat interested in listening to the honourable member for Fogo District as he depicted the picture of Fogo District. Now I was born in Fogo District. I was born on the straight shore, Musgrave Harbour. And I know every word that the honourable member stated in relation to the isolation of the people down in that area was correct. I remember as a boy listening to the old people telling about the time when they could hear the train blow, mind you the train coming from Benton down to Musgrave Harbour—and then the Morris Government, I think, told us they would have the road put through and the old men had visions and the young

men dreamed dreams. That road would eventually come through to Musgrave but not until the present Government and with, no doubt, the foresight and enthusiasm of the Premier the road eventually did become a reality.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't forget I had a little bit of help from the Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. ABBOTT: Yes, I must give him a few marks for that, and the contractor who did the work: J. Goodyear and Company did a marvelous job putting the road through. It was almost an impossible undertaking with very little material to build the road. It was quite an achievement, Mr. Speaker, and the Government should be complimented on that achievement. I know people when they saw the first cars come through from Wesleyville to Musgrave said: "Can I believe my eyes?" The very thing that was promised our forefathers has come to pass. And we look forward—and I support the honourable member for Fogo in his plea that the road be continued to extend to Carmanville and from Carmanville into Gander so that eventually that isolation that did exist in the days gone by will no longer exist and our people will be able to mix. Because after all roads have not only a material advantage to our people, there is that social advantage to our people, there is that social advantage where people can mix to and from and enjoy good fellowship. I think that is one of the great advantages of roads.

We get accused, there are people who do accuse us, especially the Opposition—of course that is their business to say we have no decent roads. Well when we realize there are many places in this country, many areas that have

no roads at all, then of course we have to put up with small mercies. I know years ago we would hear of the roads on Avalon and the people would be disgruntled and say, all the money is being spent on Avalon, they get roads up there and can go anywhere in a motor car. Now there is no longer that grumble. They know full well they too are enjoying some of the benefits derived from roads. Vast areas have been opened up in Newfoundland, areas unknown have been opened up in Newfoundland, areas that never saw roads are now enjoying roads that have been brought to them by this Government.

There is one more matter I should like to mention, the great benefits brought to this land, this Province, this Island home of ours by union with Canada. I represent a Department of Welfare, and some of the honourable members present may be surprised to know that my department issues allowances to forty thousand people each month—forty thousand people receive benefits, allowances from the Department of Public Welfare. During the past eight years this Provincial Government of Newfoundland and the Federal Government of Canada have paid to the people, through the Department of Public Welfare, twenty-five million dollars. Twenty-five million dollars have gone into the pockets of our people through welfare services. And I assure you, Mr. Speaker, there is no one happier than I am to know that we are making it possible for some of those people to enjoy some of the comforts that we enjoy. After all, are they not entitled to it? Of course they are. Too long have our people been existing on a mere pittance. As I said at the beginning of my speech, that too many too long were our widows and our orphans and

old age pensioners living on a pittance, and the war veterans of World War One and World War Two were living on a pittance in the form of pensions whereas their comrades of the Canadian Forces were enjoying far better pensions. But with Confederation, of course, our people are put on the same pension plan and are happy. That is one of the things that Confederation has brought and which this Government supports, this great welfare plan so that our people can be happy.

There were other benefits brought to this Province such as cooperative housing. The Government of today has loaned two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to co-operative housing. Town Councils have been opened up and town councils have been given loans, here, there and everywhere, so much so that our people are getting a new concept of what municipal life really is. Then we may go on to schools—The Honourable Minister of Education referred yesterday to that great university, the Memorial University and how it has expanded during the past few years. Next year, I understand, there will be over one thousand students attending that university. How comforting it must be to the men on both sides of the House to hear these remarks. After all one of the greatest benefits of education is to bring light to people, and that is the desire of every member on this side of the House and on the other side as well.

There are in our schools today many boys and girls that but for the different allowances being given through my department would not be permitted to attend school. I know for a fact, and personally am just as much interested in the boy and girl in Sops Arm and White Bay as I am in the

boy and girl living in St. John's. I believe in giving them an equal opportunity, and that opportunity is ours to give them

We owe it to them, Mr. Speaker, and while I am a member of this House I shall always raise my voice for more money for education. Today we are spending a lot of money. Yes we are spending this coming year over ten million dollars on Education. And when the Liberal Government entered power in 1949 we were spending three and a half million dollars. It is a good investment. Years ago our young men and young women would leave Newfoundland and go to universities on the mainland and they would never return. They would go and stay there and enrich other Provinces and other parts of the world. Wherever you go you find them. But today they can receive their degree here in their own university, and if the jobs are available well then they can remain in their own native Province, and carry on the work. After all I personally am pleased to be associated with a Government that has displayed such an interest in education of our young people, and I do trust that that interest will not in any way wane.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think my time is just about up. There are many other things I should mention in relation to the activities of the Government during the past seven years, but they are well known, they are history, and I feel sure that those who come after us will be able to read with pride some of our actions and conduct.

I should like in closing to remind this House that every honourable member has at times in his mind the idea of what he should be: That idea does not consist in birth nor title, in extent of power or authority but is

ably expressed by the poet when he said these lines:

Oh, God, give us men as times like
these demand,

Strong men, great hearts, true faith
and ready hands,

Men whom the lust of office does not
kill,

Men whom the spoils of office can
not buy;

Men who possess opinion and a will;
Men who have honour, men who
will not lie,

Men who can stand before a demagogue
and scorn treacherous flatteries
without blinking

Tall men, sun-crowned, who will live
above the fog of private thinking.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate my first duty is to join with the other speakers in extending to you, Sir, congratulations on the honour that has been done you by this House. It has been said and very properly said that your training since 1949, as deputy speaker and as chairman of committees, certainly gives you a background that has been perhaps unique in the history of this House. The unanimity of your election, Sir, must I am sure be a source of personal satisfaction to you. I only hope, Sir, that the smooth sailing we have had so far will continue. It is a tribute to the respect the House has for you that so far at least all has gone on very smoothly.

I would like also, Sir, to join in congratulations that have been extended to the two honourable and gallant members who moved and seconded the motion for the appointment of a committee to draft an address in reply. I have had the privilege of

knowing both these honourable gentlemen for some time. I must say, Sir, that it was a much less harrowing experience to listen to the Honourable and Gallant Member for Harbour Grace speaking the other day than in some other places where I have had the privilege of hearing him. It was, I say quite sincerely, a very fine effort—and the same applies to the honourable and gallant member for Bell Island. I think the Minister of Education yesterday certainly understated the case when he said the address of both these gentlemen were well on a par with anything heard in this House since it was reconstituted in 1949.

I would like also, Sir, I notice for the last half hour, since the departure of my learned colleagues for St. John's South that I am the senior member of the Opposition—By virtue of that position, Sir, I would like to join in the welcome that has been extended to our new members. I have had the pleasure of knowing most of them for a long time, particularly the members of the Cabinet. There are one or two that I have not known very long, but it did not take very long for the honourable member for Burin to come along and collect a dollar, and then a week later come back and take another dollar. So that I do say, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Almost as bad as Maritime.

MR. HIGGINS: That is a subject which perhaps we might skip, on which sweetness and light might disappear, a matter on which I feel very strongly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are not alone.

MR. HIGGINS: But all these new members, I think, Sir, we can agree are of a very high type. I think they are going to add to the calibre of this

House. I think they all have a definite contribution to make, and I look forward to hearing more from them as we go along.

I do note that there seems to be a tendency to explain why some honourable members were here, how they came to run for election. Nobody ever asked me if I were coerced into running. I think they seem to assume because you are a hungry lawyer and there is a dollar you are going to go looking for it—and mind you they could be right. But I am here, Sir, and I am back again, and I am very glad to be back. To be quite truthful I would not be particularly worried how I got back as long as it was legally. I am not worried whether I came down the chimney as long as I got in. Because, Sir, membership in this House, apart altogether from the position that it gives one in the community—and do not let us fool ourselves on that—membership in this House is a very treasured thing, but it also gives you a membership in a club in which one can stand and slander an individual or a community without any fear of legal reprisal. You can say what you like—and people do—I will have more to say on that in a moment. I think I will say it now to get it off my chest—Because in his very fine speech of last week the Honourable member for White Bay North took occasion to refer to St. John's as a parasitical gossiping town. Now I am a native St. John's man, born here, my father was born here before me, and I represent a district that is very largely urban. And I certainly, Sir, would not be doing my duty to the people who sent me here if I allowed these remarks to pass unchallenged. The honourable gentleman did say that he hoped in his stay here in this House that he would be able to do something statesmanlike. I would suggest to him

that it is much easier to be a demagogue than to be a statesman. Indeed, Sir, it is ridiculous to talk about St. John's as if it were a different separate part of the country. That may have been so, Sir, and may have been perfectly sound politics fifty years ago to say that. But St. John's today, Mr. Speaker, we all realize it, I am sure the honourable member for St. John's North will agree with me because it is something we have had occasion to discuss before—St. John's over the past forty years has swollen to practically three times its size. And that increase, Mr. Speaker, has come from areas outside the city. The Great Northern Peninsula has contributed some of the people who today are amongst the most prominent citizens of St. John's. It is a rather pointless thing for anybody to attempt to drive a wedge between St. John's and the outports. Now, Sir, having said that let me also say this: I have known the honourable gentleman, the member for White Bay North, for quite some time, ever since we were at school together in Memorial University, and I do know that the honourable gentleman spoke with his tongue in his cheek at that time. I am certain of that, positive—I think that like all of us coming here the first time you want to say something that is going to attract attention—Well he certainly attracted attention—But I say this for him: The man who never makes a mistake is the man who does nothing—I remember a situation very much akin to this, some five years ago, when that great imperial concept, BRINCO was launched in this House. Well I have got to say something about this—In one of my picayune moments I referred to it as “Bunco”—Every Spring, Mr. Speaker, from year to year the knife would be put in, definitely put in and twisted until eventually you will recall, Sir, I had to actually

beg for mercy—And since that I have been allowed to go along in my own quiet way—So there is nothing to worry about making a mistake—You are going to be hounded for a while yet, you see, but it will be all right.

You know about this time every now and then when I get up to talk I start to run out of things—I am reminded of a story that used to be told about a gentleman who formerly adorned the Upper House in the days when we had an Upper House. The gentleman apparently had been a loyal party supporter and a generous contributor, and had received his just reward and had his seat in the Legislative Council. But apparently he was not a particularly affluent speaker, and he sat for many years and said nothing. Eventually, so the story goes, there was another gentleman of Irish extraction who had joined the Council and he could not understand why this fellow would not speak. Eventually he said: "Look here, there is a Bill coming up tomorrow—speak on it." "No, I am not going to speak," he said—"I never spoke." There is nothing to it. All you have to do is get up and say: Mr. President and members of the Legislative—I will be alongside you and tell you what to say. You got to do it boy—There is nothing to it.

Our friend was persuaded, and he looked in the mirror and practised the opening words and in due course the matter came up. He got up to speak—"Mr. President and Members of the Legislative Council. Everyone stopped—They thought the man was in the horrors—He looked at his friend and found he was reading the newspaper—He started again "Mr. President and members of the Legislative Council", and then he made one more desperate effort—"Mr. President and members of the Legislative Council"

—What do I say now"? "Oh, say you are sorry, and sit down." Actually you know, that might be as good a way to get out of it as any.

However, there have been some very excellent speeches here in this debate, and some points made with which quite truthfully I can find myself completely in accord. The Minister of Education yesterday in the course of his speech referred somewhat sorrowfully to the Wailing Wall which had been confronting him for the past five years, and said that the Government had been subjected to these wails and lamentations. Now the wails are still being heard, Sir, but the wails this time are coming from Your Honour's left—We have heard the complaints of the honourable member for Placentia West and the honourable member for Burin and from others, I have no doubt, yet to be heard from I think that we can say that some of the chickens are coming home to roost.

The honourable member for Placentia West did say that this business of the United Towns not giving service should be looked into. Well, now I think he is possibly quite right in that. But there is another public utility that is equally delinquent in its duties, and I refer to a message I got only yesterday from a group of people down on Logy Bay Road, less than three miles from this House Mr. Speaker. There are over twenty families on that road. They are looking for telephones. They have been told they cannot get the lines. But in actual fact I am informed that a private line was installed for one of the directors of that company into Virginia Waters last year. Now whether it is properly within the purview of this House—probably not—but I do feel having been asked by these people to raise that point that the Public Util-

ities Commission should at least afford these people some relief. If these people need a doctor or an ambulance it is a matter of walking several miles to the necessary phones. That, in this day and age, Sir, and within three miles of the capital city of St. John's does not seem to make sense.

The honourable minister of Education in the course of his complaint (I suppose one would call it) about having listened to prophesies of despair and doubt and death and depression says that sort of thing gets you down. Now, actually, Sir, that is not the proper approach to it. I do suggest that that is merely a counterpart to the exuberant song we have been hearing from the other side for the past five years. All we could hear about was the wonderful things that were going to happen. We all remember, those of us who were here in the Chamber in 1952, the great speech, "Newfoundland is on the March," and all the people were to be employed and so on. The sad fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, after the "Eight Best Years Yet," there are eighteen thousand people out of work in this country today. That, so the authorities say, is the highest total that has been reached since Confederation. Now what the explanation of it is I do not know. It may be some of it is seasonal but it certainly does not jibe, Sir, with a country that is on the march to prosperity, that has gone through its best eight years yet. You will find our employment is at its highest total since we went into Union.

There are one or two aspects of this Speech from the Throne—Roads: Everybody seems to have had something to say on roads. The speech itself says "My Ministers intend to embark upon a large programme of road building and with that in mind they

request you to pass legislation dividing the present Department of Public Works into two." Well, nobody is disputing the fact that roads are undoubtedly a very important feature in present day life in Newfoundland. They certainly will play a more important part in the development of the country. But, Sir, that type of programme that has been envisaged, the type of programme being suggested—I remember the Honourable and Learned Member for Fogo the other day took one little section of his own district and figured on two million dollars to fix it up well. Now, Sir, I have got to take that and multiply it all over this country, and where is the money going to come from for all this programme. It would appear to me, Sir, it is predicated on money that is going to come to us as a result of the findings of the Royal Commission. That is all very fine. I remember looking at Television the night that Royal Commission was announced and the Honourable the Premier was on with that enthusiasm, which is a source of constant admiration and amazement to me—But he raised two hundred million dollars, Sir, in a minute, because he said—Suppose we get ten million—What is the good of ten million—But we can capitalize that and get a hundred million and if we get twenty million we can take and make two hundred million. Now that is fine—If we get ten million, if we get twenty million then that may or may not be possible. I am not an economist and there are times when I suspect the Premier is not either. But we have no guarantee, Sir, at the moment that we are going to get ten million, five million, two million. We do know that we have got a good case. It is the hope of all of us in this House, irrespective of party that this Commission is going

to give us a just and fair division. But we have to look the hard realities in the face, Sir—The Federal Government cannot give us something that is going to be out of proportion to the rest of Canada. If they give us a generous amount then they are going to have the other Atlantic Provinces on their necks. I do say, Sir, that is rather reckless—No—reckless is not the word but rather haphazard planning to talk about what we are going to do out of the money that we have not got. That is the same old story of counting your chickens before they are hatched. There is no good, Sir, in telling people of this country we are going to have more schools, we are going to have more roads, more hospitals unless we can pay for them. You cannot give what you have not got. There is no point, and we might as well stop kidding ourselves on that. Unless we get a very large sum awarded by that Royal Commission there is no other way that we can finance the Government projects other than by continued borrowing.

Borrowing at the present time—and I say this subject to the Minister of Finance's opinion—is almost uneconomical, Sir, the rate of interest you have—You get something like ninety cents to the dollar. I happen to know something about it because in other places we had to make enquiries along the same lines. So that, Sir, it is all very fine to talk about the wonderful things we are going to do. But we have to ask ourselves first and got to be able to tell the people of this country where this money is coming from.

Speaking of roads, Sir, this has been a hardy perennial—There is a lot of talk about the roads all around the rest of the country. Only the other day, I think the Premier said St. John's will have to wait for these roads

until we look after areas outside the city, which put the present Government in power. That is rather a poor paraphrase of what was said, but that was the gist of it as I got it. Now, Sir, I happen to represent a district which has the distinction of being persistently, obstinately, if you will, refused to yield to the blandishments of the Premier. It is the only district which at no time since Confederation has returned a Liberal Candidate, provincially.

St. John's East has got a very large section of rural roads, and it extends into St. John's North, down through Flatrock and Pouch Cove there was some thirty years ago one of the finest set of roads in the country. Indeed it was used very extensively and promoted by the Tourist Bureau of that time as a drive for tourists—The Marine Drive—That whole area now, Sir, the Logy Bay section is completely useless as far as driving is concerned. You can drive over it yes, but to say driving for comfort, no, and certainly as a tourist attraction it is out of the question. I do feel that the Honourable the Premier was speaking, say, off the cuff—they do feel the people down in this area are entitled to look to the Government for attention to their roads. Indeed I bespeak the co-operation of my friend, the member for St. John's North because you do not do anything in St. John's North, at least in the Pouch Cove, Bauline without driving through St. John's East to get at it. So that if that gentleman and myself will meet in another place next week and get together I do hope perhaps that even obliquely some attention will be given to the roads in that district.

Now the Speech From the Throne this year is very reticent in its references to the new industries. There is

an announcement that the firm of Arthur D. Little has been retained to undertake an analysis of the industries. Somebody on this side referred to it as an investigation and we were told, no, it is not an investigation, it is an analysis. Well, Sir, a rose by any other name will smell as sweet. We do not care whether it is an analysis or an investigation, it is the thing that the Opposition has been asking for, for several years now, and we are happy to see it.

Incidentally, Sir, on that point, if I may, there is an interesting reference to the firm of Arthur D. Little and Company in the issue of "Time" dated April 1—Incidentally this is not the copy that the Honourable the Premier loaned us the other day. I thought the owner might want it and I brought up my own. With your permission, Sir, I would like to read this because it is of interest to all of us.

"We are not do-gooders. We are quite willing to reform the world, but we insist on being realistic about everything we do. We are a profitmaking organization." So says President Raymond Stevens of Arthur D. Little, Inc., the Cambridge (Mass.) research firm, which has done a notable job in reforming seven countries—at a price. Last week, adding luster to its reputation for solving social and economic problems from Iraq to Puerto Rico, A.D.L. took on two new projects: They do not mention us but go on to say—Arthur D. Little's ability to revolutionize backward economics is based on seventy years of practical experience. Started in 1886 by the late Arthur D. Little a chemistry student who left M.I.T. before graduation when he ran out of money, the organization has 450 topnotch researchers (out of a total 900 employees), can field a team of experts in everything from bank-

ing, law and engineering to outer space.

Well now, Sir, if they do those outstanding things we have a couple of little things down here they can go to work on. In all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, I think the retaining of that firm by the Government, whether the Government conceded to Opposition pressure or whether it was just a planned decision of the Government, represents, I do honestly believe, the best hope for the complete analysis and salvage of these industries. There are some of them may perhaps be scrapped. I think there is no doubt that some of them will go under. But if these people are as good as they are supposed to be there is no reason at all why we should not salvage something out of the thing, and I hope we do.

There is a reference then, Sir, to the appointment of a Royal Commission to consider the matter of civil service pensions. Now, Sir, there again I find it a little bit difficult to understand why it is necessary to appoint a Royal Commission. It means there is going to be nothing done for a considerable period, months and perhaps a year and perhaps longer. Is there something so terribly involved in this thing that it could not be tackled by the Government. Surely if the Government proposes, as has been announced, to give an increase to active civil servants it could quite well consider the pensioners at the same time.

Now I was very happy the other day, Sir, to hear the Honourable and Learned Member for Fogo refer to the question of these members of the police force who had been retired between 1949 and 1952. That is a matter, Sir, that I have been bringing up in this House annually since 1953, and each time it has been brought up I

have been given the assurance that the matter is under investigation and that something would be done. I do hope, Sir, that something will be done. The men who are affected in that particular group represent some of the finest men who ever did duty in the police force in this country. They are men deserving of consideration. And I would ask the Attorney General, if it is at all possible, to do something this year—To do it for them—They are certainly worthy of consideration.

The reference to the university—I do not think there can be any quarrel with that. I think that the Honourable the Minister of Welfare put it very nicely—The more people get the advantages of higher education the better it is going to be for the country—In a sense he said that one of the purposes of education is to shed light. Well no, that is exactly what we want, because my leader for the past several years has been endeavouring to get the light shed around, and the more people who get an education the better—And I hope a lot of people in this country will at last see the light and come and give my leader the support he needs.

There are just one or two minor things, Sir, I would like to mention in passing, firstly, we have had for several years past now this thing trotted up, a fishermen's market for fishermen of St. John's. There has been nothing done yet, Sir, nothing done yet. The whole thing is a "cod."

MR. MERCER: Better go to Ray Riche about that.

MR. HIGGINS: No. I don't think it is quite fair, Sir. Surely something could be done. I do know the fishermen approached the Municipal Council and the Council was prepared to go so far but it was felt it was a Gov-

ernment project. So approaches were made but the things seem to have broken down. There is no doubt about the fact that these men fishing out of St. John's if they had a proper market could certainly dispose of their catches at a much better return than they are presently getting by selling their fish green to wholesale plants.

One other thing struck me going through the Public Accounts the other day, and that was the reference to the amount of loan that was made to the Municipal Council in connection with the erection of the stadium. One of the conditions of that loan was that the stadium would be available to the Government for a couple of weeks. I think, each year or each spring and each fall, for the holding of agricultural exhibitions. As yet there has not been one. Again, Sir, I am at a loss to understand it because down in Flatrock for the last couple of years they have been running very successful exhibitions and are running them all over the country. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources and his predecessor both have seen the work that has been done. There is no doubt about it, Sir, there is tremendous progress being made in agriculture in this country today. It seems to me it is a great pity that the Government would not take advantage of that stadium that it has the right to do. I would like to see it done.

Now, Sir, I do not propose to delay the House any longer. I do say there are things in this, very little in this Throne Speech with which one could quarrel. It is a far cry from these documents we had in other years, indeed it is so restrained that there is not very much a fellow can find to get wrought up over at all. I will say too that it is not innocuous, but that there are a lot of hidden things there if one

could only find them. I will say this, Mr. Speaker, to the Government, repeating what has been said by my leader and by my honourable friend from St. John's Centre, while it is our job to oppose and whilst we will oppose anything that we think is deserving of opposition we are not here just to make quarrels. This session at least, I am glad to say, there appears to be no personal bad feeling. If the Government has not got a conscience we are supposed to supply it—I am not saying that they have not. I can say this, Sir, whatever we will do it will be done in the light of our duty as we see it. There will be no opposition just merely for the sake of opposition. And I say, what we can contribute will be done gladly and willingly. (Applause).

HON. J. T. CHEESEMAN (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion debate adjourned.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act To Amend the Partnership Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the second reading of this Bill which is a bill to amend the Partnership Act, An Act which has been on the Statute Books of Newfoundland since 1892.

Through a comedy of errors there have been mistakes made in that Act ever since it was enacted. The very first Act that was passed was badly drafted, it seems. It dealt with two sub-sections and then when the sub-sections were joined, instead of being joined the wording was such that it applied only to the second of the two sub-sections.

I do not think the members of the House will be particularly interested

in the details. Actually I have not got the original Act in front of me, but I think it does appear in the present Consolidated Statutes, Revised Statutes. That Act is 224 of the present Revised Statutes—I refer to the Act so that honourable members will see that the legislation passed is simply legislation to amend small errors. Take for instance Section 2. Sub-section 2 of this Act respecting partnership, it relates only between members of any corporation or association which is a registered company under the Companies Act or other Act, of the Legislature or by or in pursuit of any other Acts of Legislature, Letter Patent or Royal Charter—Then instead of starting a new line so that it incorporates both these it says—It is not a partnership within the meaning of the Act—Instead of that being a separate clause applicable to both (a) and (b) it is tied on to (b) which, of course, makes the whole section unintelligent.

The other amendments made to the Partnerships Act are similar—The error that was made in 1892 was carried forward to 1916 when we had a consolidation and also in 1952's consolidation. Indeed they did a better job still in 1952 in the consolidation in as much as they allowed another error to creep in. So, as I say, this is a comedy of errors. I do not think I need to go into the details until we get into committee. I would like to assure the House that the object of the Bill is simply to tidy up the Act by making the corrections that were made necessary constantly and continuously by errors.

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 Department of Mines and Resources Act."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, this sounds to me like something that happened before—Did I not move this one yesterday? I had an uneasy suspicion that I was not moving that one although I said it was—I said if it was not it should be—Now this is the one it should be, I think. Yes, and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition spoke on it too. And it was the wrong Bill, apparently all the time.

MR. HOLLETT: I do not have the title now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill which puts into the Department of Mines and Resource jurisdiction for Co-operative activities of the Government, but upon which both the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's South spoke.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable the Premier will forgive me—I believe yesterday I spoke on taking the Co-operative activities out of Fisheries. This one is putting it into Mines and Resources.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Good—I am happy to know that. If this Bill passes the Co-operative activity will find a home in the Department under the jurisdiction of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, where it should be—So, Mr. Speaker, 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 a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Corrections Act."

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, in the existing legislation of the Corrections Act it is provided for delinquent children to be committed to the care of

the Minister. Now this Bill proposes an amendment so that the child would be committed to the care of the Director of Child Welfare.

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 Welfare of Children Act."

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, Section 2 of this amendment is similar to that same section under the Corrections Act. We will just deal with Section 3 here, which increases the amount of money of a bond or down payment from seven hundred and fifty dollars to twelve hundred dollars.

Now the existing legislation says that any putative father can pay the sum of seven hundred and fifty dollars as a minimum amount. The Department feels that this amount should be increased to twelve hundred dollars, for very often the putative father just pays the minimum amount of seven hundred and fifty, which is utterly inadequate for the support of a child until he or she has reached the age of sixteen. So that the amount has been increased to twelve hundred dollars.

Section 4—There is a typographical error in the Act, where the existing legislation provides for one dollar—It was just an error. It is proposed now to increase the amount to one hundred dollars. Then in Section 5 deleting "not more than one thousand dollars" and putting in "not less than twelve hundred dollars." That too is similar to section 3. Section 4 really sums up the whole of the previous section.

MR. HIGGINS: There is one point in that, Mr. Speaker, it has come to my notice recently this very thing that the Minister speaks about which allows

putative fathers to satisfy an action by paying presently an amount of seven hundred and fifty dollars over a period of three years. It is now going to be twelve hundred. I notice the first installment, in other words, four hundred dollars would have to be paid. Four hundred dollars on the date of the order or twenty days thereafter. The thing I am wondering about, in the case particularly of servicemen, what security the Department gets—Because I had a case come to my attention in the past week of one of these agreements where a serviceman had made the agreement which had been accepted, apparently by the Welfare Officer in good faith. He made certain payments and was then transferred to St. Antonio or somewhere, and there appeared to be no surety of signing a bond or anything else, and it looks as though the unfortunate girl is left high and dry. Can the Minister tell me whether or not there is any practise in his department to cover that type of thing in future?

MR. MURRAY: So the military authorities permit a man to slip out?

MR. HIGGINS: To "rotate" is the word.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, just a word in connection with this—I see this is exactly the same section 2 as in 1952, taken out again in 1954 and something else put in and now it goes back in again. There is one other thing—the amount of twelve hundred dollars—it seems to me the Government is not taking into consideration the high cost of living at the present time—If it were seven hundred and fifty dollars some years back I think it ought to be much more than twelve hundred at the present time. That does not go very far these days when you have to pay thirty-five cents a

pound for salt fish in some retail stores. I hope the Minister of Fisheries takes note that the cost of living has gone up when we have to pay thirty-five cents a pound for salt fish, which is three parts bone. I bring that in there in support of the fact that I do not think twelve hundred dollars is sufficient for a putative father to have to pay in connection with the bringing up of a child for a total amount, I think, of sixteen years. He has to pay all of it down, I suppose, pay it over to the Director and it is doled out—dole is the only word we could use—I would like the Honourable Minister, who was a magistrate for a number of years as I was, and I know how terrible in the old days it was when I think it was a hundred dollars for a while—That was paid out over a period of years to raise a child—I forget the amount—Anyway in those days it was terrible, and even now twelve hundred dollars is almost as terrible. Twelve hundred dollars will not go very far in connection with raising a child, particularly the child of a putative father. I would like to bring that to the attention of the Minister—And I am quite sure the point raised by my honourable colleague from St. John's East would be absolutely essential. There must be provisions by way of bonds so that a service man can not just slip out of the country and get away without paying the full money. Certainly we are in favour of the general principle of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

On motion of Mr. Curtis all further orders of the day to stand deferred.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday at three of the clock.

MONDAY, April 8, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. JONES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the people of Garnish. The prayer of this petition is that the sea fence which was built at the beach at Garnish extending eastward to protect the lives of some twenty families be reconstructed and improved.

Mr. Speaker, the facts of this matter are that a sea wall was built a number of years ago and since that time much of the beach between the sea wall and the sea itself has been washed away, so that the wall is now exposed to the sea and is in grave danger of breaking through. Should that happen the twenty-eight will be exposed to the sea and there is a danger that the houses will be washed away.

This petition was actually sent to the Honourable the Premier last year, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately it was received too late for presentation at the last session of the House of Assembly.

I ask that this petition be received and that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I rise in a sense to support the prayer of this petition. As the honourable gentleman says, it was addressed originally to me at a moment when the district had no member and this House was not in session. I thought therefore that the appropriate thing for me to do was to hand it to the new member when he was elected so that he could bring it

before this House at the first opportunity.

Now that I have refreshed my memory by hearing the matter raised again by the honourable gentleman it occurs to me that quite possibly this is a matter for the Government of Canada rather than the Government of Newfoundland. If the wall in question were there to protect the road then certainly it would be a Provincial matter. If, however, the wall is there to protect the shore then, I think, it is a Federal matter. The Government of Canada are not interested in protecting roads that are built and owned and operated by the Government of the province, but it is their duty and their concern to protect the shore of Canada, and the shore at Garnish is a part of Canada, that great continent. Therefore, I think, perhaps when the matter reaches the department to which it relates the action might consist of taking it up with the Federal Department of Public Works. In any case whether it is the Newfoundland Government or the Government of Canada that is to deal with it, I give it my hearty support.

HON. J. McGRATH (Minister of Health): I don't know if this is in order, Mr. Speaker, but as a matter of fact this has already been taken up with the Government of Canada who have said they have no obligation in the matter and have it referred back. The reason—When I was Acting Minister of Public Works the matter came up, and they have clearly indicated they are not empowered to do anything in the matter and that it is a matter for the Provincial Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was a good try anyway.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from the Congregational Church of Newfoundland—

To the Honourable Speaker and Members of the Honourable the House of Assembly of Newfoundland:

The Petition of John W. Cahill, James R. Steele, Rosa Carmichael, Ada Barnes, Louis Calver, Gladys Calver, Ralph W. Barnes, Frederick J. Penney and Cyril W. Barnes of St. John's in the Province of Newfoundland.

HUMBLY SHEWTH

1. That your Petitioners were members of the Congregational Church in St. John's (hereinafter referred to as "the said Church").
2. That by an Act passed by the Legislature of Newfoundland being 16 Victoria, Chapter 13, entitled "An Act to regulate the election of Trustees of Lands and Chattels for the Congregational Church in St. John's," it is provided that the lands and chattels belonging to the said Church be vested in wardens for the benefit of the members of the said Church in the manner therein provided.
3. That in the year 1938 union took place between the said Church and the Presbyterian Church in Canada and the said Church thenceforth became known as "The Queens' Road Presbyterian Church."
4. That at the time of the said union of the Churches no provision was made for the transfer of the lands and chattels of the said church to The Presbyterian Church in Canada and the same remained vested in

the wardens who held office at that time.

5. That by reason of the death of several of the wardens last appointed and the impossibility of the election of successors, the provisions of the said Act have now become entirely inoperative.
6. That the former members of the said Church are desirous of disposing of certain property belonging to the Congregational Church in St. John's and wish to have all lands and chattels belonging to it vested in trustees to be appointed for that purpose.

Your Petitioners therefore pray:

That the Honourable the House of Assembly may be pleased to enact the annexed Bill and that the Act 16 Victoria, Chapter 13, entitled "An Act to regulate the election of Trustees of Lands Chattels for the Congregational Church in St. John's" be repealed.

And as in duty bound your petitioner will ever pray.

Dated at St. John's this 8th day of April, A.D. 1957.

I present this petition, Mr. Speaker, and beg leave to have it tabled.

MR. MERCER: I second the motion, Mr. Speaker.

On motion the petition was received and referred to a Committee on Standing Orders.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices of Motion**Notice of Questions**

Notice of Questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett.

No answers to Questions.

Orders of the Day

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply.

HON. J. T. CHEESEMAN (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the other honourable members who have already spoken in extending to you my heartiest congratulations on your election to the high office you now occupy. I am sure that you will discharge your duties with credit to yourself and to this Honourable House.

I should also like to add my congratulations to the mover and seconder both of whom did an excellently fine job. Both of these honourable members will, I am sure, as time goes on make valuable contributions to the work of this House.

Whilst I am in the mood for congratulating I should like also to congratulate the Government on what they have achieved in the past in many fields of their endeavour. I don't think that anyone will expect me to say that all efforts were outstandingly successful, but whenever anything is attempted there must be some mistakes. At this time I would refer particularly to the wonderfully fine work that this Government has done in connection with Education and Health. There has been a tremendous improvement throughout Newfoundland during the eight years, and we all hope that this good work will be continued.

Mr. Speaker, I have been flattered no end by honourable members who have referred to me as a new member, that is they have included me with the new members. As a matter of fact I am not a new member to this Honourable House. It is true I am a back-bencher, so very close to the back that my back is against the wall, and I do not have too much room for the moment. But it is, as a matter of fact, thirty-seven years ago to this month since I first occupied a seat in this House. I was elected for my home district of Burin in 1919.

Many changes have taken place since then. However, Mr. Speaker, you will observe that the Premier was kind enough to think that I would be well taken care of while I am here in the back benches, because on my right side sits the Honourable the Minister of Health and on my left the Honourable Minister of Welfare. So my physical welfare should be in good hands.

Mr. Speaker, it might also be of interest if I were to tell you that of the thirty-six members who occupied seats in this House when I first came here there are but two of us living. All the others have gone to that greater parliament beyond. Harry Small who then represented the District of Burgeo and LaPoile, which district I have the honour to represent at this time, is the other, Sir, surviving member of that day.

Although I am not as new as some of my honourable colleagues, I, like the youthful member for White Bay North, hope to be around here for a few more years before I will retire to the Senate Seat that some of my friends of the Opposition did say before the election, not since, that I had been promised in return for my support of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that I will be forgiven if I refer to some of the men of my day. I recall that great Liberal Leader with whom I had the pleasure to serve on that occasion, the late Sir Richard Squires, the late Sir William Coaker, who, no matter what has been said or written to the contrary, made a tremendous contribution to the welfare of Newfoundland. It was the late Sir William Coaker who brought the fishermen of Newfoundland, particularly the fishermen of the Northeast Coast to the realization of their responsibilities and of their opportunities. He founded that great, truly co-operative trading company known as the Fishermen's Union Trading Company, which I am happy to say, after fifty years is still in operation and going strong.

There was also the late Dr. Barnes, who was a great educationalist. The Memorial University of today is the result of the dream of Dr. Barnes.

Then I recall with great joy the late Sir Michael Cashin who was the Leader of the Opposition—with great joy because he was a kindly man. I remember well how kindly he treated us youngsters. Associated with him was the late Billie Higgins, as he was then known to us, who later became one of the greatest judges of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, the late Judge Higgins. He was the father of the present sitting member for St. John's East.

Then there was that outstanding businessman, Sir John Crosbie. So I could go on recalling the many great men—and they were great men of their day. These were the men who contributed greatly to the development of Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Speaker, before leaving that—I am probably the only member of that clan known

as the "Fish Merchants" in this Honourable House, the clan that is much maligned from time to time.

HON. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Waffle Irons.

MR. CHEESEMAN: As I am the lone fish merchant in the House I might consider myself as their, shall I say, spokesman—But let me hasten to say that I am quite sure that they will not always agree with what I shall say or do.

Mr. Speaker, I was listening with some interest to what had been said about the merchants, particularly by the Honourable Member for Placentia West. I recall that in my younger days there was a very fine merchant in Placentia West who bore the same name and bore it with renown. Then my colleague on my left, the Honourable Minister of Welfare told us about the bad merchants and the quintals of fish and such like. Now, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness let me say this—and I think most reasonable people will agree with me—Merchants are not much different from any other class or progression of people. They do not differ greatly from the magistrates. I should say there are some good and some bad.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point on which I would like to touch at this moment. You will recall that a few days ago the Honourable the Premier introduced a bill to this House in connection with the separation of the Department of Fisheries and the Division of Co-operatives. I think the Honourable the Premier said at the time he introduced it that it was the object of this Bill to take away from the Department of Fisheries the Division of Co-operatives. Now I do not think it was meant just the way it sounded, because as a matter of fact

it was not taken away. It was one of the conditions on which I accepted the Department of Fisheries—That I would not have to continue to look after the Division of Co-operatives—I shall explain in a moment. Then some other honourable member referred to it as divorcing the Fisheries Department from the Co-operatives Division. Now of course that is wrong too I would suggest that what the Bill really meant was that it was a legal separation—the word divorce is not generally liked in this island—I thing legal separation would be a better term to use.

Now in regard to the Division of Co-operatives let me say this at once—I am a firm believer in the principles of co-operative effort. I think it has a great place and under proper conditions and under proper direction can be a tremendous benefit. But, Mr. Speaker, for my part I am not competent. I have had no training in such work and do not feel competent to supervise that division as it should be supervised. I am certain that my honourable colleague, the Minister of Mines and Resources who has been associated with the co-operative work for a very long time will do a much better job and give the people a much better service than I could have done. Furthermore, in the Department of Fisheries there is more work that I will be able to do as well as I should like to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I have noticed a number of innovations that have occurred in this House since my time. I shall only mention one, the four-thirty coffee break. I have often wondered as I sit here and thought of the good old days, what would happen if some of the members of the early twenties were to come into this House at four-thirty o'clock in the afternoon and see us

drinking coffee. Mr. Speaker, then as now members occasionally get thirsty, but theirs was not usually connected with coffee, it might have been connected with a liquid that in colour there might have been some resemblance—That would be, Sir, purely coincidental.

Mr. Speaker, now I shall probably shock most members and perhaps many people outside this Honourable House when I tell you quite frankly that I am unable to say, Sir, that I came to this House this time because of any such high feelings as have been expressed by some of the honourable members who have preceded me. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am a very selfish man, and it is because I am selfish that I am here today. I, after very considerable consideration, accepted Premier Smallwood's invitation to take the portfolio of Fisheries, to join his party and to contest a district. I did so mainly, let me say very frankly, to satisfy my own ego. But I feel in saying that I may go on to say that at the same time to be able to render a service to Newfoundland particularly to those connected with the Fisheries.

I have more than fifty years of active association with the fisheries of Newfoundland, and I feel that I should like to be in a position at least for a few years before I would be obliged to withdraw from active life to have the opportunity to try and make a contribution based on the experience that I have gained over the years that I have been associated with the fisheries. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to strive to the utmost of my ability to do that, and if I fail there will be no one more disappointed than I shall be.

Mr. Speaker, I now have the honour of representing the District of

Burgeo and LaPoile. In comparison with perhaps any other district in Newfoundland that District of Burgeo and LaPoile is the one district that has received less public monies than any other district for many, many years. Mr. Speaker, the district of Burgeo and LaPoile has exactly fifteen miles of highroad. We have no snow-clearing problem like most other districts because we have no roads to be cleared. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if snow-clearing grants were distributed on the usual Newfoundland basis, that is per capita and according to denominations I would have enough money left over to have perfect local roads throughout the district and still enough remaining to build a few churches and schools. The fact of the matter is that not only do we not have any highroads but we do not have in the District of Burgeo any local roads worthy of the name.

MR. HOLLETT: After eight years?

MR. CHEESEMAN: After four hundred years. Mr. Speaker, east of Isle au Morts which is about twelve miles east of Port aux Basques and to the end of my district there are just two motor vehicles, one at Ramea where they have about half a mile of road over which to ride—and I was bold enough to take a ride on that piece of road a couple of years ago. The result was that I was under medical treatment for nearly two months afterwards. The other motor vehicle is at Burgeo. Now at Burgeo it is much better because they must have nearly a mile of road there.

Mr. Speaker, the district which I have the honour to represent is perhaps the only district in Newfoundland today that is almost entirely dependent upon fishery. It has been a fishing district from time immemorial, and has

produced a great deal of wealth. In the matter of transportation and communications I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that I am unable to say anything that would be very encouraging about either. I think I can speak with some authority and a great deal of feeling about travelling conditions and communications on the Southeast Coast, not only the Burgeo-LaPoile District but the whole area from Terrenceville at any rate to Port aux Basques. I know that whole area well because it is in the section of the Island that I have most of my own business. The regular coastal boats are more crowded, a great deal more crowded than ever was the case with either the old *Portia* or the old *Glencoe*. Now the reason why the present boats are so overcrowded is of course that there are more people travelling. The time taken to make the trips along the coast by the *Barhaven* and *Baccalieu* I am quite sure works out at longer intervals than the old *Glencoe* and the old *Portia*. I have seen people myself on board these ships for days and nights, many with no place to sleep, women and children lying around the smoking room or one of the lounges. I have seen men who paid first class fare lying on the floors, I myself on more than one occasion have slept in the smoking room.

I recall that back thirty-seven years ago when I was canvassing Burin District one of the things that I advocated then, and that was a long time ago, and you young fellows take heart, it has not come to pass yet, I advocated then what the southeast needed was a freighting service separate and apart from the passenger mail and express service. I have been advocating that type of service nearly forty years, and I suppose it will take another forty before I accomplish it.

In the matter of mails, it is most unusual to get any communications from that district under ten days to two weeks. The people who live in other parts of Newfoundland especially on the Avalon Peninsula, the Bonavista Peninsula and the Burin Peninsula are unable to visualize how different are the travelling conditions on the Southwest Coast even in this Year of Our Lord, 1957. I have had occasion to travel to Ramea every year for the past fourteen or fifteen years, to attend an annual meeting of the company. We usually have the annual meeting in February. The time occupied is so great that a couple of years ago I had to tell my associates that I could no longer spare the time to be away. On the last visit that I made there I was away from my office here for ten days and of the fourteen days was able to spend two in Ramea. We are now holding our annual meetings in Halifax and find it much more convenient.

MR. HOLLETT: Since Confederation.

MR. CHEESEMAN: That is always—it is no better now than ever.

Mr. Speaker, it is probably not generally known that whilst the rest of Newfoundland has been enjoying great prosperity and still is enjoying prosperity the Southwest Coast from Fortune Bay to Burnt Island, which is quite near Port aux Basques, with very few exceptions have been going through a depression—and unfortunately the situation has not improved. It is getting worse. The most hopeful sign at the moment is the prospect of a great industrial development in Bay D'Espoir. I hope that that comes and that that comes soon.

The district, Mr. Speaker, that you happen to have the privilege to repre-

sent is probably harder hit than even the district that I am representing. Fortune Bay has suffered a great deal. The end of the bank fishery was the end of prosperity for Fortune Bay, particularly the north side. Then to make matters worse, in recent years there has been a failure of the herring fishery. Fortune Bay was really founded not so much on the codfishery as on the herring fishery. It was the centre from which the French and Americans were supplied with bait. That continued until 1887 when the Bait Act came into effect. The Bait Act, as any of you who have read the past history of Newfoundland will know, it took them about two years to try and enforce, then the enforcement was followed by many rights. It was after the enforcement of the Bait Act that Fortune Bay turned to codfishing, at first in smaller schooners that operated under offshore grounds from Trepassey and around to the Southwest and down the Northwest Coast to Southern Labrador. Then later they developed the larger vessels known as the bankers and subsequently fished the banks all the way from Sable Island and the Nova Scotia to Greenland.

The bank fishermen of Fortune Bay were, I believe, the first to fish for cod, the first fishermen in North America to fish for cod on the Greenland Banks. That bank fishery is no more. I am quite sure that nothing we can do can revive that bank fishery.

There are probably upward of two hundred men from the north side of Fortune Bay who are fishing on bankers out of Nova Scotia. But the Nova Scotians' fleet, like the Newfoundland fleet, is dying. The fishermen from Fortune Bay are getting older and they are not being replaced by the younger ones.

Mr. Speaker, another matter of passing interest to a good many might be with the matter of historical interest—The bank fishery did not originate on the South Coast as a great many people think. As far as I have been able to find the bank fishery probably got its first start from Trinity Bay, and in all probability the first banking schooners sailed from Catalina. One of the banking skippers operated from the South Coast came from Trinity Bay and their descendants are still on the South Coast.

Mr. Speaker, last year the Honourable the Premier set up a commission to investigate economic and social matters on the South Coast. He was good enough to invite me to be Chairman of that commission. I did so with very great pleasure. I accepted because it gave me an opportunity to try and bring home to the rest of Newfoundland as well as to the Government the particular and peculiar needs of that coast. I can assure you this much, Mr. Speaker, that was no overstatement. We have gathered a great amount of valuable information, and it is now in the course of preparation. I do hope that we will have our report ready for presentation before the close of this House.

I feel quite sure, Mr. Speaker, (and again maybe I am egotistical) but I feel quite sure that the contents of the report we shall present will be very informative and valuable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may for a moment, I would like to refer to one or two remarks made during the speech by the Honourable member for White Bay North: The honourable member made some very unkind references to our good old city of St. John's, and the oldest city in North America, a city that I have greatly enjoyed. I

came here years ago. He referred to us, we the people, being citizens of St. John's as being parasites. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that like the merchants and the lawyers there must be good and bad parasites, and if the honourable member himself is an example of the kind of parasites we have in St. John's then I must say they must be good because I thoroughly enjoyed those people of St. John's including the honourable member himself, those people whom he termed parasites. So I think that the honourable member must have discovered a good breed of parasites.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with the honourable member in his reference to the bait services and the manner in which reference to the bait services and the manner in which it has so far been handled by the Federal Department of Fisheries who are responsible for the Bait Service in Newfoundland. I will however hasten to say that we have had some slight improvement within recent months, and I am hopeful that we shall get more. But, Mr. Speaker, let me assure the honourable members in this House that I realize the fact that this bait service is far more important to our Newfoundland fishermen and that whilst I should continue trying to get the necessary improvements made by the Federal Authorities if they fail to do all I think should be done I shall not hesitate to come to this House and say so at the next session and ask for someone to supplement the work. The bait service must be brought up to the required standards of today through effort. I also agree with the honourable member that it is deplorable that we should be supplying in Newfoundland bait to the very fishermen who are taking the fish that they catch back and supply

ing the markets that we had supplied for hundreds of years, and to which I don't think we have sold (I was going to say "a quintal" but changed my mind in deference to the honourable member and will say "a hundred pounds") a hundred pounds of fish in the past two years. Now that we should be doing that without any return whatever I think is entirely wrong. It is a matter, I think, upon which this Provincial Government should take the most, make the strongest efforts to see that if we are going to continue supplying bait at least we get a share of the market that is available in the home country of the people to whom we are supplying.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of publicity recently about fishermen's insurance. No doubt the measure has a great deal of good in it, and a great many people think it will mean the resurgence of the Newfoundland fishery and that there will be a great many men coming back to the fishery. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that we shall have a great many fishermen register for insurance during the next few months, but not all of them will fish. It would be difficult to say at this time, but I would hazard a guess that say ten per cent will be the increase in the number of fishermen and the total catch would probably be optimistic. Mr. Speaker, on this question of insurance I am sure that you, Sir, will share with me the disappointment that the Act as it stands at the present time is a gross discrimination against the people of your district and particularly of mine.

MR. HOLLETT: Hear! Hear!

MR. CHEESEMAN: As the Act stands, the benefits are only payable to fishermen who are not operative between January 1st and, I believe it

is, April 15th. Now the fishermen on the South Coast will be obliged to make contributions but they will not be eligible for benefits because in my district and in most places in the Fortune Bay District the real fishing time, the harvest time is December through April. Now what will happen? It is gross discrimination as it is at the moment. Will the fishermen of the Burgeo District and the Fortune Bay District continue paying in and getting nothing out? Will they continue to fish during the hardest time of the year and the roughest time of the year and the coldest and the most expensive time in the year, will they try and find some way to get enough established during the summer so they won't have to fish in the winter? Mr. Speaker, I suggest this is a matter that the Federal Government will have to take under review without delay.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Premier has done a number of good things for Newfoundland during his best eight years but in my opinion his greatest stroke of genius was when he found a seat, found a riding I think it is they call it, in Newfoundland for the then Mr. J. W. Pickersgill, who is now the Honourable J. W. Pickersgill and the Newfoundland representative in the Federal Cabinet. That was a stroke of genius. I can imagine the Premier when he first approached him pretending not to be interested. I can almost hear him—"What do you want me to do, commit political suicide in Newfoundland by bringing in a Mainlander? I could not think of it," and at the same time wondering if the door was locked. The Honourable Mr. Pickersgill has proven himself to be of inestimable value to Newfoundland. He has done a wonderful job for Newfoundland. He is a man who is destined to go far in Federal Politics. I

am quite sure that Newfoundland has in the Honourable Mr. Pickersgill a friend who no matter how far he goes will still remain and remember that he got his real start in public life in Newfoundland and that he will always be our friend and advocate. Mr. Speaker, at this time he has shown that.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to take a brief look at the marketing outlook as it appears to me. It is of course always dangerous to prophesy and I am no prophet. But as I see it, the situation in regard to frozen fish has improved a bit during the past six months, and there is every indication that, if we want to consolidate our position and if we do not increase production unduly, if we continue to maintain the good quality of which Newfoundland is known that there should be less difficulty in the marketing for the 1957 production than there was during either 1956 or 1955. Now by that I do not mean that there is likely to be any improvement in prices that will be paid for the raw fish to the fishermen. The reason why I say that is that it is a known fact that almost without exception the producers have been losing sums of money during the past three years even at the low prices that they have been paying.

MR. HOLLETT: Nonsense! Nonsense!

MR. CHEESEMAN: My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, says it is nonsense. It is non-cents. It is true there has been an awful lot of non-cents and dollars too.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman ought to look at a few balance sheets.

MR. CHEESEMAN: In so far as the Government is concerned I think that I can say, and certainly say for myself, that there is no intention of providing any find in the foreseeable future for the extension of the frozen fish industry. We want to see it get on its feet. The facilities in Newfoundland at the present time are sufficient to produce almost double the quantity that we are now producing. Last year our production was sixty-two million pounds which is almost the maximum quantity that we can hope to sell in the foreseeable future.

In regard to salt fisheries: Stocks at the moment are slightly in excess of what they were at this time last year. That is due mainly to two factors (1) because of the ice conditions that prevailed on the east coast during recent months the shipments that were scheduled to go out during January and February were not shipped and (2) there it is my information that there will be no sales problem and that all will be sold and shipped before the new fish becomes available.

I feel, Sir, that we may look forward with confidence to a reasonably good year in the salt fish business in 1957. Prices should be at least as good as they were last year. There is, however, one note of warning that I would like to make, i.e. that there is every indication that we might soon be producing more heavy salted type than the markets will be able to take. Newfoundland is traditionally known for light salted, and the fishermen would be well advised if they would revert, as far as possible at any rate, to curing of light salted fish.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Premier has told this House that steps have already been taken to have certain industries in which the Govern-

ment have invested money by way of loans or otherwise examined. Now I have asked the Honourable the Premier to include in that examination the examination of the financial affairs and outlook, prospects, of some of the fishing operations in which the Government has heavy commitments. I hope that if and when this is done that we will be able to put the industry on a firmer basis than it is at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it was on opening day or thereabouts, but certainly early in the session, that the proprietor of Fisheries Products came in for a great deal of unfavourable comment. Now, Sir, I am not here to defend anyone. I want to say at once that I think the Manager of Fishery Products, Mr. Arthur Monroe, has put altogether too much money of his own and of the Government into that operation, he has shown perhaps more aptitude for the building of a big empire than for the successful operation. But that as it may, I would like to point out to this House that Fisheries Products is a very, very important factor in the economy of Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. CHEESEMAN: I think back only to the home town of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and myself. We both came from Burin. When Arthur Monroe came in there Burin was just recovering from two depressions, an earthquake and a tidal wave all within a matter of about ten years. Burin was virtually a ghost town. Burin is today one of the most thriving towns anywhere around Newfoundland. It was built around the fisheries operation. Last year, in 1956, Fisheries Products employed no less than fourteen hundred and sixty-five

people and paid out in cash wages approximately two million dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: In Burin?

MR. CHEESEMAN: In the whole operation—They purchased approximately seventy-five million pounds of fish. That is a big operation. That is an operation that Newfoundland cannot afford to let perish. Ways and means must in the interest of the fishing industry and indeed in the interest of the general economy of Newfoundland be found to keep such an operation going.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that largely as a result of the Premier's energetic salesmanship that we are on the threshold of great mineral development and great development of our water power. I believe firmly from all that I have seen in recent months that the day is not far distant when Bay D'Espoir will become the greatest port outside St. John's and probably the greatest if not the greatest industrial town city—in the not too distant future—That would change the whole economy of the South Coast and a great deal of the East Coast too.

It has been said by the Premier that the past eight years were the best eight years yet. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion if we all pull together if we all do what we can to make the best contributions our abilities will permit us and with that energy for which the Premier is known, I am quite sure that we may look forward with confidence to the next eight years being even better.

(Applause.)

On motion of Mr. Smallwood the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with previous speak-

ers in congratulating you on your elevation to the high honour of Speaker of this House. I wish you success in this high office for many years to come. It is a double honour to me, Sir, as I was born in the district that you represent and the honour conferred upon that district by your appointment to the Chair and the honour as a member of this House, serving under your guidance.

I would also like to extend my congratulations to the honourable and gallant member for Harbour Grace, the mover, and the honourable and gallant member for Bell Island, and seconder, on the splendid addresses in moving the Address in Reply.

In must also thank the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and honourable members on the opposite side for congratulating us on our victory and welcoming us to this House.

With reference to the Distribution Bill, dividing certain districts, I was pleased that the honourable member for White Bay South made a reply to the Speech from the Throne. I happened to be one of the members elected in a district that was divided, the District of St. George's Port au Port, which up to the time of the last election was one district and the Honourable Minister for Fisheries and Co-operatives was its representative. The district started from Cape Ray West to Howards East and down through Stephenville, Port au Port, covering a certain number of miles of territory, and it had somewhere around sixty settlements with the registered electors around eight thousand. The district that I represent now starts from Port au Port from Indian Head, Stephenville to Port au Port, which takes in Piccadilly, West Bay West, West Bay Centre, Winter House and Black Duck Brook, Long Point, Bull Point, Broad

Cove, St. George's, Ship's Cove and Flower's Cove, a total of somewhere in the vicinity of twenty-eight settlements and an overall of four thousand registered electors.

To cover that district by car only in one place, I think and in a boat would take at least a couple of weeks. I do not know how the Honourable Minister for Fisheries and Co-operatives could spare the time, being a Cabinet Minister, and give the district the attention that it deserved. It must have taken all his time to do so. By subdividing the district and giving my colleague St. George's, I am certain it will be better for all concerned.

I wish to say that in the campaign on the Port au Port District, how clean the campaign was. The first person I received a word of congratulations from was my opponent. He was Bill Winter a man although not born in the district a man who knew the district very well and has a very important position there. He offered his support in anything he can do to help the district and Newfoundland, and will be willing to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member would forgive me—I wonder if the honourable member would speak a bit louder. He is up in the corner and the sound is not carrying.

MR. SMITH: I will try, Sir, I do not intend to elaborate on what has been said by honourable members on this side of the House in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I fully agree with them, and I congratulate them on their able addresses.

In the Speech from the Throne reference was made to the Royal Commission to examine into the Economic and Social Conditions along the South

West Coast of this Province: Mr Speaker, anything connected with the South West Coast of this Province is very dear to me. I was born there, and in the good days, as we call them, before the first war, in 1911 and 1912 I am sure there are members in this House who can remember Burin and Fortune, Lamaline, Grand Bank, Harbour Breton, English Harbour and other places, and these sailing vessels that all came petitioning to get a crew for a vessel. Fishermen were short. There was a scarcity of men. Then the war started and after the war people instead of returning to the fisheries decided to follow other ways of living and they went to Gloucester, a lot of them, and some to the Mainland and the others took to more or less land work, and we found the fishing fleet depleted. Indeed the honourable member for Burin said there is only one vessel now in the fishery; and the rest have been turned into coasters and so on.

Then we found the next thing to happen to the Southwest Coast was the earthquake, and as we go on down worse yet was the depression, the dole days. These were days I knew in the district when they bartered flour bags for clothing and so on. People were depressed, and fatigued both mentally and physically. But out of the wilderness, out of somewhere I would happen to know, and I would not have to mention their names, a call was sent out and from Fortune Bay people started to move to the West Coast to a place called "Lourdes." I remember well when we were all just wondering what was taking place—There was practically nothing else—the fishery had gone. You could see ten or twelve people boarding the coastal boats and making their way down the Southwest Coast, to the Lourde's virgin forests—

There were all fishermen came there. There were carpenters capable of building their own homes, as all fishermen. They erected saw mills. They built their homes and their barns and when they had their homes completed they sent for their families. That carried on until gradually that little place, with a handful of people, had somewhere around two hundred and fifty. It was thought every time by the advance guard preparing the way for the outlander—the unfortunate part is—Most people on the Southwest Coast knew we have harbours, but on that peninsula where they were located there were only coves, and the only chance they did have was to haul their boats up every evening. They had one place for the discharge of their cargoes, Piccadilly, otherwise they had to go around sixty miles to Corner Brook. They only had a beaten trail to get to Stephenville. In spite of all that, that community centre built up and was doing well and what happened? We had the second World War. We had Harmon Field's demand for labour, we cannot blame the fishermen who would be fishing morning until dark that they went to the bases and every week drew their cash pay. Roads were built, built to the cape and to the Mainland. They put buses and cars and trucks on them and were trucked back and forth to their work. Gradually this encouragement to the others got out and they started moving people from Placentia Bay and people, I think, from Burin and other districts. You will find them all over on the Port au Port Peninsula and practically all through Stephenville District, and they are still moving. All I am trying to point out, as I read this, Sir, this economic survey which is being made I feel certain that on the Port au Port Peninsula in the Dis-

tract that I have the honour to represent there is a big opening there. We have, as you know, in most of the district groups of ten houses, twenty houses, fifty houses but they are miles apart. There is fertile land there which has never been touched, there is a lot of timber for the saw mills, and pulp wood; in the water it is teeming with codfish, herring, lobster, salmon, mackerel, scallops. I do not know any other place in Newfoundland that has so much to offer.

But before any decision, which I know will be carefully worked out there is one thing which we will have to make certain of, that is, say if it were decided on to move people at their own free will it should be recognized—I know this is a Federal matter—a harbour should be recommended, some place for the people to put their boats and haul up their boats, somewhere where they can take away their fish and their farm products. Just now they take them to Corner Brook, a distance of somewhere around one hundred miles. I understand there is a survey on now by the Federal Government—and they started to put the power there last fall, as far as Ship Cove—It should have been there long ago—We have to encourage any growth in a community that has so much to offer. It certainly should be investigated. If the power is applied in the Port au Port Peninsula in Point au Gaul the people here themselves will put in a cold storage. They talked about it last summer when the fish was in abundance. I am glad to hear the Honourable Minister of Fisheries say there is hope and prospect that the salt fish especially the light salted fish, the shore fish outlook is improving.

What has happened, of course, is that a lot of people who went on the bases to work naturally their boats

and fishing gear is all gone. How far the Government or whoever is responsible is going to help re-establish them back in their own way of livelihood I do not know. But I do say that the opportunity is there, with proper roads—Mind you the roads there now are second class roads but being improved. They must be improved. These roads bear all the people who work on the bases and all the traffic to and from Corner Brook and the Crossing.

Take the school buses mentioned by the honourable Member for Burin: They have tried out this bus system and the buses are now taking the children to Port Au Port where they have splendid schools and this system has worked very, very well. But we most absolutely must have roads. I was glad to hear the Honourable the Premier say the other day when talking on road he wanted to build them and have them kept open. They must be kept open to get through and to and from work.

Another point we have heard very little about—We have heard that councils were elected, town councils, and I feel a lot of credit is due to the people that are elected in those town councils. I speak mostly of Stephenville: I do not know when they started but I certainly know the amount of work that has been accomplished. They have built roads, installed water and sewerage, how much I do not know, but they have street lighting and country fire brigades which go to make up a town. We very seldom hear about them. I do not hear very much praise or credit given. It is all done without pay, most of them working on the base or in their own business. The only chance they get to attend meetings is in the night time or on holidays. All they do is try and estimate and work out a scheme that

can advance the progress of the town. It has grown like a tree, sprouting everywhere. Go out there today. There are new homes, new mains, new roads, new sewers, to be laid and water lines and street lines for poles all have to be taken care of. When you get so many homes and congestion you have fire hazards. They will, I am sure, be approaching the Government for a loan, not a gift but a loan, to take care of fire fighting and likely a loan again for improving of the town. Stephenville has a population now of between seven and eight thousand. So that I hope when they approach the Government and I know they will get sympathetic consideration. But I will go on further than that, I hope the Government will see their way clear to advance the loan. We all must have money. Nobody can exist without it, and how can a town council which perhaps spends in the hundreds of thousands a year on roads and services and so on depend on the amount they collect in taxes and their assessments to pay their way. There is only one way they can do it and that is by the help of the Government or with the assistance of the Government in backing a bond issue or a loan. I certainly think they are entitled to it if you consider the amount of work these men put into the job. We have there a new town.

At the present time we have in a district of eight thousand one small cottage hospital at Stephenville. I salute the staff and doctors of that hospital for the tremendous amount of work they are doing, taking in all the outlying settlements.

I know that by the town council and all the others I will be approached when I go back to see what can be done to get a hospital to look after the sick. Believe me they have my

sympathetic interest. I think I know they are expecting things to happen. We have an obligation to look out for the right of the people. It is part of our job.

Another thing I would like to mention about Stephenville and Harmon Field is the harmony that exists between the personnel of Harmon Field and Stephenville. It is splendid. They help us. They help to clear snow and a lot of other things.

I was pleased as I am sure was everybody else in this House when the Honourable the Premier spoke about roads. I think he said a hundred million dollars. I was hoping to get another thousand. We all feel that without roads we are licked.

Mr. Speaker, I told you in my district we have everything to offer. I would like all members to come out when they have time and visit that district, the best salmon-fishing district in the whole of the West Coast—Come out for yourselves and see I am not exaggerating.

MR. HOLLETT: Will you pay our way?

MR. SMITH: But I feel and I am sure everyone feels the necessity of roads. Take the Trans-Canada Highway. I think the Premier is doing pretty well on what he said about a programme of roads—We know from Stephenville and the Crossing through to Corner Brook, and I suppose it applies all over the Trans-Canada Highway, the foliage of the trees are covered with this lovely mud. That is money, mud, because it is thrown on and two weeks after we have to eat the dust. The situation is bad.

Talking of tourists—It is a good thing as everyone knows to have tour-

ists. But we must have roads and we must have paved roads. When you get your paved roads, I do not think you will have any trouble with tourists, but you will have to get your gas stations, repair shops, lunch rooms and motels and hotels. But I believe one hundred per cent with the Trans-Canada Highway. Let us put this thing through and let us finish the job, but not at the expense of the secondary roads. To some of us the secondary roads are as important as the Trans-Canada Highway. It is important to the people living there, and in fairness to the people and in fairness to everybody the revenue we derive from it and in cases of emergency—and again I refer back to Port au Port—Take last year I see the Minister of Public Health looking—He does his best to try and get a doctor for Lourdes—We have a settlement there covering hundreds of miles, without a doctor. We must, I say, keep the roads open. We must keep them in repair and we must keep them well in repair as well as everything else.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have lost my notes—There are a lot of things I have left unsaid which I will think about when I get home. Like everybody says, you are only supposed to speak in the House for the good of the district. It is a new one on me. I did not know that. My district is going ahead anyway. I hope it will be considered and put in the papers, what I have not said, and I thank you very much, Sir, for giving me the privilege.

(Applause).

MR. O'DRISCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

On motion the debate on the Address in Reply was adjourned.

First Readings:

Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Corner Brook Act, 1955."

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

Second Readings:

Second reading of a Bill—"An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this amendment to the Education Act, I do not think I can make my explanatory remarks very short.

This amendment is in five parts in all. It is an amendment of the main Education Act of Newfoundland, the parent Act, whereby we run our schools and our general educational system. I suppose I need not say, Mr. Speaker, when we bring in an amendment to the original education Act the Government is always scrupulously careful to insure the matter has been thoroughly discussed and examined by the denominational educational authorities of the Province.

The first amendment is to include Labour Day as a school holiday, to make Labour Day a school holiday in Newfoundland. The reason for that is the fact that a great many of our people are in our unions have consistently requested that. But that is not the only reason for bringing in that amendment. As the House of Assembly probably knows Labour Day is also the first Monday in September, and when schools are opened on that day it often means that they are opened at some inconvenience to a lot of the parents who want to take advantage of

that holiday to take the day off and to go into the country or to have some kind of a free weekend, and that is very difficult then when school is open. So that there is a double reason there. I may say, Mr. Speaker, the majority of the schools in the larger parts of the Province, St. John's, Corner Brook, and Grand Falls and so on have in the past all remained closed on Labour Day anyway. This will have the effect of making it a day that would not be counted for school purposes.

The second amendment is that it will change the parent Act or that part of it which insists that all school fees must in the first instance be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council for consideration and approval. That is a very clumsy process and it is not workable in practice for the simple reason that we do have, I believe, something like four hundred school boards in Newfoundland. That could really mean four hundred submissions to the Executive Council, the Executive Government, in any one year. It is something which is entirely superfluous in any case because Boards of Education with the approval of the authorities who are quite competent and who should know what fees should be and can be paid in any area. So that this amendment will put the responsibility back where it should be and where it used to be years ago, with the Council of Education made up of the denominational authorities—In other words if a board wishes to establish a rate of fees for anyone or all the schools it will simply refer it to the denominational superintendent who in turn will refer it to the Council of Education within the Department and they will either approve or disapprove. It will not come before the Government as has to happen now.

The third amendment is a little involved, that is the wording is involved. I am not going to attempt to go into the legal terminology which makes it possible for the property formerly held by common schools and vested in the Minister of Education to be made over to any particular denominational group which may withdraw from the common school. Most of the common schools in the past few years have been made up principally of Pentecostal children, children of the Pentecostal Faith. Now that the Pentecostal Assembly has been given recognition by this House it becomes necessary for the Department of Education to have the authority to pass back, to vest some of their property in the denomination concerned. The authority does not exist in the parent Act. Bringing it down to a very simple case, for example, in some small settlement where a common school has been operated in the past the property there and the school house and other property has been vested in the Minister of Education. Now, however, if the Pentecostal Assembly sets up a service there, as would happen say if they were nearly all members of the Pentecostal Faith, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council will have the authority under this amendment to make over the school to that particular board of Education. Mr. Speaker, this point may not be too clear to all members of the House, it appears the Education Act, where a common school is set up to be operated by the Department of Education, as was the case in the areas of Newfoundland where there was some small denomination not recognized by law, for example, the Pentecostal Assembly, there was no need for an amalgamated school because all the children were Pentecostal. But it was not recognized by law so that somebody had to own and operate

the schools. So the Education Act carried a provision whereby the Department of Education could operate such a school and the property was vested on the Minister of Education. Now with the Pentecostal Assembly taking over the service there since its recognition by this House something has to be done with the property. There is no longer any point in the property being vested in the Minister of Education, and now the Lieutenant-Governor in Council would have the power to vest the title to such property in the denomination setting up the service there.

The fourth amendment, Mr. Speaker, gives us the authority to do something which actually has been done for a number of years in the past, especially in the last two or three years, and that is the legislative authority to operate schools during the months of summer, the months of July and August when normally all schools are closed. The reason for that is very simple: Because of the shortage of teachers and the difficulty of getting standard teachers to go to some of these small places, the Department of Education especially one of the denominations has had a practice this last few years of putting a qualified teacher in for a period of two months in some small communities where the school has been closed for ten months of the year because of no teacher. But the teacher would go there for two months and operate a school during the summer. It meant that children did have the benefit of two months school whereas otherwise they would have had none at all.

Now the Department of the Attorney General pointed out to us that actually there was no legislative provision for that practice and they thought we

should amend the Education Act accordingly.

The final amendment, Mr. Speaker, is again to give legislative sanction to something which we have been doing, that is to transport children from their homes to schools in those areas where we have set up regional or central schools services. Again we have been doing that. There was nothing to say we could not. Again the Department of the Attorney General has advised us that they feel that there should be some legislative provision to cover that practice. So that the last section of this amendment gives us the legislative authority to provide for the transportation services in regions where the school services are being centralized.

These are all the amendments, Mr. Speaker, and I move the second reading.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Speaker, might I ask what protection the Government might have in cases of public liability in case of an accident to these children in this particular amendment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know that the Minister has at any time or that the previous Minister of Education at any time had made any public statement on the question of bus transportation of school children. I think perhaps it might be appropriate if I said a word now to let the policy of the Government be known, and known clearly to the public. I heard someone speak, I think it was the honourable member for Burin, and someone else, I think I heard the honourable member for Port au Port and some other member a third member speak of this question of transporting school children by bus. Each of them seemed to think that where it was being done in his

district it was rather unique, it was the only part of Newfoundland where it was in fact being done. Now that is not the case. Actually there are a number of, or it should not surprise me to know, there were twenty or twenty-five places in Newfoundland—I know there are getting to be quite a few—Now the history of it is this: The Government lent the services of Mr. Gordon Pushie to the Royal Commission which for the last three years has been preparing Newfoundland's case for the Revision of Term 29, under the leadership of my honourable friend, the Minister from Harbour Main—Mr. Pushie was lent to that Royal Commission to make a tour of the three maritime provinces, where in each of them he secured an enormous amount of information for our own Provincial Royal Commission. He brought back to me personally from the three Provincial Premiers of the Maritime Provinces a word of warning which was this: For goodness sake! tell the Premier (meaning tell me, Smallwood) don't let Newfoundland get into this business of school buses. That was from each of the three Maritime Provinces. The three Premiers are gone now, two of them are dead and the third is no longer in office—So I can say this, I think safely—The position in the three provinces, they said, was becoming utterly desperate—From the time when they had begun school buses up to the time they sent this warning to me, the incidence of the growth of the school bus system has been staggering, and was costing the Government in each case a tremendous sum of money. So they sent a very friendly warning that Newfoundland if it were wise would not get into this school bus business, in fact would avoid it like the plague. That rather brought us up with a round turn, because it came just at the point where

we were considering an application for a school bus system, I am not sure, but I think it was in Petty Harbour. At any rate Petty Harbour was one of the places we did consider and where in fact we did enable a bus system to be introduced for school children. I dare say it was in connection with the application from Petty Harbour that we gave careful consideration to that application in the light of the warning we had received from the three Maritime Provinces. So we thought and thought and we debated and discussed it over a period off and on. We did not drop everything else to devote ourselves to that one topic, but off and on over a period of time, seven weeks, we discussed the matter until finally we came up with what we thought and think is a very good formula: This is our formula: My honourable colleague tells me that, as you heard, Mr. Speaker, as many as two dozen different settlements have so far been able to fit into the formula and are receiving a cash subsidy each month, each month of the school year.

The formula is this: We pay a subsidy on the school bus—The department of Education pays a subsidy on the cost of running the school bus. We do not run the school bus, the school does that. We do not hire the bus, we do not make the business arrangements with the owners of the bus, the school does that. All the Government does is make a cash payment to the school authority, the local authority. We make that to the local school authority where it results in a net saving on the Treasury—That is our formula—

In other words, if there is a school down in Petty Harbour and if there is a school out at the Goulds, out at the Cross Roads, just this side of Doyle's

Bridge, run by the same denomination, and they have in the school down in Petty Harbour classes I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X and XI and they have the same out at the Goulds let us say four or five miles distant. If they find it difficult to get teachers and if they put in a bus system and close all the classrooms in one of these two schools, all the classrooms below a certain grade—You see they would thereby be saving the annual salary of one or two or three school teachers by closing that many school rooms. Then in the second of the two schools or the second or third or fourth of three or four or five schools as the case may be, they can accommodate the children of these class rooms that are closed in the first school without adding to their expenses or by adding only by a small extent to their existing expenses, then the cost of providing the bus to bring the children from the first settlement to the second, do you see, is less than the cost of keeping the classrooms open. Now where that formula can be met, where there is actually a saving in operation to the Treasury, we do give the cash subsidy. We want that fact to be known. We want it to be widely known throughout Newfoundland that we gladly pay—I do not think we pay all of it—We pay ninety per cent of the cost of a bus system to bring children back and forth to school. We do that where the result of it is that there is actually a saving on the Treasury.

Now if we had not found that formula by now the annual Bill for school buses would be probably a quarter of a million and in another four or five years a million dollars, because they say there is just nothing that grows so fast as the amount necessary to maintain a school bus system. if you allow it to do so and if you do not have the kind of formula that

keeps it within manageable proportions.

Now the answer to my honourable friend from St. John's North, I think, will be given, is the Government in fact do not retain nor hire nor own nor operate the bus in question. The school authority does so. Then certainly the Government as such, I take it, are not liable for any damage—although I feel that the Attorney General would be much more at home answering that question that I could ever hope to be.

Now in the case of regional high schools and in the case of central high schools, again we subsidize the bus system. The Central High school is a new one. That is a decision we made just a few weeks ago. I think within the last two or three months the Cabinet decided we would include central high schools in the scheme we had already decided on about a year or two ago and on the Regional High schools three years ago when we decided to put a subsidy for a bus system. For example the first regional high school at Foxtrap in the district of my honourable friend, the member for Harbour Main, where a large new regional high school was built, I suppose they take in Grade IX, X and XI, which means it enables the owners of the schools to close out Grades IX, X and XI in I do not know how many of the schools scattered up and down the South Shore of Conception Bay and by having a bus system operating back and forth all these students that would otherwise be in these small schools would now come to this very modern and up-to-date regional high school that was built in there. A few weeks ago, as I said, we brought in another plan which is to subsidize to the extent of seventy-five per cent of the cost of a bus system for central high schools.

Now a central high school is somewhat different from a regional high school. Frankly I don't—I am not the Minister of Education and these differences are not at the tips of my fingers nor the tip of my tongue either, so that I am not sure of the difference between a regional high school and a central high school, but I believe a regional high school takes from Grade Nine to Eleven whereas a central high school takes lower grades. There are not as yet as many central high schools as there are regional, but I should think there will in the next three or four or five years be a very considerable increase in the central high school taking lower grades. There high schools, as they grow, so will the number of buses grow, and so will the number of students being conveyed back and forth by bus increase. But again our formula is such, we think, that in the end there will be actually a great saving on the Treasury.

Now it appears we have been doing this without any legislative authority. We hope the House will not reprimand us for doing that this last two or three years and we hope the House will vote this amendment to give us the legislative sanction for a good thing—It is a good thing to be doing it legally where perhaps we have not been doing it in strict conformity with the law.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to say very much. There are a couple of things—One is that I do not have and have not yet seen the reason why a school teacher is not allowed on any governing body of a board of education. I take it the Honourable Minister will advise us that regulation is being enforced. There must be some reason because usually in a good many of our small outports the teacher is the well-in-

formed person of the community and the one who has had practical experience in education and might be an addition to any of these boards. For some reason the Government decides that is not to be any more. This is not strictly the principle of the Bill—In connection with the transportation of school children, as the Honourable the Premier was speaking I was carried back in my mind to the days when I myself went to school, and some of the other people on the other side went to school. We did not have any snow clearing programme in these days, Sir. I remember all of us where I lived had to walk a mile and a half winter and summer and through the snow up to our necks, and beating our own path, with a bundle of kindling under our arms. The first boy there had to open the door and light the fire. Rain or shine or whatever it might be, everybody went, cold or hungry, but cold or wet I can tell you when we gathered around the fire we got warm enough to start school. Now that is a far cry from what is proposed in this Act, and I am glad to see it in there. It shows that we are on the march not only as a Province of Canada but as a people of the world. It is, I think, a grand thing that our children can be taken to school in buses particularly for long distances.

I am very much in favour of the amendment, and I want to say a word of praise for the strides which education has been making. It has cost the people a lot of money, I know. We cannot get anything in this day and age without money. In the old days you got it yourself and did not get anybody to pay it for you. But this administration, I will say for them and not only this but the administrations of every Province of Canada has paid huge amounts for education. I believe

it is a step in the right direction, and I hope the steps continue.

I want to congratulate the Honourable Minister of Education and the previous Ministers of Education for the things which have been done along the line of education. But it does not solve the problem, as you all know, I want you just to think of our examination results. If you think of them you will see that we do not get as good results from examinations today as they did twenty years ago. What the cause of that is I can't say—because they get buses to school or because they have first-class teachers or what—But there is a reason for it. If we have not so many passing the various examinations, what is the trouble? I do not know. That is a problem which the educational authorities, of course, will have to solve.

There are various other problems too with regard to education. If I may say this, Sir, it is not strictly to the principle of the Bill—I wonder sometimes if we are not in a great measure, not only in this country but in a good many other countries, educating our children perhaps away from the natural resources which we have. Are we putting too many white collars on ourselves? I wonder? Are we making it not the right thing for our children as they grow up to get in the fishing boats and go fishing? Is that one of the causes by which the fishing industry is not prospering as it once did.

There are various aspects of education which have to be considered besides those of transportation from schools. Although I know this is not the place to voice these thoughts, I thought I would just say this. But I certainly agree with the principle of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

Committee of the Whole on various Bills.

On motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Clarke, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on rising was discussing a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Highways." The clause under consideration was Clause 11.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, since we last discussed this matter, Clause 11., the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may establish such boards, committees and councils as he deems necessary to assist and advise the Minister in carrying out this Act or the Regulations. There was little fear expressed on the other side that that gave extraordinary powers and so on. It was asked if there was any suggestion of setting up paid boards and the like. The answer was given that, no, that was just there just in case at any time we wanted the board. Actually this is the counterpart of similar and identical clauses in every other departmental Act. Every Act we have creating a department of the Crown has that clause. So if we are not going to take it out of all the Acts we might as well leave it in this Bill.

On motion Clause 11 carried.

Clause 12:

MR. HIGGINS: Now, Mr. Chairman —

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is taken from the old Act.

MR. HIGGINS: With no change in it at all?

MR. SMALLWOOD: This has been the law for fifty years anyway.

MR. HIGGINS: If it is fifty years old it is good enough for me.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask if that system has been carried out strictly by the Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Virtually all roads we have built that we have not built ourselves have been built under contract by tender—Virtually all but not all.

MR. HOLLETT: The reason I asked that is—"The Minister shall." In other words it is mandatory.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Except in a case where, as it goes on to say, where it may be more expeditiously and economically completed.

MR. HOLLETT: I see—There is a breakdown there.

On motion clauses 12 through 14 carried.

Clause 15:

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is in the old Act. It is extraordinary. It seems to make the Minister, judge, jury, court and everything else,

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I was about to say something about this. If it is in the old Act there is no reason why it should remain in this. It is rather extraordinary. (2) "Any person appointed for that purpose by the Minister may summon before him and examine on oath any person he deems necessary respecting any matter relating to the business of the Department under which their appearance is required and may require those persons to bring with them such papers, plans, books and documents and things as he deems necessary to examine with refer-

ence to that matter and he may administer the oath to those persons and they shall be paid such amounts for their time and disbursements as the Minister decides."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Court, police for the whole thing.

MR. HIGGINS: They used to do that under the old Customs' Act.

MR. HOLLETT: That was in Commission of Government days.

MR. HIGGINS: And before.

On motion clause 15 through 20 carried.

Clause 21:

MR. HIGGINS: Has that always been in the Act?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is as old as the hills, public right-of-way, you know, is a pretty powerful right.

MR. HOLLETT: In connection with that snow clearing, I recall there was a public statement made by the Premier, I believe sometime this winter, whereby no more money would be spent this season on snow clearing. I thought by the estimates some five hundred thousand dollars was granted. I notice in answer to a question tabled here only three hundred and forty-three thousand dollars was spent. I may be wrong on the exact figure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Quite wrong. The amount appropriated by this House was, I think, four hundred thousand. We spent over five hundred thousand.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not clear on the figures.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Public Works): I believe the vote was three hundred thousand. But up to

about ten days ago the actual expenditure was three hundred and ninety-eight thousand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the present year—But then last year, at the very beginning of the year, we spent a very large part of it, the tail-end of last winter, which was in the first of the year that ended a week ago.

MR. POWER: In the month of April 1956, eighty thousand dollars was spent.

MR. HOLLETT: I am wrong. It is only two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. I stand corrected.

On motion Clause 21 carried.

Clause 22:

MR. HIGGINS: On that point, what constitutes a secondary or subsequent conviction—Is there any limited time?

MR. CURTIS: It is not stated there.

MR. HIGGINS: I think you will find it in 57 (2)—I am sorry, it provides that a second offence shall be within twelve months. We can leave that until we come to it.

MR. SHEPPARD: "Any person who obstructs or interferes with an engineer, agent, workman or servant of the Minister engaged in exercising on behalf of the Minister any powers conferred by this Act, etc." I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if wilfully should be inserted there?

MR. CURTIS: This is the exact wording of the previous Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Actually it is alright in practice. The Minister never does bother unless it is a wilful obstruction.

MR. SHEPPARD: That is something which quite often comes up in the profession I just left—the word "Wilfully." Personally speaking, I always like to see the word put in, because it saves a lot of headaches on the part of whoever is sitting on the bench trying to interpret what the words mean.

MR. CURTIS: It makes it harder for the prosecution to put the word "Wilfully" in.

MR. SHEPPARD: In cases like this, if a person removes a snow fence for a right of access, and puts it back again, or in taking it down might damage it. It is not wilful damage—and if the word wilful is not put in he could be probably open to prosecution. Why not put in—unless prior permission is given to the Minister—

MR. HIGGINS: Why not let it stand.

On motion Clause 22 (2) stand.

On motion Clauses 23 and 24 carried.

Clause 25:

MR. HOLLETT: How about the roads built by the various woods operating companies?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are private roads, and they frequently forbid entry on them.

MR. HOLLETT: The Public is not at the present time prevented from going over these roads.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think except in so far as the company has abandoned and do not use.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not very important at any rate.

On motion Clause 25, and Clause 26 carried.

On motion of Mr. Smallwood, the Committee rose to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Highways," and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

On motion all further orders of the day do stand deferred, carried.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 9th, at 3:00 of the clock.

—

TUESDAY, April 9th, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

HON. DR. J. McGRATH (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here. I do not know what to do with it. I do not think it is presented by any body in particular. It is in connection with the Dental Act. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you could direct me what is to be done with it.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it introduced as a Government measure or what?

MR. McGRATH: I do not know. I found it on my desk.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, I am the original one—I found it on my desk and I think perhaps it might be all right, therefore, if I presented it.

To the Honourable Members of the House of Assembly:

The Petition of the undersigned carrying on the business of Dental Mechanics in the Province of Newfoundland,

HUMBLY SHEWETH, that

1. The undersigned persons and others carrying on the trade and business of Dental Mechanics in the Province of Newfoundland.
2. A Bill entitled, "An Act Further to Amend the Dental Act" presently before the Honourable the House of Assembly contains and relates to matters which directly affect the trade and business of your Petitioners.
3. Your Petitioners therefore pray that they be given an opportunity of presenting their views to a Committee of Members of the Honourable the House of Assembly to the end that the effect of the said Bill upon their trade or business shall be known.

And Your Petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray, etc.

Dated at St. John's this 8th day of April, A.D., 1957.

Ralph Moore, Gerald Walsh, W. J. Browne, Clarence Horton, John J. Hennessey, John T. Browne, Pat Kennedy, Peter R. Browne, Harold J. Cantwell.

The dental mechanics will undoubtedly have their affairs, professional and trade affected by the Bill before

the House if that Bill becomes law, and the prayer of the petitioners is therefore quite reasonable when they ask that they be heard or be given an opportunity to be heard by a select committee of this House.

So Mr. Speaker, I move that the petition be referred to the House, as a Whole, I suppose.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, that petition seems to be perfectly in order. It is signed by the petitioners themselves.

On motion petition received.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the House care to appoint a select committee now or let it stand for a day?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the Bill has received its second reading and its next step will be committee of the whole. If it is the wish of the House to have a select committee that committee might very well be set up and begin to function before the House goes into Committee of the Whole on the Bill, so that when we get into Committee of the Whole we would have the benefit of the views or recommendations of the select committee.

I move that a select committee be appointed and that the names of it be left to Your Honour, to consider this Bill and to receive representations.

MR. SPEAKER: If it is the wish of the House I can appoint the committee now although I have no notice of that—Agreed?

Honourable the Minister of Health, Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, Honourable the Member for Burin, Honourable member for Port de Grave, Honourable Member—

MR. McGRATH: Mr. Speaker, if it is in order I should like to say that the Honourable Member for St. John's

South expressed a great interest in the Bill and desired to be informed about it.

MR. SPEAKER: I was going to name another member of the Committee—It will be the honourable and learned member for St. John's South.

Mr. Clerk might acquaint those who signed the petition that the petition has been heard and this committee has been appointed.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices of Motion

None.

Notice of Questions

None.

Answers to Questions

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, there are three questions on the Order Paper of today addressed to the Department of Finance in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Nos. 74, 76 and 78. I have just made the necessary enquiry through the Department and find that these answers are in course of preparation.

QUESTION No. 75: Mr. Hollett.
(See Appendix).

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, also on today's order paper, there is QUESTION No. 80 addressed to me—The answer is in course of preparation. QUESTION No. 81, I beg leave to table the answer. (See appendix for question and answer).

QUESTION No. 77:

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Minister of Fisheries is not in his place this afternoon—Perhaps that answer might stand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Fisheries will be in the Chamber later in the day. He had to be absent for, I think, something like an hour. He should be here by 4:00 o'clock.

Orders of the Day

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply.

MR. O'DRISCOLL: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in the debate I would first like to offer my congratulations on your appointment to the high office of Speaker of this House. I wish you every success for many years to come.

Along with the other members who have spoken, I would also like to offer my congratulations to the honourable and gallant member for Harbour Grace on his masterly speech in moving the Address in Reply.

Mr. Speaker, this address of mine is going to be rather short, but is going to be very much to the point. I would appreciate it if the press would pay particular attention to what I have to say, so that I won't be misquoted.

The honourable member for St. John's South seemed to be worried about my district of Bell Island and especially about the ferry and about the hospital services. I can assure him that for the first time in eight years the people of Bell Island now know where they stand. They know that the Government they helped to elect will stand by and help them.

Yes, Bell Island will have a hospital and they will also have a decent ferry service. That is not all they are going to have. They will also have paved roads, water and sewerage and a landing strip.

Bell Islanders, who are they? As far as St. John's and the rest of Newfoundland or most of Newfoundland know they are the best hockey players in Newfoundland. Well, Sir, I would like to tell this House and the rest of Newfoundland that Bell Islanders are also the best iron ore miners in the world, and they and their families certainly deserve better treatment than they have received during the last sixty years.

I can say without fear of contradiction that Bell Island is the most neglected district or community in the whole of Newfoundland. I would even go further and say that Bell Island is the most neglected district in the whole Dominion of Canada.

For sixty years the miners of Bell Island have contributed very largely to the economy of this country. They are supporting twelve thousand people on Bell Island and about ten thousand more on the mainland of Conception Bay. They take approximately three million tons of iron ore out of the bowels of the earth every year, twelve thousand tons of ore a day. Just think of it, Mr. Speaker, twelve thousand tons of ore a day—That is six tons of ore per minute per day. Now that is a lot of iron ore and at today's price of steel it must be bringing a lot of wealth to someone, certainly not to Newfoundland. One would think that with all the mineral wealth on Bell Island it would be a model town with all modern facilities, something like Grand Falls or Corner Brook—They do not even have a sidewalk.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that they do not even have water and sewerage on Bell Island? Can you imagine or think of a town in the whole of the Dominion of Canada, that contributed so much wealth to a community, without water and sewerage? Mr. Speaker, not only do they not have water and sewerage but they do not even have a hospital. Can you imagine a mining town with twelve thousand people, two thousand miners, without a hospital. It is absolutely fantastic, it is unheard of. Nevertheless, it is true—they do not have a hospital. God only knows what would happen if they ever have an epidemic or a major mining disaster over there. I expect everyone who reads the papers and read that column, the Bell Island Miners Column, all know about bluebottle flies—Bluebottle flies and no water and sewerage can cause an epidemic in any community.

So far, Mr. Speaker, I have only touched upon one of Bell Island's major problems. There are others that need to be looked into immediately—there are the roads and the ferry service—Something will be done about the roads soon as the weather permits. I am hoping that the Department of Highways will pave most of the main roads on Bell Island this year. Bell Island has only sixteen miles of Government roads, and they have eleven hundred trucks. Just think of it—eleven hundred cars and trucks and sixteen miles of roads. Yesterday the honourable member for Burgeo and LaPoile told us of fifteen miles of road with two cars—That is quite a comparison. The people of Bell Island are certainly entitled to a decent road to drive and to walk over. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that a mother cannot put a baby out in a carriage outdoors let alone walk the baby on the roads, on account of the contin-

uous clouds of red iron ore dust that constantly hovers over the island—There is more danger of getting sclerosis—is that the word? on the surface, far more than underneath the earth.

Bell Islanders are a good long suffering people and their lot has greatly improved—good roads and a good ferry are absolutely a must for Bell Island. You probably know, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian National Railway and Canadian National Steamships do not operate to Bell Island, because it is not a port of call and never was, therefore they do not offer any services there. Every district in Newfoundland, every district except Bell Island, gets services from the Federal Government. They either get boats or rail or by air, every district except Bell Island. Something should be done about this as well. I do not see why Bell Island should be discriminated against. Everything on Bell Island cost twenty per cent more than it does everywhere else in Newfoundland, building and housing cost forty per cent more on Bell Island than on the Mainland of Newfoundland. These are figures quoted by Saunders and Howell and other contractors who happen to do business over there.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on all day about Bell Island's problems. However, I think I have said enough now to give you and other members of this House an idea just how badly off my district is—However I may be very optimistic about Bell Island and the future of Bell Island. I predict a new lease of life for Bell Island. Within the next five years a hospital, water sewerage, new housing, paved roads, a landing strip and a good ferry service. I know it is going to take a few years to accomplish all this, but it must and it will be done. The plan for a hospital has already been sub-

mitted, a road programme is now under review, the town council have plans for water and sewerage well under control and the ferry service has been discussed here already and is now being investigated.

Now that Bell Island has a liberal member representing them in this House, I am sure the people over there appreciate what the Government has done and are now doing for them.

Ice conditions have been unusually heavy this winter, and has paralyzed the ferry system. About two months ago a food shortage occurred on the island, due to the ice conditions—I informed the Premier how serious the matter was—Immediately he took steps to relieve the situation and chartered a motor vessel, the "Trepassey" for a month to bring freight back and forth from St. John's to Bell Island. This relieved the situation and brought the needed supplies. The ice blockade also created a very serious hazard for transporting seriously sick and injured people to St. John's hospital for treatment. The Premier was again most co-operative and he gave instructions to his Minister of Health to hire a helicopter and use it when it became necessary. Over fifty emergency cases have been transferred so far, and in one instance a few days ago an emergency occurred at night. The Deputy Minister of Health, Dr. L. Miller was called at 2:00 o'clock in the morning and asked what he could do to get a very seriously sick patient to hospital—It was a matter of life and death—Dr. Miller without hesitation informed the doctor on Bell Island that he would do something. Little did Dr. Miller know that at the time when he said that it was not going to be easy as he thought. He got the United Helicopter Personnel out of bed and told them they had to proceed to

Bell Island immediately to pick up a very sick person. He did not know that helicopters are not made or designed to fly at night. Now while all this was going on there was an accident happened in the mines, when a miner got hit with a falling rock and became an urgent case as well—They both happened at the same time. The helicopter there that is generally used for transporting sick and emergency cases to St. John's only can take one sick person at a time. Therefore Dr. Miller, who is a very keen and active man and thinks of everything, got in touch with a Mr. Harold Bradley of the Federal Fisheries and asked him if they could use their helicopter. The helicopter had to be loaded for daylight to go to some other place, but he gave permission, to have the helicopter unloaded and at daylight the helicopter was over and took the two emergency cases to St. John's. The miner was still alive but unfortunately the woman died. I am just stressing these two cases to show you the urgency of Bell Island having a hospital. If they had a hospital, I don't know, maybe that woman would still be alive today.

The Honourable the Minister of Health and certainly the Deputy Minister are to be congratulated on their untiring effort on behalf of the people of Bell Island. They have saved countless numbers of lives this winter by using this helicopter service.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned these cases, as I said, just to point out why Bell Island needs a hospital.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to stress that Bell Island has needs for a lot of services. I have mentioned some of them. I feel quite sure that such a deserving people, who are adding so much to the economy of this

country, will receive every consideration from the Premier and his Government.

(Applause).

MR. STRANGE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with all my colleagues in expressing a very brief address in connection with the welfare of our people at the present time, past and present. First of all I would like to associate myself with other speakers in offering my sincere congratulations to you, Sir, on being elected as Speaker of this House of Assembly. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, I am one of the new members referred to, one of the seventeen. As a member for this Liberal Government, I suppose I should give some explanation as to the questions asked as to why we had come to be associated with the present Government.

I for one was asked if I would be a member and to go out and canvas the District as a member for the Liberal Party. I was asked by a request from the people of Port de Grave District, asking if I would consider coming out as a member. On that request the Honourable the Premier asked me if I would consider it. That was twelve months previous to the last polling day. I told His Honour, the Premier, that I would consider the matter.

Now only a matter of three or four weeks before polling day I gave my answer, after giving it every consideration. What called for me to come to the conclusion was from the personal knowledge and experience I have and had the chance to get the people's conditions and the conditions of the country, and I considered that as I had given thirty-five years of service, public service, mostly to the people of St. John's, people whom I absolutely respect and have a great regard for

—Thirty-five years of public service, good or bad, but I have given an all-out effort in that time dealing with the people of this country, and I have no regrets, and I am confident that this minute I have quite a lot of respect from the class of people to whom I refer. Giving that my consideration I thought that the other few years that I might have to give to the public, seeing that I gave thirty-five years mostly to St. John's what better could I do than try and give the support to the people from the district from which I came. I made my decision on this point, and I went out as a candidate. My opposition friend was in the district when I arrived. We treated each other with every respect. I do not think there is anyone who can say I mentioned his name during the campaign. I never mentioned the Opposition during the campaign. I had one public meeting in a hall. When I went on the platform I told the people that requested the meeting—Probably you may think you have me here to criticise. You are getting no criticism from me whatever. I am going to refer to nobody as far as the Opposition is concerned, not the members of the Opposition. I am going to leave it to your own decision and common sense, and if you consider that your conscience tells you that you would be better off than you have been in the past let your conscience guide you and vote for him. I must say I believe the Opposition member, I almost said he got what Tory votes was in Port de Grave District and that was five hundred and something—As you know that polling day was a day that was not fit for any human being to get out-of-doors let alone to go any distance to vote. I believe that the people voting for the Opposition made a special effort to go out in the weather—

HON. M. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): It was only fit for a Tory to go out.

MR. STRANGE: Mr. Speaker, I know quite a lot of this country—During my thirty-five years as a police officer my duties called me to a number of places in this Province. I can remember well during the depression days I was the one, whenever there was any trouble spots, to be sent there although I was at the time a very junior member in rank. I was the one selected to take a number of men and go to different places where the trouble spots were. I saw poverty—When I say poverty I mean poverty, I saw poverty at its worst. I have never forgotten it, and I hope I will never see the same again. I was in houses during the depression days of people I knew well and shed tears because they could give me a cup of tea but could not give me anything else during these days. I have had the privilege to visit some of these places since, particularly within the past eight years—and eight years seem to be particularly mentioned here—and particularly during my campaign around that district—I must say conscientiously that the worst I saw during my campaign was as good as the best, clear of merchants or business people, the best that I saw previously when I went in that district, as far as living conditions were concerned.

I remember in St. John's here during those days, during the depressions days, and a good many in this House remember as well as I do, when the unemployed were holding meetings daily, and the police all had to guard against any trouble practically every day and night. I know and know perfectly well, and some of the members of this House remember when the unemployed paraded from Water

Street with a red flag—when they paraded through Water Street with a red flag demanding assistance, and then the equivalent of six cents a day. I with Ex-Head Constable Russell were selected to go and open up unemployment offices down in the back of it—and it was not a very pleasant task, I assure you. We were there for some considerable time. I think our services were appreciated because we never had any more of these trouble spots or never had any more riots afterwards. When we finished in the evening and had all our employment cards given out, through the sympathy we had for that class of people and through the condition and trouble they were in, Ex-Head Constable Russell and myself distressed our own personal selves and gave extras to those people to help them out.

Now today why would I not join the Liberal Party or be a member of the Liberal Party that has made such changes in the welfare and living conditions of the people of this Island? Why would I not join it? I am after going through all the experiences of the conditions under which we lived previously, and I can see the changes today from what it was in those days I referred to—and why would I not be a member and supporter?

MR. HOLLETT: Why not—There was no Liberal in power then.

MR. STRANGE: Sir Richard Squires was there when they carried the red flag down through Water Street, and when I took over relief matters—That is who was in at that particular time—I will go so far as to say—and the people backing the present Honourable Premier and his Liberal Government today know what was being done by any Premier previous to him, and the same effort was never made before

to my knowledge and I have had much experience and for as long as anyone in this House—and in my opinion there was never the same effort made before to my knowledge and I have had much experience and for as long as anyone in this House—and in my opinion there was never the same effort made in the interest of the people of this Province as there has been since the Honourable the Premier took over his Government. I do not think there is anyone who can say differently than that.

I have heard since I came here as a new member talking about the millions spent and the millions wasted. I would go so far as to say our people whom I represent do not take the trouble to take a pen and pencil and figure out the millions wasted they are too much interested in the benefits they derived.

MR. HOLLETT: Hear! Hear! That is an awful indictment.

MR. STRANGE: I am pretty sure when making that statement and sincerely—none of us want to be wasteful—I for one never had the chance to be wasteful, and I have not any use for anyone that is wasteful—It is just as well to be frank about it—But I must say the people of this Island have to appreciate the welfare of this Province at the present time and know what brought it about. The question has often been asked me, why the outport people vote for the Smallwood Government. The only answer I have for it is that they appreciate the change in their living conditions from what they were used to. I could be a bit personal and probably be different and say something different—what other people would expect me to say—I am not personal enough for that—I am too broad-

minded. I have personal things I could speak about, but I am not that make-up—I am too broad-minded for that—My interest is in the general public as a whole and in their living conditions.

I am very glad to see in the Speech from the Throne where the Honourable the Premier and this Government have been thinking about starting out on an extensive road programme. I have heard a lot being said about roads being required in different parts of this Province, in other districts, I can speak for my own district, and without any request from the people in this district I have a personal knowledge of road conditions in the district I represent. In my opinion there has been a lot of money wasted in the district that I represent. Years ago probably for the want of money—and it requires a lot of money now to make improvements—That is necessary—There is always a certain amount of money spent in Port de Grave District on roads, but not in the way that I would like to see it. I do not think there is any improvements in taking a shovel and firing red clay over roads. I would rather see one mile of good road done each year, because every spring you get the same conditions—and I would suggest, as far as Port de Grave District is concerned, it is a scattered district—Port de Grave proper where I was born is one of the oldest settlements in this Island, and it is a fishing settlement. Lots of other places in the district are fishing settlements, and the people derive their livelihood from the water, from the fishery. Port de Grave was always a fishing settlement, and even during the depression days they kept up the fishery and kept going fishing, fishing all the year around practically. I was one of the fishermen too—I am the

son of a fisherman, I am not ashamed to say it either. My father was a fisherman all his lifetime. He was forty-two years at the scalfishery. I was eight years myself in the scalfishery, and I was eighteen years to the codfishery. I was not always a police officer. I fished from the land. I fished in a schooner as skipper of a schooner for three years, and had a good record as far as catching fish was concerned, as my father before me—But I could not get a living out of it, I could not get a decent living out of it—and there are thousands more like me—that caused me to leave the fishery and go look for other employment. Possibly that is why I am here today. I have a good knowledge of fishing. I think I had as much experience in that eighteen years as anybody who is at it twice eighteen—I can knit twine, make the traps. I can set it in the water and I can do anything that has to be done with it. It is also the same with fish that come out of the water. I do not have to go and ask any questions nor look for any information from anybody in connection with the fishery. I have a personal knowledge of it. I have worked in the lumber woods in my neck in snow—So I am not a greenhorn. I was in all of that before I joined the constabulary—I know what the people of Port de Grave are going through as far as the fishery. I know the different life they have now fishing compared with what they had in those days.

I would suggest to anyone that would like to see Port de Grave, some Sunday it would be worthwhile to drive to Port de Grave. It is a little settlement, not a town, with a rough road. When you get down to Port de Grave and look out on the harbour and see what is moored there around

the harbour there for fishing, and I think you will come back surprised, and greatly surprised. They have boats up to a certain tonnage. They have those over there up to eleven tons, used as trap skiffs and also for fall fishing, trawling. The harbour is just crowded with boats, a real fishing settlement.

Now they do not ask for very much but seeing that they have gotten on so well fishing over there—The fishermen over there now have trucks and they bring their trucks to the wharves and when the fish is brought in it is put in the trucks in boxes and it goes right on to Harbour Grace to the fish plant. I might tell you that men over there make up to two thousand dollars fishing. This past year in Port de Grave one man had eighteen hundred quintals of fish, himself and two boys. I was in his home when I was on my campaign. They go back and forth each day. They go down in the morning and if they get fish enough to come out the bay with they will transfer it right across to Harbour Grace and discharge their fish and come back to Port de Grave for the night and away to go again in the morning. That is daily routine. I had the privilege of seeing Mr. Si Moore's books in his office over there, just previous to the election campaign. He said: you won't believe what I tell you, but the money I paid out to Port de Grave fishermen last year—I will show you in writing—He put the book down so that I could see it myself. There one fellow and two sons that Moore had paid up in the three thousand dollars for fresh fish alone, clear of what was salted. When they do not get a chance to go to Harbour Grace they come back to their own premises and salt it. Now that is a fishing place. As I said before, with the knowledge I have in

fishing I am interested in Port de Grave—It is just as well to be frank about it—

Take for instance Brigus—Brigus is an old historical place. Take Cupids. John Guy's monument is in Cupids. They are all old historic places, and if every day tourists come to this country, which I hope they will, I think one of the first places the tourists will want to go is around Conception Bay. What I am interested in and what I am going to be interested in while in this Government, is that if there is money enough becomes available I am going to try and see if we can't have a paved road down in Cupids and down through Cupids, a half decent road. The late Captain Bob Bartlett lived in Brigus. His name is world-wide, everybody knows it. I know people I took around the Bay. They wanted to see the birthplace of Captain Bob Bartlett. Brigus is an old historic town, and I think we should encourage these places and get up to date as much as possible, if money could be available to get it done. I am very much interested in the district and for the length of time I have in the Government I am going to try with every means in my power to help the people. I promised nothing but I told them I promise you one thing—to get everything in my power for you people over here. I will do my utmost to get it—I intend to carry that out while I am in the Government. I hope that prosperity will come in such a way that this Government and the members associated with this Government will get credit for trying to do something for those people over there that are trying very hard indeed to help themselves and deserve every consideration.

MR. HOLLETT: Of course they had a Liberal over there this last eight years.

MR. STRANGE: I know that quite well—what we have had—that is all right—I am not saying one word about it—I told you I am not casting any reflections on anybody.

MR. SELLERS: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the Debate.

On motion the debate on the Address in Reply adjourned.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Corner Brook Act, 1955."

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I regret to say the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply is home ill, and it is for that reason that I move the second reading of this Bill today. Actually I would personally prefer to have the Bill stand over until his return, but I understand the people of Corner Brook would like to have this Bill put through during the present week so that a loan that they are negotiating can be consummated.

Members of the House will recall, at least those of us who were here last year, that quite a large and lengthy Bill dealing with the incorporation of the City of Corner Brook was submitted to this Honourable House, I think, if I remember rightly, the Bill had about one hundred pages. It was a very lengthy document. We at that time on this side of the House were not satisfied that it had been thoroughly enough prepared to recommend its enactment. Consequently we withdrew the Bill and the City of Corner Brook, it will be remembered, was incorporated by the very short Act which incorporated some of the principles

of the Local Government Act and provided that the provisions of that Act should apply to Corner Brook, except in so far as provisions were made in that Act to the contrary.

Now we since then have been corresponding with Corner Brook, and we have been trying at the Department to get a Bill in shape that would satisfy the City of Corner Brook and this House. But so far we have not been able to say that we have come up with a Bill that is quite satisfactory. For that reason we are not at this session introducing the Bill that we hoped to have had ready. Instead we are submitting to the House and I am now moving the second reading of a Bill which will amend the present short Corner Brook Act by giving some additional features which they find they need. These are features which are not covered by the Local Government Act, and not covered by the existing Act which we put through last year. But those amendments when read together with the original Bill and with the Local Government Act will enable the City of Corner Brook to function successfully for another year or so until the new Act can be prepared for introduction into this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Corner Brook became overnight a city council and, as well might be expected, they made their mistakes. They failed in many instances to follow in careful detail the provisions of the Bill creating them as a city. They did make mistakes, mistakes which were regretable but which were really not serious mistakes, nevertheless mistakes which brought them into the Courts and which gave them a temporary reverse. The objects of the present Bill is therefore not only to define just what are the rights of the City of Corner Brook's City Council

but to provide that any small mistakes they may have made during the short time of their being in office may be ratified. They are asking this legislation to ratify the omissions that they may have committed, omissions which do not affect the principle of the Bill but merely a technical oversight which occurred. I understand, for instance, one of the things is that they had a plebiscite and they appointed the magistrate over there to be the returning officer. He conducted the plebiscite. Well, when the time came it was found that through a technicality appointing him the returning officer had not been regularized, and although everyone knew he was appointed and it was the intention to appoint him there was a technical defect in his appointment, which technicality voided the plebiscite and so on. Now this new Act gives the City of Corner Brook certain powers similar in all cases to the powers exercised by the City Council of St. John's—I am sorry my honourable friend from St. John's East is not here—There is an assessment section, as the honourable member knows, and provision is made in this Act for assessment by an assessment Act in the case of property at Corner Brook this Assessment Act carried with it the saving clauses that are provided in the St. John's Municipal Act. In other words, all assessments are subject to appeal to the District Court in the first place, to the magistrates in the second place and to the District Court of Corner Brook. So there is no question but that there is an appeal from assessment to the courts.

The only thing that the Act does which is unusual is to ratify assessments which were made and at the time because of some technical oversight were

illegal. These are now made legal by this Act. But there is no hardship created on anyone because everyone knew what was being done—Some people were ready to take advantage of the technicality, and it is that technicality which we are asking the House now to ratify. Actually as the people knew, everybody knew what was intended, and there is provision still for an appeal. But the City of Corner Brook was faced with two alternatives. They either had to collect from everybody or repay those who had paid. As the majority had paid it was felt that it would be more profitable to collect from those who did not pay rather than have to be put in the position of having to remit to everybody who did pay—In other words—Here is a tax: There are some technical errors—Some people paid, some did not—Something had to be done they either had to pay back these who paid or collect from those who had not paid. So, in view of the fact that the city of Corer Brook had undertaken certain responsibilities, spent certain monies, negotiated certain loans and it was decided—they decided—to ask the Government and are now asking us to ratify what they had done.

The other sections of the Bill provide for the financing of a loan which Corner Brook has arranged. They have arranged a loan, Mr. Speaker, of five hundred thousand dollars—But under the provisions of their Act they were only allowed to borrow this money in Canada. First there is a section in this amendment which enables them to borrow this money in either Canadian or American Funds and it is necessary that they have this authority because, I understand, they have negotiated a loan without any Government guarantee, in the United

States for the amount that they require.

There are several other clauses in the Bill, most of which are the normal clauses which have been in the original Bill—The particular clause to which I would draw the attention of the honourable members is the clause relating to the plebiscite that had to be held in Corner Brook before a loan can be raised. They did not have a plebiscite, and it was this plebiscite that was held questionable because of the non-official appointment of the magistrate as returning officer. But the people of Corner Brook by plebiscite did vote for this loan. One of the purposes of this Bill is to validate the negotiations taking place for the loan and to provide notwithstanding any irregularity in the plebiscite, that the City of Corner Brook shall be authorized to arrange this loan.

There are several other clauses, Mr. Speaker, which I think we can deal with in committee, when my honourable friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply is here.

I would move the second reading of this Bill feeling that it is the wish of this House that we should facilitate the citizens of Corner Brook who have just undertaken a terrific and a big responsibility for them, the responsibility for running their own affairs, and perhaps making some of these mistakes which always take place when a city is having its growing pains.

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

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Bill I would like to thank the Honourable the Attorney General for his remarks on the other Bill—One thing he did not mention

was a court of revision. I wonder could he advise whether Corner Brook has a court of revision. I might say too I know something about civic affairs and know we must collect taxes. We can't get away without them—So as long as they are taxed fairly and equitably.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have not very much to say about this Bill. Naturally we are all agreed with the principle, and the system of getting in an incorporated town by a proper election. I have gone carefully through the Bill and compared it with the original Bill—Not being a councillor myself like the honourable member for St. John's North and my honourable friend from St. John's East, I would not be too familiar with some of the clauses. There are certain things there in the original Bill which would be double dutch almost to me, unless we have people who have been used to such terminology.

It does not matter very much what mistakes are made by the present administration or any authority set up by this special administration, it does not matter very much how many mistakes are made, the people are asked to look over it, forget and forgive and if that does not do it, of course, the Government comes along and brings in a Bill like this which indemnifies the city council of the city of Corner Brook for mistakes which they undoubtedly must have made. We find for instance in Clause 3:

"No error informality or irregularity on the part of the Mayor or Council, the appraisers, the court of revision, the City Clerk or other civic officer, shall affect or prejudice the validity of any general or individual assessment made, or any tax imposed under this Act."

In other words, all is forgiven and this Act is a sort of indemnification which wipes the slate clean again.

There is one thing I was thinking I would mention and that is—I wonder when they had a plebiscite was it put forward to the people that the city council would be raising a loan of two million dollars? I notice in this Act there is a clause which allows them to raise two hundred and fifty thousand dollars without consulting anybody on the matter, without going to the people. Then there is another clause in connection with raising two million dollars for the purpose of constructing a road programme. Heaven knows they need a road construction programme in Corner Brook. The roads there, I think are worse than they are possibly in any other place in Newfoundland—However they do it, I do hope they get these roads fixed up. I was wondering if when a plebiscite was held they had told the people that the council were seeking power to borrow up to two million dollars. If it were, then I see nothing wrong with it in this particular. There is nothing wrong with it any case, if this House wants to give the necessary authority to the City of Corner Brook to go out and raise a loan of two million dollars nobody can gain by it except the people themselves, and I take it the people have been fully informed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think they had a plebiscite on it didn't they?

MR. HOLLETT: I know, but were there particular stipulations with regard to the borrowing of two million dollars?

MR. FORSEY: A lot of people thought they should have a plebiscite for five millions. We are all Liberals,

out there, you see, and we believe in spending.

MR. HOLLETT: Very liberal with the Government's money, I discovered that. This does not happen to be Government money—

MR. SPEAKER: Order—probably the honourable member for Humber East would make his speech in a moment.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, he comes from that area in Corner Brook, and I take it has the people behind him, and I take it he will take some responsibility for the bringing of this Bill. I do not know whether my honourable friend from Corner Brook East has any knowledge of the school tax authority there and is prepared to give us something about that when he gets into his speech. He may not be able to do it under this particular Bill, but I do say I would like to hear from him, a citizen of Corner Brook, and, yes, he is a Liberal—They have no Tories out there—I do not know what you would call them. I take it he would have something useful to say on the principle of this Bill.

As far as I can see, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with the principle, unless Clause 3, as I have said, may be at fault—That is, did the city council go to the people on a plebiscite to borrow five hundred thousand dollars and then come back to this House to ask this House to enact legislation empowering them to raise two million dollars? Now that would be a little bit—not just right, I would say—if they did that—I do not know whether they did or not—I just raise the point—Probably the Attorney General when he replies could be able to explain.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I raise to sup-

port this Bill naturally— Again with regard to the question asked by my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, I may say that the City did go to the people and did have a plebiscite on the two million dollars. They have an opportunity, I understand, to raise or to sell some bonds on the American Market—As the Honourable the Attorney General knows, in their original Act they did not have the authority to raise money except on the Canadian Market—This would correct that position.

As the Attorney General mentioned there is another not a great deal in this Act here that is not in their original Act or in any city act, except to correct some minor errors that were made and to give them an opportunity to get down to work. They require it soon, and that is why there is a little urgency in the passing of this Bill, so they can get into the market immediately.

With regard to the roads, the situation over there we all know— As the Honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned, the road situation is abominable. It is a matter that the city has to look after mostly all of the roads, which are within the city limits and are city roads and not Public Works, and it is for this purpose that they are most anxious to get this Act put through so that they can raise their money and get on with work of fixing up their roads. I certainly hope we will be able to do it today or just as soon as possible, as it is very badly needed.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Bill. I would like to assure my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition that he need not have any fears about the City of Corner Brook. Our councillors are

men who devote their time freely, without any remuneration, to the welfare of the city, and this amendment of the City of Corner Brook Act is something which has been given a lot of consideration and a lot of time.

What he said about our roads is quite true, and I shall gladly, Sir, with your permission, inform him that I will speak in support of the School Tax Bill or any amendment to it which may come up, I would not want and would not represent a district whose people would not be intelligent enough to realize education is something which has to be paid for.

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 (Teacher's Training) Act."

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, this is a small and not very important amendment to the Education (Teacher's Training) Act." Actually it seeks to rectify or at least to give validity to a practice that has been going on in educational circles for many years. Under existing regulations governing the award of teaching certificates the certificate may be dated from the day when the teacher actually met all the requirements for a particular certificate. However, in the past the various examining boards of the various denominations, in cases where qualifications had been met through supplementary examinations have been following the practice of making their teacher certificates retroactive to July 1st., if the supplementary papers were written and passed during the first half of the school year and to make the certificates retroactive to the 1st. of February in the new Calendar Year

if supplementary papers were written during the second half of the school year. The school year, I do not need to point out, normally runs from July 1st to June 30th, hence the division into these two.

The effect of this amendment is to permit this long standing practice to continue.

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 of Mr. Smallwood the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on various Bills.

On motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Clarke Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Highways."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on rising had just conducted Clause 26.

On motion Clause 27 carried:

Clause 28:

MR. BROWNE: That sub-clause (2) is something new that has been added now?

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Chairman, before you carry that clause: What about abandoned vehicles? We see lots lying around country roads and in the outlying areas of this city. It is considered a structure? The wheels are taken off and it is left there.

MR. HIGGINS: That comes under the heading of other structures.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Everywhere we look we can see cars and most of them rusty—I hope it is covered well by that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know, Mr. Chairman, if that matter comes under this clause—But I was wondering if the honourable members were listening behind closed doors of our Cabinet during part of our cabinet meeting today. We had a cabinet meeting this morning and I don't mind saying that for a while we did discuss very seriously this question of the horrible practice of so many people of using the public roadsides as public dumps on which to dump tin cans, bottles, garbage and motor cars and trucks and buses, and just leave them there rusty and ugly looking to deface and mar the countryside until if you go along a public road with a stranger in the car with you, knowing where the dumps are, when you come to them you direct his attention to the opposite side of the road. You just drive around ashamed at the shabbiness and filthiness and disorder of so many of our public roads. We had quite a discussion on it, and I do not mind saying the Minister of Public Works, since lunch, went over, I think with his deputy, driving out as far as Holyrood, to put to the test, to count personally how many dumps there are along that section of the road and how many places there may be defaced—That is the very thing he is doing this afternoon. I do not know if he is back yet.

Now I do not know if the honourable member for St. John's North was listening behind the door or something to the Cabinet this morning, because that is the very thing we were talking about.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I assure you I was not. This thing has been in my mind for some time, not only on the highways but in the City of St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is dealt with a little further along.

On motion Clause 28 carried.

Clause 29: On motion carried.

Clause 30;

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this means what it says. The word beach now is a very broad thing, and applies to hundreds of miles of the coast line, and in many places people have been using the beach for generations and have a sort of claim on it because they have their stages there and people have boats and some of them have their flakes built over the beach, and in that way they have an obstruction already in existence there. I do not think it would be just to consider they should have to remove the stages and flakes and other things they might have there at this stage of the game. I do not think it could be meant to do that, does it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is certainly not in mind.

MR. BROWNE: When the public is already using it by right and someone comes along and obstructs it, that is what is supposed to be meant—For example: I think of a place where people are accustomed to coming to this little cove, everybody bringing in his boat and landing there, and someone went and took that. I think where a person who has a claim already by having a stage or has been using it exclusively for a number of years he has a claim.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly. The inclusion of that in the Act for the

last fifty years has not been unfortunate and is hardly likely to.

MR. CURTIS: It is in the other Act.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, I know that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Public opinion would never allow any Government to start interfering with fishermen's stages and flakes built over a beach or on any part of the foreshore.

MR. BROWNE: Actually I know of places, and I guess everyone does, where flakes have been allowed to be neglected and have fallen down, and now by right of many years or generations the owner of the stages and flakes acquired a right to that section of the beach and he could go and put flakes and stages there, while there are places like Topsail Beach—Well we have not seen any stages on Topsail Beach—The stages are not there any more—At one time all Topsail Beach was covered with stages and the people fished at the codfishery and lobster fishery from Topsail—That beach is claimed privately today although the people go out and swim there. During the war when a construction company wanted sand and they bought it from the owners of the beach there.—They have actual title to the beach—I don't suppose much will be done about it anyhow—

On motion Clause 30 carried.

Clause 31.

MR. BROWNE: What does the clause (b) mean there—"by a dam or obstruction prevents water flowing from a highway onto the adjoining land whether or not he is the owner or occupant of the land."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Just as it says, anyone on the highway who prevents the flow of water from the highway.

MR. CURTIS: And he could easily flood the road.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He may prevent the water from flowing off the road by barring off the flow from the road and preventing it from flowing away from the road which is the desirable thing to happen.

On motion Clause 21 carried.

Clause 32, carried.

Clause 33, carried.

Clause 34, carried.

Clause 35, through 41, carried.

Clause 42:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman. "A municipality may within its municipal area construct or put down a sidewalk or carry out other improvements along a highway but no such work shall be undertaken without the consent of the Minister, and a municipal authority constructing a sidewalk or other improvement along a highway shall conform to any requirements or conditions imposed by the Minister and is responsible for any injury or damage arising from the construction or presence of the sidewalks or improvements."

Surely it cannot be intended the Municipal Council to get the consent of the Minister to put down sidewalks. They have not been doing that. I think that is an oversight—Could we let it stand.

MR. CURTIS: It is just copied out of the old Act.

MR. HIGGINS: This is fifty years old, that part of it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not follow that—What is wrong with it?

MR. BROWNE: What is wrong that the Municipal Council of St. John's for example has authority within its area to put down sidewalks without consulting the Minister of Public Works.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no highway running through the city.

MR. BROWNE: They are all highways running through this city. There is nothing to distinguish a street in the city from a highway as far as I can see.

MR. HIGGINS: I must say, Mr. Chairman, there is some strength in my honourable colleague's argument. For instance a couple or quite a few weeks ago the Mayor of St. John's announced quite publicly over the radio and in the press the city's building project for the year, and it quite certainly never occurred to him he had to refer to the Minister to get permission from the Minister of Public Works.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course not—On the other hand there are highways in Corner Brook, which goes right through the city, and the Government is at the present time spending a large sum of money, two or three million dollars may be spent, three-quarters of a million in the year just passed and this year something like that again and next year something like that again, to build this great highway right through the City of Corner Brook. That is unquestionably a highway. Now there may be other roads in Corner Brook that are highways, but not highways in the sense of this one is. How would you define the difference I do not know

—Certainly with regard to this highway the Minister should have control.

MR. HIGGINS: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, in this section we should adopt the reasoning of the honourable member for White Bay North and say—a municipal authority other than the City of St. John's.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, I think that merely applies to highways known as provincial highways which are under the care and maintenance of the Department of Public Works or the Department of Highways.

MR. HIGGINS: Highways are defined in the Act "Highroads means a common or public highway or road and includes a street or bridge forming part of a highway, or on, over, under or across which a highway passes, or any other structure incidental to the highway or road."

Now then you go along LeMarchant Road to Cornwall Avenue where it joins Topsail Road where does the highway begin and where end? There is a fringe area of one mile outside.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that is what it means—I think it goes further than that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Here it is covered in (c) (c) defines a municipal area "Municipal Area means an area in which a municipal authority has jurisdiction." Then within a Municipal authority which is defined here in (f) a municipal authority has these rights. What is wrong with that?

MR. HIGGINS: But according to Section 42 it is not that authority, except with the consent of the Minister—no such work shall be undertaken without the consent of the Minister and the Authority, and so on, shall

conform to any requirements or conditions imposed by the Minister. I submit, that, Sir, is not acceptable to the City of St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, clearly something is missing there. The definition of highway is not sufficiently conclusive or it is too all inclusive. Every street in the city of St. John's is a highway, according to this particular definition. Well, the Minister of Public Works does not want to have the responsibility for the streets of St. John's or the street of any city or municipality, but he must have responsibility and power in connection with highways that run through the Province and in doing so run through cities or other municipalities.

MR. HIGGINS: It would appear, Mr. Chairman, this section will have to be redrafted in some way.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I think the original Act which the Attorney General took was probably taken from some Canadian Act or some other Provincial Act, for example where the city street is often part of the Provincial Highway, for instance in Toronto and similarly other cities.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, as far as I can see there is just one little slip there. The drafters forgot "main" on line (3)—the word "main highway"—If you look it over and see—main highway, secondary highways and secondary roads are defined in Section 23. I think if we just had the word "main" put in before "highways."

MR. HIGGINS: We may have to go further and may have to designate every street either as a main or secondary or whatever it is.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Chairman, we have no highways in the City

of St. John's. What we have is streets adjoining highways all through the city—we must co-operate with the Minister of Public Works in laying down or finishing a street with its drains and everything adjoining the main highway that is coming in—That is as far as it goes—a mile outside—The engineers are supposed to see these things are finished correctly, which they have done in the past.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the clauses following immediately after, Clause 43 and 44 the whole matter is again dealt with, and what is missing clearly is the definition of the word "highway." It is not meant to cover all roads, and apparently all roads are highways.

MR. CURTIS: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we might proceed with the Bill, and when the committee finishes instead of passing it we might just have it held up so that the drafters of this Act could be asked.

MR. BROWNE: Why not let that and three following sections stand and go on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Pass the whole Bill including these and then hold it up?

MR. BROWNE: Not because we don't agree they are not right.

MR. CURTIS: It is the law now.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, but we have only now discovered it is wrong. I move, Mr. Chairman, that Clauses 42, 43, 44 and 45 be allowed to stand until the Attorney General's assistants redraft it.

On motion Clauses 42 through 45 stand.

Clauses 46 through 49 carried.
Clause 50:

MR. NIGHTINGALE: There is no time limit for the removal of these poles,

MR. MURRAY: There is.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Well, they are a nuisance to the public especially on a foggy night. There are several places in my district throughout Portugal Cove and such where poles are still out in the middle of the street practically, and these are really a menace to the travelling public.

MR. MURRAY: I believe this clause raises a very wide question—Where poles are actually upon the highroads or road construction places the poles out on the road the Minister gives orders but we must pay the company. Now if the company has trespassed in the first place upon the road they could be ordered to be removed without payment but if it was with the consent of the Minister that they were put there in the first place it gives these people the right to demand compensation. After all to my mind the right would be to give them tendency of sufferance—Should they come along and ask—could I lay poles there, and at the time they were put there it was never contemplated the road would be as wide as it became subsequently. Then the poles are either on the road surface or very closely adjoining, and the Government has to pay the company concerned. I think they should not require a right merely by the fact that the Minister in the first place had given them consent, but at their own request, to put the poles where they are to save them expense in the first place.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Why not have an agreement that where the road is widened they should remove them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The next section, unfortunately, is mandatory upon the Minister.

MR. MURRAY: That is the practice—The Minister does compensate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly the word "shall" should come out, and the word "may" be inserted. The way it is now he has no choice, and is paying out twenty-five dollars (\$25.00) for every pole so moved. I do not think we ought to make it mandatory in this Act. It is mandatory upon the Minister to pay and it ought not to be mandatory.

MR. BROWNE: Do you want to let it stand?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, either we change it or let it stand—we can't just carry it as is. Let all of Clause 50 stand.

Clause 51 carried.

Clause 52:

MR. BROWNE: A good deal of that is new.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And it needs to be.

MR. HIGGINS: Neon signs—are they all erected with permission of the Minister?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hope so for the sake of those who have them—They are subject to fifty dollars a day.

MR. HIGGINS: I am thinking of one in Holyrood, going around the Bay.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is one on the right hand side of the road. Mr. Chairman, it is a great pity that if the public by means of radio and newspaper were not made aware of

the fact that there are no bill boards nor signs, advertising signs, permitted in Newfoundland today within a hundred yards on either side of any Highway, outside of a municipal area, and then only small and modest signs are permitted on business establishments, gas stations and industries around the road. That is a reform introduced in Newfoundland within the last—I forget when this was passed but it was passed within the last four or five years. That is a reform introduced in line with the most progressive thinking in North America today, which abhors the way in which the countryside in so many parts of North America has been defaced and marred by advertising signs. I was very much struck in driving from the boundary of Switzerland and Italy to Milan, as I did by car, to notice that of all the roads of the whole earth I suppose this was most noted for billboards and signs. The committee would scarcely believe it. It is fantastic, beyond words almost, the whole of that distance which takes three or four hours to cover, driving fast because it is one of Mussolini's famous roads. The whole distance of that road is just one fantastic collection of billboards, on both sides of the road and spanning over the road every few hundred feet. As you drive along there is a great billboard which begins on one side, goes up and across and down on the other, all advertising one product or another. Now that is the worst example in the world. It is so bad it is good. It is so bad it is fascinating. It is so ugly it is one of the sights of the world and therefore perhaps not too ugly. But the ordinary advertising signs plastered up by someone not necessarily concerned with the beauty of the country but concerned only with making a fast buck by advertising something he has

got for sale. That kind of thing can become a complete eye sore. In this Province three, four or five years ago we passed legislation which we are now reenacting, and, as the honourable member for St. John's South, I think, says, adding to in some part here by adding gas stations. I wish the whole public and business men who have the idea of putting up these signs would take note of the fact that it is against the law now, and subject to a fine of five dollars a day as long as that lasts, and if it goes on for a year or two that can soon begin to run up in to real money. Perhaps a good way to get revenue would be to let it run up and then pounce and collect a lot of penalties.

On motion Clause 52 carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I think it might be necessary to provide in this section 53, something to this effect—"Certified by him or by the chief highway engineer of the Department or some other authorized authority of the Department." Suppose the chief engineer dies—Suppose there was a vacancy on that position—Suppose there was no such post—Then only the deputy Minister could certify it.

MR. SPENCER: There is no such post today.

Clause 53—"A copy of any map; plan or other document in the custody of the Deputy Minister, certified by him or by the Chief Highway Engineer of the Department to be a true copy, is deemed to be authentic and is prima facie evidence of the same legal as the original for the purpose of any proceeding in any court or for any other purpose."

Clause as amended; by deleting the words "or by the Chief Highway En-

gineer of the Department" on motion carried.

Clause 54, carried.

Clause 55, carried.

Clause 56, carried.

Clause 57, carried.

A Bill—"An Act Respecting the Department of Public Works."

Clause 1, 2, 3, carried.

Clause 4.

MR. BROWNE: This is different here from the previous Act: In the previous Act it said—such other officers, clerks and employees as are necessary for the proper conduct of the business of the Department shall be appointed or employed in compliance with the Civil Service Act." I wonder why the Civil Service Act is being left out there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It might, for instance, be purely contractual for three, five or eight years and not be established nor pensionable and therefore it would not come under the Civil Service Commission. As a matter of fact now that I think of it, that is quite a necessary one in the Department of Public Works and the Department of Highways and the Department of Mines and Resources. It is often quite essential to pay more money to pay a much bigger salary to get a man to come to work, a highly trained technical man—It is a difficult thing today to get engineers and the like because of the definite shortage of men with these qualifications. Therefore to offer the ordinary job with the ordinary conditions and at the ordinary rate of pay under the Civil Service Act leaves us without the men we need. To get them, therefore, you have to offer them higher rates, considerably higher rates of pay

but on a contractual basis, without establishment and without pensions. Because very frequently you can bring a man in to do a job who is not interested in the pension or being established but is interested in the large salary. That is the only way to get the men.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the point is, why leave out the Civil Service Act. The Civil Service Act here is the law of the country for employment of staff for a department and now it is being left out. It is not necessary to leave that out in order to engage the persons you were speaking of because you could easily amend it slightly by leaving out the word temporary—The Minister may employ such technical and other assistance as he deems necessary—You see we have here "temporarily employ" I don't think the intention is to temporarily employ altogether."

MR. SMALLWOOD: There may be that intention to employ a man one season.

MR. BROWNE: Why not leave out the word "temporarily"?

MR. CURTIS: The only thing is, Mr. Chairman, if you say they are authorized by the Civil Service Act, sometimes, the Lieutenant-Governor in-Council have the right to waive the Civil Service or except certain posts from the Civil Service Act. In that case the people would be appointed by law and not under the Act.

MR. BROWNE: I am not really familiar with the Civil Service Act at the moment but that is the one did set up the Civil Service Selection Board. That is the Act under which people are appointed to the Civil Service.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, that is the Act under which a small proportion of the civil service are appointed, a relatively small proportion, fewer than half.

MR. CURTIS: There are posts exempted.

MR. BROWNE: I know that. In other words all the provisions of the Civil Service Act are here, the rights to pensions and everything else is covered. Now if you just leave it out and use the words here "In the manner authorized by law" I take it it could be intended to include the Civil Service but also give you power outside it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, which we want—We could have it under whichever appears to be the better procedure at the moment to meet the situation (1) to come under the Civil Service as an established and pensionable civil servant or (2) under a contractual arrangement.

MR. HOLLETT: That word "temporary" I wonder if that should not be defined, what is temporary?—We know of people who have been appointed by the Government in other Departments temporarily I suppose, but some of them have contracts up to ten years at very high salaries. I wonder, in fairness to the Civil Service especially in the Public Works Department, whether we should not define the word "Temporary" so that a Minister would not be able to appoint a man temporarily and let it go for keeps.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are temporary men who have been working with the Government for thirty years and there are men I notice in the Government of Canada working

forty years temporary employees, temporary civil servants.

MR. CURTIS: You cannot fix the time in advance.

On motion Clause 4 through 6 carried:

Clause 7 carried.

Clause 8:

MR. BROWNE: "In matters relating to public works the Minister has and may exercise and shall perform all and every of the rights, liabilities, powers, duties and functions which were immediately before the date of the commencement of this Act by any Act or regulations or by any Order in Council or Order in Commission vested in or required to be exercised or performed by the Commission for Public Utilities or by the Minister of Public Works."

I don't know how that is going to work. I don't know why that is there like that instead of saying, by any other Act that might exist.

MR. CURTIS: It is just to clarify anything he may be doing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A sort of catch-all—That is there because of the splitting of the Department. The Minister is a new Minister you see.

MR. BROWNE: I think you really need to look that over.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We might let that one stand.

On motion Clause 8 stand.

On motion the Committee rose to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred, Bill No. 2 and Bills No. 18 and directs me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received.

On motion committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

On motion of Mr. Curtis all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

WEDNESDAY, April 10, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the House is probably aware for the past several years official architects had been drawing plans and making specifications of the new university. The plans are now completed for the first four buildings. The specifications, however, are not yet finished. The specifications will be finished, I believe, within the next two or three weeks and when the specifications are finished it means that with the plans and specifications both of them available it will be possible to call for tenders for the construction of those first four buildings of the university.

That will be done, as has been announced already, as soon as it is physically possible to do so, that is to say

as soon as the specifications are ready in the Department of Public Works. Now a scale model of the four buildings has arrived in the city. It arrived, I believe today. I asked my colleague the Minister of Public Works to have the scale model placed on exhibition in the Chamber next to this present one. I now invite all members of the House, all members of the press and radio, at recess which will presumably be taken between four and four thirty today, as usual, to come in and view that scale model showing the campus and the lay out generally of the four buildings. In front nearest to us is the library then the next centre, the main building, the building on the left the building that will be the assembly hall, gym and so on and on the right the large building which will be the science building. Next to that at one corner is the power plant, which will heat all the buildings on the campus.

I heartily invite the whole House and the press and radio to view the model at recess time today.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Premier a question arising out of his statement? I did not quite get what he meant—very soon these tenders will be called—Does he mean very soon?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I said as soon as the specifications are ready. The plans are ready. My honourable friend is an engineer and I believe would be well aware of the fact it is not enough in calling for the tenders for the construction of a building or a number of buildings to have just the plans and blue prints. It is necessary also to have the specifications. Now the plans and blue prints are ready, have been ready for some weeks. The

specifications are not quite ready and it will take another two or three weeks, I understand, before they are. Now when they are everything will be ready and the tenders will be called at once.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier one thing about this—I notice it is all beautifully laid out around the university with trees but I noticed no parking lots. Now only this morning we have been asked to close off parking on one side of Elizabeth Avenue. It is getting very, very busy. In this particular building I do not see any accommodations for cars inside the new Memorial University. I think that is a mistake as a parking lot would be a great asset to it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is quite in order for the honourable member to debate what I have said or in order for me to debate what I have said. But in answer to my honourable friend the campus shown in the scale model is merely a very small part of the campus. The campus is, I think, over a hundred acres, and the part shown will be probably some four or five acres. Very ample and very satisfactory parking space must and will be provided for the campus.

Presenting Petitions

MR. W. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Shoe Cove which is the most northerly settlement in Green Bay.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petitioners is for a road connection from Baie Verte to LaScie, which is the most easterly settlement in White Bay South.

Mr. Speaker, this petition arrived rather late. It was supposed to have arrived at the time that the Honourable member for White Bay South presented the petition of the people of LaScie. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I gave the petition of the honourable member for White Bay South my wholehearted support, and I do so again now, especially at this time when I have a petition from the people of Shoe Cove. These people wholly support the petition of the people of LaScie for the road to Baie Verte to LaScie. Mr. Speaker, I think there is a great need for this connection of around four miles from LaScie to Shoe Cove and when the road is finally made to Shoe Cove the people of Shoe Cove will have access out to the Trans-Canada Highway.

I ask that the petition be received by the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and very briefly support the two petitions which my political neighbours of the north have asked leave to present to the House.

I would draw to the House's attention this fact, this road which he states and which I endeavoured to some extent last week to explain is about thirty miles in length and will have the effect of linking up what is probably the largest segment of population presently not being linked up with any road system. That road will serve approximately half the population of my district of White Bay South and I would judge upward of half the population of my honourable friend's district of Green Bay. I doubt that there is any other road or potential road in Newfoundland

which could serve so many purposes as that one stretch would serve, opening up great mineral wealth and forest areas and serving one of the richest fishing areas in all Newfoundland.

I would like to add my hearty support to that petition, Mr. Speaker.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices of Motion

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill—"An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act."

I also give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled a Bill—"An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act."

On behalf of my Honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, who is ill, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled a Bill—"An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Receivership Act."

Notice of Questions

None.

Answers to Questions

HON. J. T. CHEESEMAN (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the Table of the House replies to QUESTIONS No. 77 and 79 asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. (See Appendix for question and answers).

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Public

Works has delayed in giving an answer to No. 23, which I asked about.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Public Works): I will have that tomorrow.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if during my absence any answer was given to QUESTION No. 38?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a question which ought to have been addressed to me. Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed, the Opposition seems to have adopted a new technique in this respect—any question which has money, dollars in it they are all addressed almost exclusively to the Minister of Finance. It may be a fisheries question but if it has any connection with dollars it is addressed to the Minister of Finance. For instance the Royal Commission of Canada's Economic Prospects. That is a matter which came directly under the Premier of the Province. If it has dollars connected with it it seems to the honourable members opposite it must be directed to the Minister of Finance although it may be education, welfare or public works. That's a novel idea.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I assure the Premier it was in order to save him labour in connection with these questions—and this was a question based on information given to us that Mr. Perry was going to devise a project for five years, I thought in working with the Minister of Finance—

MR. SMALLWOOD: But I suggested to the Cabinet and the Cabinet authorized me to approach Mr. Perry, as head of the Administration, and ask him to go and undertake this work, and the negotiations were with me. That having been done, the

work then came under the Minister of Finance and now comes under him. But the original arrangement was made by me.

MR. BROWNE: Would the Minister answer the question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I could probably answer now.

QUESTION No. 38: Mr. Browne. (See Appendix).

MR. BROWNE: I notice by today's paper that Mr. Perry is going to address the Board of Trade. Without reference to any previous addresses given by visitors here to Members of the House of Assembly, would it be possible for Mr. Perry to give some members of the House some elaboration on the idea announced by the Premier?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think it an excellent idea. I will be very happy to ask Mr. Perry to come and address Members of the House on this very matter. It will be for the information of the House, not to be made public until he is ready to release his report, certainly not until then, if then—On that basis I will ask him and see if it can be arranged.

MR. BROWNE: While on the subject, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could consider giving us the estimates this year prior to bringing down the Budget. It is very difficult for us to consider the two things at one time—If we could get the estimates a little earlier?

MR. SMALLWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would have to consult with my honourable colleagues on that. The practice in Newfoundland since the coming of Commission, and I am not sure but it was the practice before, but

since the coming of Commission of Government the practice had been to bring in the Budget and the estimates simultaneously. I think that I like the practice in most deliberative assemblies to naturally bring in the estimates of expenditure first and then the Budget. But if the estimates of expenditure are released in this House how can the House politely pass one estimate after the other until they run forty or fifty or sixty million dollars and then, having voted this money to the Government to spend then sit down and hear from the Government how the money is proposed to be raised.

MR. BROWNE: That is what they do elsewhere.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps—But it is a little more practical to have the budget first and show how the money is proposed to be raised and then show what it is proposed to do after the raising.

MR. BROWNE: That is not the traditional manner.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No it is not.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before we go on into the Orders of the Day, I have here another interesting item I took out of the paper yesterday. May I address a question to the Premier? Could he indicate to us what Department Professor Goundrey, this special economist, will be attached to and what his salary will be and when he is likely to take up his duties?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I dictated a statement for release on the matter of Professor Goundrey's appointment and by an error my office released the statement to the press and radio. Now I would not do this

House that discourtesy of deliberately, of deliberately dictating a statement of release before releasing it here myself first in my place in this House, which is the proper place for me to do it, while the House is in session. While the House is not in session I issue these statements from time to time direct to the press and radio, but when the House is in session the courteous and proper thing, I think, is to make the statement here in the House so that the House has first knowledge of it. But by an oversight in my office it happened the way it did.

Now the answer is that Professor Goundrey has been appointed as provincial economist. That is done by the Executive Government. I merely announced it. He has been attached to the office of the Premier—that is the department to which he is attached—and his salary is ten thousand dollars a year. He is not established. It is a three-year contract. He is not established and not pensionable. It is a straight non-pensionable salary of ten thousand dollars a year for three years.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Attorney General a question? I noticed by yesterday's "Telegram" again that the price of bread has gone up two cents a loaf. Has the Commission of Public Utilities any power or is there any power in any of the laws now to investigate whether any such price, coming as it does from all the bakeries, is justifiable at this time?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, my memory on it is fairly good—There was an Act set up. Price Control Regulations were made under the Act. The Act itself was abolished. The regulations remained. Under authority of

the regulations we continued price control for a year or two after we came into office. Then we abolished price control. My recollection is that we repealed the regulations—But the Attorney General is not sure of that—He thinks the regulations may still exist. If so—if so we might be able to resume price control.

MR. BROWNE: Would he look into it and give us an answer tomorrow?

MR. CURTIS: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have another question, which I was going to address to the Minister of Mines and Resources—I am not sure of the right official—In his absence may I address it to the Premier "The Premier got a message from Ottawa saying formal agreement setting up a park in Newfoundland is expected in ten or fifteen days"—Can the Minister tell us if that agreement is approved by the Government and if anything is involved.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In conversation this forenoon with Ottawa, I was informed that the Privy Council tomorrow is expected to pass the final order which will set in motion the whole business of the creation of the national park. That now was only the passing of an order in Council at the meeting of the Privy Council tomorrow—So the Honourable Mr. Pickersgill informed me in a telephone call from Ottawa this morning. As a matter of fact they are a little concerned by finding an appropriate name for the national park—and I undertook to do some questioning, to tap some of my sources of inspiration and information to see if an appropriate and acceptable name for this great new national park might be found.

MR. HOLLETT: "Pickersgill Park."

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. The practice is not to name it after living persons. That rules out the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and myself as it does Mr. Pickersgill and as it does the honourable and learned member for St. John's South. If it is a person it could be someone no longer living but ordinarily it is not a person but it is a place. All the national parks of Canada are named in every case after a place and not after a person. Now I do not say that we have to do that in Newfoundland because they do it in other parts of Canada. In Newfoundland we might very well name it after a place.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest "Cormack" Park may be considered seeing he was the first one to walk across the country and probably started somewhere in this neighbourhood.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, from Trinity Bay—Random Sound.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have something to ask the Premier in connection with the announcement made in Ottawa either yesterday or today by the Minister of Mines and Resources concerning grants to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in connection with hydro-power.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have no information beyond what I have read in the papers. It may be in the correspondence on my desk, of which there are many, many hundreds of letters which I have not had a chance in the last two weeks to read—There may be some correspondence bearing on that matter.

MR. BROWNE: I am sure the Premier would be interested in reading this—I would like to send it to him. I may say this report today indicates it may involve expenditure of a hundred and fifty to two hundred million dollars in the Maritime Provinces in the next twenty years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The more they get the happier I am because the more they get in the Maritimes the more we are likely to get here.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Honourable Minister of Fisheries: in connection with the O'Brien Fisheries, Limited, we know that lobsters have been paid in that connection—I have had several complaints from various parts of the country relative to those who sold salmon to this firm and were given to understand they too would be compensated for salmon they delivered to this firm—I wonder, could the Minister tell me whether or not these people are to be paid for salmon which they sold to O'Brien Fisheries?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

Orders of the Day

Resumed Debate on the Address in Reply:

MR. SELLARS: Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to extend to you my hearty congratulations on your election to the high office of Speaker of this Assembly. The fact that you were elected by acclamation is evidence of the high regard and great confidence the Members of this House have in you.

I would also like to congratulate the honourable and gallant member for Harbour Grace who made the motion

for an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. His speech was of a very high order and could very well be taken as a pattern for some of us new members who may not be very well versed in Parliamentary Procedure. The honourable and gallant member for Bell Island who seconded the motion also proved himself to be not only a very eloquent speaker, but very observant as well, when he indicated that this House was lopsided. I have made a great many voyages in my time and I have often heard it said that it was a good omen to start a voyage with a Port List. There may be no traceable connection between a Port List and a pleasant and successful voyage, but the two invariably go along very well together.

I assume that in speaking to a motion for an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, that our remarks should centre around matters concerned in that speech. It has been stated that the Speech contained very little to talk about because of its simplicity, but I find in the very first paragraph these words:

"Much has been accomplished in the two General Assemblies that have preceded us, and much yet remains to be accomplished if this Province is to be a thoroughly successful and happy part of this fast growing Canadian Nation."

This statement gives us the privilege of speaking on anything that has been so far accomplished, or is in process of being accomplished and of the expenditures that have been made in connection therewith. It also gives us the privilege of commenting on anything that is in prospect of being accomplished during the ensuing years, and this seems to give us all the scope

we want to deal with almost anything we wish.

Perhaps much more has been said about the New Industries than was ever justified, or that was good for this Province. I do not intend to elaborate on this subject, except to say that the pessimistic views expressed by some people when they were in their initial stages seem to have melted down by the continuing sunshine of success of some of them. It would be regrettable if the adverse opinions so freely and frequently expressed and broadcast to the people of this Province by those who opposed them would tend to lessen further any faith or confidence some of our people may have retained in their ability to adequately appraise these and other matters. I hope that in the coming years some of these critics will become ashamed of themselves when they realize what a blessing to this Province some of these Industries have become.

The discovery of large tracts of minerals in the interior of Labrador will, in the future, produce large revenues for this Province. Apart from any Royalties the earnings of our people who will work there will exceed all our expectations.

Some doubt has been expressed about the propriety of so hastily bringing these deposits into production. It has been indicated that if the negotiations were more leisurely considered, prospects of securing more advantageous concessions might have been brighter. Personally I cannot subscribe to that idea. What would happen, if, during the interim, another great discovery was made in close proximity to the Coast Line that would eliminate the costly necessity of

having to build railways hundreds of miles in length in order to transport the ore to the Coast. Where would you turn then to get the interior deposits brought into production, and if it were possible what would be likely to get out of it. No one can tell with any degree of accuracy where and how soon the next great discovery will be made.

Mr. Speaker, there is probably a man in almost every settlement of Labrador who claims he has some knowledge of mineral deposits of one kind or another. I know this to be a fact so far as the District of Labrador South is concerned, and I also have some knowledge of the presence of iron, graphite and other minerals in Labrador North. It is therefore my considered opinion that the Government did not move too fast in getting those interior deposits into production.

It is well known and accepted that there is an immense wealth of timber resources in Labrador—tens of thousands of square miles of it, and, in the not too distant future, it is only reasonable to assume that this timber or some of it will be in great demand. Mr. Speaker, I thought I knew something about the forest areas of Labrador long ago, of the quality and size of the trees in some places, and its value for paper-making, but last fall on a flight from Goose Bay to St. Mary's Harbour across the interior of Labrador a distance of more than two hundred miles, I was amazed at the vast timber resources that was unfolded to me. Across this large area there was nothing to be seen but lakes, rivers and forests. My unalterable opinion is that the timber resources of Labrador will never be depleted, but will always remain ac-

cessible in stupendous quantities unless continued forest fires play havoc with it.

I expect I would be blacklisted by honourable members on this side of the House if I did not have something to say about roads. A few days ago the Honourable the Premier referred to a strip of road in Labrador beginning at the Quebec boundary and continuing to near West St. Modeste. It is the intention of this Government to extend this road to Red Bay, probably completing it next year with connecting roads to all the various settlements. This is an excellent piece of road, built of excellent material, and it reflects great credit on the road built anywhere on the coast of Labrador. However, it is not anticipated that this road will extend beyond Red Bay for a very long time to come, so the problem of road building in Labrador is not likely to become a major problem, as it seems to be fast becoming in other Districts of this Province.

I do not however mean by this that there is no need for any roads for Labrador should take precedence over all other Districts. What we especially want is local Community roads, not very wide, and most of them will not be very long. They do not need to be construction to carry heavy vehicular traffic except in two or three locations. I am also saying that inter-community roads are not feasible. The settlements are so scattered and are located for the most part on islands that connecting roads are quite impossible except in a very few cases.

There are, however, two places where comparatively short inter-community roads are deemed desirable, and I have been asked to specifically

mention these two places in this House.

The first one is Indian Cove, located in Assizes Harbour Run across Caribou Island, a distance of about three miles. The second one is between William's Harbour and George's Cove. Frequent and extensive use of these two trails would indicate to me that what is needed is a repair job and not new construction that would entail expensive surveys. There is also a request in prospect from Cartwright which as honourable members know is an old established community in the Sandwich Bay area. A local Committee has been formed there and they are systematically dealing with the position there with the object in view of making Cartwright a large and well laid out community that could take care of its fast growing population, as well as the numbers that is anticipated will be moving into this community in the near future. Until they have completed their plans then, and made known their requirements, there is not much that I can say on the matter at this time.

In addition to the efforts that will be made to establish Cartwright as a Centralized Community, other effects will be made to further the attempt being made to create another Centralized Community at St. Mary's Harbour in St. Lewis's Bay near Battle Harbour. As the honourable members are undoubtedly aware, Battle Harbour which has been regarded as the principle Community in Southern Labrador is situated on two Islands, and does not possess the facilities necessary for the founding of a Central Community. During the winter months the ice that forms between these islands and the Mainland often breaks up, and is partly because of

this and of the very favourable facilities that are available at St. Mary's Harbour which Battle Harbour do not have that the new site has been chosen. I remember some years ago accompanying Sir Wilfred Grenfell on a fishing trip out to St. Mary's River. During that trip he commented on the suitability of that place for the founding of a large Community. At that time Sir Wilfred was deeply interested in forming a system of co-operative stores along the coast of Labrador and I believe that his idea was to make St. Mary's Harbour the headquarters of this undertaking. Unfortunately the Labrador Merchants who were from St. John's and Conception Bay, but who maintained small trading posts on the coast during the winter, vigorously protested to the Government against Sir Wilfred or anyone else associated with the Grenfell organization, participating in any way in any kind of commercial enterprise. An exhaustive enquiry was ordered and a prominent Magistrate sent to the coast to collect all the evidence possible about this undertaking. The inquiry was for the most part held in the best room of the Merchant's residence who took good care to be present when the investigation was in progress. The result of the inquiry which seemed inevitable from the very start was that Sir Wilfred and all his associates who were in any way connected with the undertaking had to withdraw all their support and interests or else severe restrictions would be placed on the Grenfell Association activities by the imposition of duties and other penalties. As a result of this the co-operative plan was never carried out but the suitability of St. Mary's Harbour for the establishment of a large Community remains unchanged. Today

about forty families are living in this Community but during the fishing season most of them move to their Coast Stations, and return in the fall when the fishing is over.

If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give a brief description of what St. Mary's has to offer, and what should be done before too many families move into this settlement and destroy the possibility of arranging streets or roads necessary for the building of a modern town.

At the entrance to a very commodious harbour there is a deep water site close to shore where with very little wharf facilities dockage space could be provided for our largest ships. The adjacent land is practically level and is quite suitable for the building of warehouses, refrigeration plant, salt stores, saw mill and other buildings necessary for the conduction of a large wholesale as well as local trade. Such a plan would eliminate the necessity of having to secure large ice-breakers late in the season to carry delayed shipments of necessary provisions to Labrador.

A river empties into the Harbour from a large pond nearby. A large fall almost perpendicular empties into this pond about a mile from the settlement. This falls could provide far more power for generating electricity and water to service the town than would ever be necessary in the foreseeable future. The supply of water to the town would be by gravitation. The surrounding area is fairly level and there is an abundance of land that could be used to make vegetable gardens. As the Honourable member knows it is not the policy of this Government to compel or require anyone to move to any particular settlement,

but the Government could assist by providing facilities in a settlement that that would undoubtedly have the effect of inducing people in the surrounding area to move there.

Already a Community Improvement Council has been elected to consider plans for the building of the necessary local roads and providing for the ultimate installation of water and sewerage pipes, and in other ways regulating the building lots in an orderly manner designed to meet the future requirements.

The problem of providing educational facilities for Labrador is a very difficult one. While there are good teachers at Cartwright and St. Mary's Harbour, as well as at some of the more populous places, particularly in the Straits of Belle Isle, there are many places where untrained teachers are trying to cope with a problem that is almost beyond them, while at many places there is no teacher at all.

This same condition exists, I believe, in many outport places and it is difficult to see what can be done about it.

It has been indicated to me that the best of our outport teachers are securing positions in St. John's and colleges. No wonder then that St. John's should have such a high standard of intelligence with all those graded outport teachers supplemented by other highly qualified and specialized teachers from across the Atlantic looking after their education. But even at that I do not think that any one District can claim to have a monopoly of the intelligence of the Province. There are many highly qualified and intelligent people in the outports but I will admit that there are also some who are a bit stupid and not

very clever, and this also applies to the St. John's District where a young lady who got married sometime ago had to go to a friend of hers three days afterward and ask her "what is the name of that man that I am married to"? Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether that young lady knows the name of her husband yet because her friend could not remember his name either.

Discussing the problem of teacher shortage with one of the Superintendents of Education quite recently, I was told that efforts were being made to recruit some students from the Memorial University to teach in Labrador during their summer holidays. This, of course, will be of some help but it is certainly not enough. I have high hopes that rehabilitation or centralization, which ever one prefers to call it, will solve some of our Labrador problems. If it does not I expect we will have to take the problem to the Honourable the Minister of Education.

It is unlikely that Labrador will ever be able to produce enough vegetables to supply the coast but some families will unquestionably be able to grow enough for their own needs. I saw some evidence of what can be produced when I visited Red Bay and Lance au Loup last fall. The potatoes produced compared very favourably with any I ever saw that were grown in Newfoundland. It appeared to me that the greatest drawback was the securing of the necessary fencing material to adequately protect the crops. Because of the smallness of the suitable areas a lot of fencing is required. Wood for this purpose is hard to get in most Straits settlements, but I believe if some assistance was afforded these people that would en-

courage them to make new gardens that when once a piece of land was brought under cultivation it will become an asset that few would ever want to neglect.

I believe I can say without any reservation whatever that nowhere in the whole Province are the people so appreciative of what has been done for them since Confederation as are the people of Labrador. In practically every home I visited last fall the first thing that attracted my attention was a poster of the picture of the Honourable the Premier on the wall. Some of these pictures suggested to me that they had been there a long time and I wondered just what they would look like in twenty-five years from now. But they will be there without a shadow of a doubt regardless of their condition.

I also saw pictures of the Honourable the Minister of Education, the same was beside the Honourable the Premier's but they were newer and fresher looking, indicating that they had not been there so long. I can honestly say that the people of Labrador, including the women, all have a very high regard for the Honourable the former member for Labrador and they all spoke highly of him and said that he was a very nice man. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if I should make this observation or not, but nowhere in all my travels in Labrador did I see any picture or anything else to remind me that there was a predecessor to Honourable the present Minister of Education and I never once heard his name mentioned.

I am wondering now, Mr. Speaker, just what the people of Labrador can do to further express their gratitude and appreciation to the Honourable

the Premier for the added blessings vouchsafed to them by the increases in Family Allowances, Old Age Pensions, and Unemployment Insurance for Fishermen.

The transportation Services performed by the Canadian National Railways in the Southern part of my District, that is from Blanc Sablon to Battle Harbour, is eminently satisfactory, and the people of this area have no complaints whatever to make. If there are times when difficulties are encountered on account of ice, bad weather or other conditions that interfere with the maintenance of the regular schedule, the people for the most part accept these things as being inevitable.

I was quite interested in, and could very well appreciate, the very complimentary remarks made a few days ago by the Honourable the Minister of Education and a former member for the District of Labrador about the co-operation he received from the Canadian National Railway and their readiness at all times to acquiesce in everything he suggested or requested.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that no official of the Canadian National Railway ever did consent or agree to do anything for the Honourable the Minister that they would not have done for me or any other Honourable member of this House under similar conditions or circumstances.

I know practically all the Railway Officials, many of them quite intimately, and while I do not want to throw any bouquets at them, and I am sure they are not vain enough to want me to do so, I will say that they are as efficient and well qualified a class of men as can be found anywhere

in the Canadian National Railway Service.

It would, I am sure Mr. Speaker, be very regrettable if too many men were to be subsequently replaced by units from the Mainland, as it seems to be the tendency at the present time. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that it is very necessary for me to point out that the services of the Canadian National Railway as performed by the S.S. Kyle north of Battle Harbour is adequate, or satisfactory to the people of the East Coast of Labrador in this present era, nor do I believe that the Canadian National Railway thinks it is satisfactory. I feel convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the Railway has plans for making the necessary and desirable improvements so important to this District but they cannot be implemented very well until the William Carson is rehabilitated and she goes to her new home. When this is done I believe the services performed by the Kyle and also the services being performed by the Burin in Placentia Bay will be speedily adjusted to the complete satisfaction to all concerned. Until this time arrives I think it is both futile and unfair to keep on nagging the Canadian National Railway about the situation which does not please them any more than it does us.

While on this subject of transportation, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the people of my District that they continue to remember throughout the summer the unfavourable conditions that existed last fall, and that such conditions might happen again, and that they do their best to get in their winter supplies before the frost comes in order to avert the unfortunate circumstances that the Canadian National Railway had to

cope with last season. Nobody will deny that the Railway did everything possible to deliver shipments of freight that were delayed too long and shipped too late. Mr. Speaker, I am quite convinced that the efforts made by the Canadian National Railway to deliver this freight was the ultimate that could be expected. How then can anyone knowing these things say that the Canadian National Railway have spent upwards of one hundred and fifty million dollars in improving Newfoundland Services since Confederation, and I do not think this amount takes into consideration the increase in wages that have resulted. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if half this amount would have been available for such improvements under any other form of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I think I ought to again emphasize as forcefully as I can, the necessity for our people to get in their winter supplies as early as possible, and I want to assure them that by doing this they will in no way be contributing to a possible discontinuance of the Service so long as reasonable navigation is possible. The day is gone when the people of Labrador South will be asked or expected to accept complete isolation from October to June. Before closing this subject, Mr. Speaker, I feel the people of my District would like me to say a word of commendation of the valued services rendered by the Master, Officers and Crew of the Kyle and not always under favourable circumstances. There is a lack of very necessary navigation aids along the Coast from Battle Harbour Northward and I have often wondered how the Coastal services of this area have been carried out so well as it has.

Between Blanc Sablon and Red Bay

in the Straits of Belle Isle there is telegraph or telephone connections with all the settlements and at Henley Harbour there is a Radio Telephone which is giving good service but north of Henley Harbour the situation is entirely different. There is a wireless telegraph station at Battle Harbour and another at Cartwright that was formerly operated by the Canadian Marconi Company but between these two stations there is a great need for improvement in communication services. With Radio Telephones so easily obtainable and so easy to operate it ought to be possible to have one in every settlement or community of importance.

Mr. Speaker, the Labrador Fishery has changed quite a lot in the past thirty or thirty-five years. At that time one could go on the hill top in the early June and see perhaps a hundred schooners of various types under full canvas heading north to their usual haunts. Today, you could go on the same hill and stay there until the bakeapples got ripe and not see a single schooner under sail. That marvellous sight has disappeared. The sails have gone too. But there is one thing about it the fish are not gone for the fish seem to be more plentiful now than ever before. But the old method of catching them remains still the same. Codtraps, trawls, and handlines are still in use and the old unpopular back-breaking method of curing it by spreading it on flakes and beaches over and over again until it is dry enough to conform to the exacting regulations of the very particular buyer. More and more of our fishermen are beginning to sell their catches to agents of Nova Scotia Fish Dealers out of salt bulk. The price they get is not equal to what is paid for the dried article, but it eliminates the long

tedious work of drying it. The regrettable feature of this is that this fish is taken away outside this Province and sold in competition with our locally processed product and in the same market.

It is not feasible to introduce fresh fish plants into Labrador. The season is too short and there are other reasons why the proposition would be economically unsound. Moreover the establishment of any kind of fish plant must conform to the economy of the community in which it is located, otherwise there is bound to be trouble. I refer to the growing practice of outside Unions going into a community where a fish plant has recently been established, forming a branch of their union which does not take into consideration any of the economic conditions prevailing in that community, and the final result is the closing of the plant which generally makes conditions worse than they were before. Mr. Speaker, I know of one new plant that was scarcely completed when it was put in operation, and shortly after it got going a union leader arrived there, established a branch of his organization which immediately demanded a rate of pay for its members far above what was considered reasonable. This completely upset the balance between what the fishermen were being paid for the fish and what the worker was demanding for his labour. The result was that the plant suddenly closed down and remained closed for quite a long time.

Mr. Speaker, it took the Honourable the Premier of Newfoundland, the new candidate for the leadership of the Newfoundland Government in the Parliament of Canada, about forty trap skiffs and motor boats manned by about two hundred and fifty men,

women and boys, with probably forty sealing guns, and carrying about fifty torch-lights, a number of lanterns and innumerable flashlights and a midnight parade to the affected fish plant before it could be re-opened.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that very few of our best merchants will have anything to do with establishing any new project if there is any possibility that it will eventually be taken out of their hands and administered by outside unions. Mr. Speaker, it was only yesterday that I learned that a large drier, the foundation of which was built last fall in one of our best fishing settlements, and which was estimated to cost ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) will not be proceeded with this year. The reason is that in this community there are two striving and struggling unions vying with each other for the favour of the working man who does not go fishing. One is a local union and the other union has headquarters I know not where.

A vote was taken sometime ago to determine which union was to be given the right to become the bargaining agents of this drier when it was completed and put in operation. The vote was so I am informed twenty seven to eleven in favour of the local union, but despite this the Labour Relations Board have refused to certify this local union as bargaining agents for this prospective drier. It is difficult for me to say why this should be for I do not know.

I understand the local union has no representative on the Labour Relations Board, but there are two members on that board who represent other unions. I do not know if this would have any influence on the findings of the board or not. It is all incomprehensible to me but what I

think and do know is that the indefinite suspension of the building of this large drier, two hundred by eighty feet will play havoc with the economy of that community and will leave the fishermen very much worse off and all through no fault of theirs, but entirely because of manipulations of an outside union who does not know and evidently does not care much about the welfare of that community. When the net returns from the fish caught is less than the take-home pay of the ordinary fish handlers there is just one thing wrong. There has been a considerable decline in the number of men prosecuting the fishery in recent years, and there are several reasons for this. One reason I believe was Unemployment Insurance. I know of one outport community where the best men in that settlement were fishermen. They were delighted when a fish plant was built there so that they could have the privilege of disposing of their fish direct from the fishing boat and obtaining payment for it in cash whenever they wanted it. Everything went well until the season ended and the men who would not go fishing but got employment at the plant handling the fishermen's product began to get unemployment insurance. One such man was on his merry way home with his first unemployment insurance cheque when he stopped by the grocery store where a number of fishermen were chatting. "Got my first unemployment cheque today," he announced. "How much is it?" one fisherman asked. "See for yourself," he replied. "Thirty-two dollars and another thirty-two dollars every fortnight all winter." There was an ominous silence until the man with the cheque walked away. Then one fisherman remarked, "Look what that fellow is getting boys and we getting

nothing." Another man said, with a few introductory cuss words that he was finished with fishing if that was the way things were going. The unfortunate part of it is that most of them have kept their word until this day.

It is probable that the situation will be reversed now that unemployment insurance has become available to the fishermen, that is if some way can be devised to distribute it.

Another disadvantage to the fishermen is the system employed in some fish plants of taking fish from individual fishing crews only every second or third day. Fortunately, perhaps for Labrador, we have no such fish plants and the nearest we can hope to get is a number of dryers, but these for the most part are almost certain to be operated by the fish dealers and will be too small to be controlled by outside Unions.

The codfishery is being constantly hampered by the scarcity of bait, and although efforts have been made to try and induce the Federal Department of Fisheries to establish a couple of bait holdings in Labrador no prospects of success are yet in sight. There are prospects, however, that two enterprising merchants will build such bait stations this year, but details of this venture are not yet available.

It is a matter of great satisfaction to the fishermen of my District to know that the Federal Department of Fisheries have rescinded the obnoxious regulations that required them to tie up their salmon nets over the weekend. It was without doubt the most unpopular regulation ever proclaimed so far as the fishermen were concerned, and I believe the honourable member for White Bay North who is also the

General Secretary of the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen ought to be commended for the success of his efforts to have these regulations abolished so far as the Coast fishermen are concerned.

I was very much interested in the reference made by the honourable and learned member for St. John's South suggesting the importation of salt direct to the District where it is to be used. I had visions of such an arrangement being made if and when St. Mary's Harbour becomes a distributing centre for much of the Labrador Coast.

The Herring Fishery, which was once so prolific in Labrador has shown a great decline in recent years, and the quantities taken during the past few years are only a small percentage of what was once a thriving industry. Some people seem to believe that the presence of numerous draggers off our coast is the reason for the plentiful supply of codfish all along the East Coast during the past few years. I wonder if these draggers have had any effect on the migration of our herring. There is no lobster in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I think it was the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition who stated that there were more people in his District than there were in three Districts represented by the Honourable members of this side of the House. Now, Sir, I have a great respect for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and I would not wish to say anything at any time that would be unfair to him. We have both been in a rather pleasant and similar situation which I am sure was quite favourable to him as it was to me, and I do not want to disturb the

happy and mutual relationship that was created by those rather infrequent circumstances so far as his side of the House is concerned. But when the honourable member suggests that some of us are going to have a very easy time representing our small districts, I think he is becoming a little unfair. The district I and my colleague, the honourable member for Labrador North, represent has an area about 110,000 square miles, while the best authority I could find gives the area of the district represented by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is only about 3,147,632 1/2 square miles. If, therefore, the honourable member and I were to start out together to visit our respective districts, I believe he could cover his fairly well in about ten hours excluding the time he would spend talking to his constituents. Perhaps if he wore a nice comfortable pair of Koch Shoes he may be able to cover the distance in a much shorter time, but where would you imagine, Mr. Speaker, that I would be in so short a period I expect, Sir, that I would be in Carbonear loading lumber for Labrador that has been left behind the last trip of the Kyle, and would still have about a thousand miles to complete before I got back to St. John's again. I hope the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition will recognize that this is a very good description of the size of our respective districts.

While it is quite apparent that coastal travel will always be by water during the summer season it is also certain that overland travel must be resorted to in winter, and while frost and snow, of which Labrador has a plentiful supply, is an excellent road-builder, there is a great necessity for keeping the overland routes in good

condition. It appears that the dog teams which have always been the ordinary means of travel in the North is fast diminishing, and today the loss of a dog in Labrador is quite as serious as a minor motor collision would be in St. John's.

It is confidently anticipated that in the foreseeable future the dog team will be more or less replaced by the snowmobile, and in every place where there is a Komatic or dog team trail, there is need for considerable widening and improving of these trails for the accommodation of the snowmobile.

The building of several small cabins or shacks, as they are generally called, in specific places where travellers may have to spend a night or two if caught out in bad weather, is another very useful necessity and I trust something will be done about this.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, honourable members would like to know how the moose herd of Labrador is progressing. I made enquiries about them last fall and what information I could get indicated that they were doing very well. I am glad to be able to state that during recent days I have had a report from Labrador to the effect that some signs of them have been seen in the vicinity of the place where they were first landed, and that the signs indicated that there were some small animals among them. Other signs have been seen in the St. Michael's Bay area probably forty miles apart, and these signs also indicated the presence of some young animals.

Honourable members will remember that a few days ago the Honourable the Premier made reference to what he considered to be the best Opposi-

tion this House ever had. It consisted of two men only, Honourable Senator F. Gordon Bradley, and the other the late Mr. R. G. Starkes. Mr. Speaker, I think I have read every speech made by Senator Bradley at that time, and I regard them as being masterpieces of literature, and I believe it would be well if every scholar in Newfoundland could read them.

When the National Convention was brought into being Senator Bradley was again in the forefront with the Honourable the Premier fighting together for Confederation which they were convinced and still believe was the best thing that could be done for Newfoundland. No other two Newfoundlanders could have combined to produce greater effects than was performed by them at that time. When he became Secretary of State, and Leader of the Newfoundland Government in the House of Commons, he accomplished great things not only for his district but for Newfoundland as well. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that when the pictures of the courageous men of Newfoundland who have steered the course of this country down through the years are placed on the walls of this House of Assembly, that the Honourable Senator Bradley's will find a place at the right hand of the Honourable the Premier with whom he laboured so valiantly for Newfoundland.

His successor, Honourable J. W. Pickersgill will, I understand, be in Newfoundland shortly, probably during the Easter recess, and I am sure nobody will be more pleased to see him than he will be to be here in Newfoundland. I have known the Honourable Minister ever since he came to Newfoundland and few have been closer to him through these years.

The more I see of him the better I seem to like him and the more I become convinced that he is destined to do great and wonderful things for Newfoundland.

While housing conditions in Labrador are not up to a very high standard yet there has been a very noticeable improvement since Confederation, and I was asked by quite a number of young men if some arrangements could be made for them to borrow a few hundred dollars to enable them to build a new and better home. This seems to me to be a very healthy sign and I shall endeavour to explore this possibility as soon as arrangements can be made for rehabilitation or centralization.

The living conditions and the morale of the people have also improved to a much higher degree than was evident before Confederation, and this is due to some extent to the Family Allowance, Old Age Pensions and other Social Security benefits that have made the people a little more independent. It is due perhaps to a greater extent to the increased religious efforts of the various denominations. The Anglican and United Church denominations have provided for the expansion of their efforts among the people, while the Pentecostal Assembly have located themselves at several places along the coast and is attracting quite a following.

A very energetic and deeply interested Priest of the Oblate Order has made his headquarters at West St. Modiste, in the Straits of Belle Isle, but he only spends a small portion of his time there. He likes to give every part of his huge parish as much of his time as he can spare, and this means an enormous amount of travel.

The efforts of the Rev. Father Tessier is exerting a wonderful influence on his people which, I am sure, will become increasingly apparent as the years go by.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I would be remiss in my duties to the people of Labrador if I did not express their gratitude and appreciation of the International Grenfell Association for the very noble work that has been done and is being continued by the valiant nurses and others for the welfare of the people of my District. They are always ready and willing at the shortest notice to make journeys to visit the sick or anyone in need of their services, and not infrequently with much discomfort and privation to themselves. This Province owes a great debt to the people of the Grenfell Hospitals and Nursing Stations that they can never hope to pay. The name Sir Wilfred Grenfell will ever be remembered with the greatest gratitude and affection as long as the Labrador endures.

I have another very pleasant duty to perform, Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, and that is to express the deep satisfaction and appreciation of the people of Labrador to the brave and very efficient air pilots who, under very difficult circumstances during the past winter, performed the mail services to Labrador with such distinction and credit. They are most worthy of the highest praise and I am sure the people of my District would not want me to omit making this observation on their behalf.

Since the election last fall I have had a great many letters and telegrams from all parts of my District asking for information that could only be secured from the various departments

of the Government, and I would like to express here my sincere thanks to the various Ministers and their very efficient staffs for the excellent co-operation that has been extended to me at all times. While I realize that this service is ordinary routine it definitely indicates to me that the business of this Province is being conducted exceedingly well by capable and efficient people who have the welfare and interests of the country at heart.

Mr. Speaker, with a Government composed of men of high reputation, intelligence, and experience, and with a leader profoundly devout, thoroughly sincere, extremely energetic and abundantly resourceful, in whom the vast majority of this Province has implicit faith and confidence, I am satisfied that the future of this Province is safe and secure from all alarm.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, like all the others, Sir, I would like to extend to you my sincere congratulations on your elevation to the high office of Speaker of this House. I have known you the past number of years, and I feel sure that you will fill that job with dignity and honour.

I would like to offer my congratulations to the mover, the honourable member for Harbour Grace, and to the seconder, the honourable member for Bell Island, of the Address in Reply. They both made very excellent speeches or talks, and as a person who listened I was very much impressed.

I would like at this time too to say to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues that I realize that courtesy and consideration

should be extended to others. If I had been the brash young man you accused me of, if I have been over-eager in my opportunity to come under a baptism of fire from you people I am glad you have been lenient and not hit back too hard. I think, Sir, we all realize, and I certainly, that theirs is a very difficult task and I think you do comparatively well. I was very —

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member would excuse me—The reference should be made to the Speaker—The honourable member should say "I think the Opposition."

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Speaker, I stand corrected. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member for St. John's East on this very fine oratory. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, representing a district of Humber East, that was formerly one big district there is not too much that one can say. The district has been divided because there was just too much work for one man. I think all of us realize that the Honourable Minister of Labour, the member for Humber West, has done an excellent job during the past eight years in representing the needs of the Humber District. I feel and I know, Mr. Speaker, that I have his co-operation and support in the needs that we will have and must have in the years that lie ahead.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, of the Humber, that we are probably moving too fast. Well, ours is the movement of a great industrial area, and if we move too fast it is a good sign—I hope we keep doing that.

We have problems—road problems which are not those of neglect but those of advancement and improvement—It is created by that fact—I

suppose, Mr. Speaker, not one other part of the Province of Newfoundland has a higher ratio of cars per family than has the area of Greater Corner Brook, and I will include in that the area of Deer Lake also. Their roads will be improved. I have received assurance, Mr. Speaker, from the present Minister of Public Works. There are many demands for the paving of the highway from Deer Lake to Corner Brook. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this will be done very shortly. It is not conceivable that it will be done during this coming season, but rest assured, Mr. Speaker, every consideration will be given the elimination of the menace of dust from this very heavily travelled highway, I suppose one of the heaviest traffic areas in our Province.

We have other needs, Sir—We have a rich district in Humber East and we have access to it that need attention, prompt attention.

Howley: We have to decide, Sir, whether Howley is to be offered a chance to move elsewhere or whether Howley is to be offered the opportunity of road connections with the Trans-Canada Highroad or with the town of Deer Lake. This is something which will be based entirely on the plans the Bowater Pulp and Paper Mill have for that area. Since election to this House I contacted Mr. Albert Martin, the Manager of Bowater's Pulp and Paper Mill, and have been, Sir, assured by him that the future of Howley is very promising. I also, Mr. Speaker, had assurance from him that Bowater's will assist in the development of roads connecting in and out of Howley. I think, Sir, that is something that the people of that area have long been waiting to hear, and something they will look forward to.

We have too, Mr. Speaker, to consider the area of Cormack—Cormack originally, as you know, Mr. Speaker and as this House knows, was developed entirely for a farm area, developed to help and assist our young farmers coming home from World War II, our young soldiers who wanted to take up farming. There is there a problem of centralization. In that area in the original plan, Sir, farmers homes have been scattered many miles away. It has not worked out too well. There is possibly need of moving the homes more closely together so that school facilities and so on may be conducted on a much more sound basis than at the present time. There is a great and crying need for electricity. I think, Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that any farmer in Newfoundland must have electricity. It is an absolute must and essential in order to get the modern machinery to properly produce products.

We have, too, Sir, in our areas of Humber East and in fact in the whole of the entire district of Humber a great need for educational improvement. That has been well looked after and well attended to by the very civil minded leaders of our areas. We have, Mr. Speaker, in the City of Corner Brook, I would say, one of the most energetic and hard-working groups of councillors that are in office in Newfoundland today, taking over the trying job of running what was formerly four separate municipalities. They have done a tremendous amount of work. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House as well as those on the opposite side will bear with them if at times their efforts are not obtaining the results that should be desired. In the long run, the period of trial and error will find they have worked sincerely

and that they have worked successfully for the benefit of our society.

As we go along the highroad we find the Community of Steady Brook, a very thriving community, Mr. Speaker. It has a community council. We leave Steady Brook and we come along to scattered places along the highroad, to South Brook and to Pasadena and Midlands. Midlands, as you know, Mr. Speaker, was originally a development founded by the Commission of Government to aid and assist the more unfortunate families of different parts of our Island Home. Some of these prospered and moved on. Some stayed farming and others have been absorbed into employment with our great paper company. Now, Mr. Speaker, there too we have a community council. It is also doing an excellent job. They have electricity and those who are still farming are finding the advantages of that. We have, I would say, Mr. Speaker, in Mr. H. Ackenson of Pasadena one of the most promising, one of the most highly educated farmers in Newfoundland today, a man who knows no hour in which to quit, a man who has worked successfully and is a real encouragement to any young farmer for hard work and what hard work and determination can do.

We move along up the highroad, Sir, and stop at Pynn's Brook. We find there the settlers are in need of electricity. It is only a matter of continuing some few miles. When that can be granted these people, and Sir, it should not be in the too distant future, it is an absolute must the granting of electricity from Corner Brook to Deer Lake right along the highroad should come into being. We move into the Town of Deer Lake, Mr. Speaker. There we find too a very able and well set up town

council working with absolute and complete co-operation with the Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply. This council is working as is the council of the City of Corner Brook working and the community of Steady Brook is working and as the council of the community of Pasadena and Midlands, giving of their time freely and without remuneration. They have done a splendid job. It has been a great thing to see the way the people who have formed up the councils in every forward move they made. I must say they have never made a backward step in my recollection.

We have there just on the outskirts of Deer Lake what may well be, Mr. Speaker, the coming airport of the Western World. I refer to Deer Lake Airstrip. A tremendous amount of gratitude is owed to our representative in the Federal Cabinet, the Honourable J. W. Pickersgill. He has worked untiringly and unceasingly to see our aims are carried through, see that we are not asking for too much, and he has guided us in a way that we can see the end in sight, when we hope Trans-Canada will make it a stop. We have had, too, tremendous assistance from Mr. H. M. S. Lewin and Mr. Martin and, of course, Sir, behind it all we have had the backing of Mr. Hodder of Deer Lake. Mr. Hodder has probably more than anyone of these gentlemen given most of his time to this effort. If I were to single out any of them, Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult and dangerous to do but I would have to single out Mr. G. Hodder for his great work. Because he has been on the stop and on the job, and he has carried out the necessary work at a very low cost considering what has been done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are the main points of interest in the District of Humber East. As I said earlier, I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, for the great work that the honourable member for Humber West has done for us in the past eight years. I coin a phrase and say—The best is yet to come—I do not think I will be considered brash, but I will say this—We regret losing him, Sir, and yet we feel we still have him with us. He is actually the senior member of the great Humber District. We are not divided, Sir, not in reality. It is through him that the main fighting, in the final stages, for our requests and our needs will be done. He has not failed us in the past and I know he will not fail us in the future.

Actually, Sir, my being here in the House now, representing Humber East is not one of my own choosing—In a way I would have liked to have seen the honourable member for Green Bay as the representative for Humber East. I believe that he could have made a great contribution to our district. But such was not the case. We could not get him—Green Bay did—and probably what is our loss is Green Bay's gain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is possible to come here to this House without a feeling of humility and appreciation. I would like to extend my appreciation, Sir, to the Premier for his confidence in suggesting me as a candidate; to the Liberal Association and the Corner Brook Ladies' Club for their support without which I could not have been a candidate and finally to the people of Humber East who showed their confidence in me and in the Premier and in the Liberal Party. I would like to assure at this time, Sir, the

Honourable Leader of the Opposition that I consider myself a representative of all—There is one thing I feel of Humber East, regardless of how we voted we have one thing in mind, better things for our district, and in that there is no division between Liberal or Progressive Conservative, and in that I hope there will never be.

I suppose, Sir, if I were to sit down without explaining why I find myself here it would be in order, and yet I do not intend to do that. I have had, Sir, since 1948 a great admiration for the Leader of our Party. I suppose you could say that I got on the bandwagon when I could not hold on to anybody else's coat—there just was not a wagon there—I think, Sir, he will go down in history as one of the greatest Premiers of this Province, a man who has worked harder in the interest of his people than any of his predecessors, and that, Sir, I say in all kindness to the man who put the hum in the Humber, the late Sir Richard Squires, because if it were not for his foresight and initiative I would not be here representing Humber East. But I think that mostly we see sparks of his great leadership, oratory and statesmanship reflected in the Premier here today. I am sure that any man who must have been as close to Sir Richard Squires as the Premier was in the past must have gained an awful lot from that association. I know, Sir, that the people of my district have absolute confidence in his ability to guide the affairs of this Province. They realize that errors have been made, errors of judgment are made everywhere. A woman who bakes a cake may some day find it heavy. Of course the husband knows nothing about it. Unlike the husband who knows nothing about a bad cake too frequently a government receives

more than its share of publicity for its mistakes. I think, Sir, from it all will come a better and more prosperous Newfoundland. On behalf of the people of my district I extend to the Premier our complete loyalty and confidence in the party and in his wise leadership in the years to come.

(Applause).

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Committee of the Whole on various Bills.

On motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Clarke Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

"An Act Respecting the Department of Highways."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, in Clause No. 22, the Honourable member for Harbour Grace suggested that we should put in the word "Wilfully" there. I discussed the matter with the drafters of the Bill, and they do not feel the word is necessary. However, it is a matter for the House.

MR. SHEPPARD: Mr. Chairman, when I suggested that the word "Wilfully" be inserted there I was thinking about the difficulty which I, myself, had found with some Acts where that word does not appear, and the over-eagerness of the law enforcement officers in some cases to bring charges which are really not founded. However, on reflection and on studying some of the other Acts I feel that in this case here the word "Wilfully" would probably not add anything to the section nor would it help the new magistrates who might have to deal with it, and I am not going to press the amendment in this section.

MR. W. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, on this matter of the word "Wilfully" I do suggest, Sir, that at present this lays down an absolute liability—the person who does any of the things forbidden under this section may have a valid excuse but in law, Sir, I do suggest that there is simply no defense to it—He is absolutely liable—He may not have meant to do the thing—It may even be done by him accidentally, not knowing it to have been done—But, Sir, I do suggest that this lays down an absolute liability and no magistrate, even if he did the thing accidentally and without any intention of doing so he would nevertheless have to convict him under the law. I, Sir, suggest that word "Wilfully" go in.

HON. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Hear! Hear!

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with the honourable and learned member, and I am rather disappointed that the honourable and gallant member who first raised this has reason to revise his thinking. We got to bear in mind that he put the point very well the other day—If a magistrate in one of the smaller places outside the Avalon Peninsula were confronted with that situation—As my honourable friend pointed out, no matter how he felt about it would have to register a conviction, he has not discretion in the matter. I am still inclined to the belief, Sir, that we should have some word such as originally suggested, the word "Wilfully" in there.

MR. CURTIS: I have no objection, Mr. Chairman—It is a matter for the Committee—If the Committee want to put it in I accept the amendment.

MR. SHEPPARD: Under the Sum-

mary Jurisdiction Act there is a section, as my learned friend from St. John's well knows and as my learned friend from Green Bay well knows, whereby a magistrate does not have to register a conviction even though the offence is proven—When I moved that amendment the other day I had lost sight of that, but on re-reading that section, which I think is Section forty-six of the Summary Jurisdiction Act, even where there is an offence proven (No, it is not 46) instead of proceeding with a conviction the magistrate may dismiss the charge and register no conviction.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, my point is that it is all very well if we have magistrates competent, as some of the honourable gentleman sitting across from us but if you have some junior men who have no experience in these matters you could conceivably do a lot of harm to people's rights. It is all very well for someone who can afford counsel to go out and argue the point—but with a magistrate with no experience I feel we are doing an injustice to the people.

MR. BROWNE: I think the thing should be clear and not left to the chances of a magistrate recalling the provisions, because magistrates may sometimes be faced with extensive documents and could quite easily overlook that. I think it should be drawn to their attention immediately. On the face of it, if there is an amendment to that effect, I would support that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not do any harm to put it in.

MR. HIGGINS: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then let us put it in.

MR. CURTIS: Amend the clause—after the word "Who" insert "Wilfully" and again on line four "Who wilfully takes down."

On motion Clause as amended carried.

MR. CURTIS: I discussed this with the drafters of the Bill and in their opinion Section 25 of the Bill definitely covers the situation "Except in so far as they have been closed according to law (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), except such as are vested in a municipal authority are common and public highways vested in Her Majesty in right of Newfoundland until the contrary is shown." Now Clause 42, 43, 44, 45, were allowed to stand—Now all streets in St. John's are vested in the Municipal Authority. This question as to what is to happen there does not come under the discretion of the Minister but in places like Corner Brook where the highway goes through Corner Brook and is not vested in the Corner Brook Council obviously the matter of building sidewalks along that highway should be exercised only with the approval of the authority responsible for the maintenance of the highway as indiscreet or improper building of sidewalks may well make the highway impossible to maintain, may block off the draining of them and things like that. So, for that reason I think the committee might well take sections 42, 43, 44, and 45 without exception. In the first place Section 42 envisages a highway passing through a municipality and says the municipal authority may within its municipal area construct or put down a sidewalk, etc., but no such work shall be undertaken without the consent of the Minister who is responsible for the maintenance of the highway and therefore must see that

the highway is protected. The other clauses follow—I think that Section twenty-five explains the situation.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot agree with the Attorney General—Here section 42 states quite clearly that a municipal authority may within its municipal area put down a sidewalk only with the prior consent of the Minister and does not distinguish between highways over which Ministers have exclusive control.

MR. CURTIS: Why do you not read it all—look at the third line.

MR. MURRAY: “Along the highway”—a highway by definition.

MR. BROWNE: That is given at the beginning.

MR. CURTIS: Section 25 defines it.

MR. BROWNE: With all due respect, Section 25 does not say that—therefore there should be some reference to Section 25 if you are to continue the wording as it is here—Section 25 as I understand it vests all highways outside of these mentioned except such as are vested in municipal authorities.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Along a highway—a highway is a Government highway.

MR. BROWNE: Suppose it is vested in the municipal authority.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then this does not apply.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we should put in here, except such highways as are vested in municipal authorities.

MR. CURTIS: No.

MR. BROWNE: No? Let us take a concrete example—Can the Municipal Authority in St. John's put down a concrete sidewalk?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anywhere within the city limits.

MR. BROWNE: Alright is it putting them down along the highway?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not under this Act.

MR. BROWNE: What about Elizabeth Avenue, is it a highway?

MR. CURTIS: No, a city street.

MR. MURRAY: If the honourable member would go back and look at the definition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman has just come back from Ottawa—He is all confused. His mind is not on this.

MR. BROWNE: Well, if these are not public highways why is the Minister's authority referred to and referred to in municipal areas here, because if you have a highway as defined by this Act passing through a municipality you cannot have the municipality nor anyone else interfering with that highroad except by permission of the Minister under whom the road is maintained, but that applies only to roads which come under the Minister, in other words, a highway. Mr. Chairman, I must be very stupid. I cannot see the logic of this section—Can there not be some alternative wording to make it clear—“A municipal authority may within its municipal area construct or put down a sidewalk or carry out other improvements along a highway but no such work shall be undertaken without the consent of the Minister.”

MR. SMALLWOOD: Put it the other way—may not except with the consent.

MR. CURTIS: If you want to fight in court about it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What are lawyers for?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I perhaps be enlightened by the Attorney General—Suppose he takes just one of these sections here—I think we can say Elizabeth Avenue is a public road?

MR. CURTIS: Yes. But it is vested in the municipal council.

MR. BROWNE: Therefore it is not a public highway—Alright, it is not. All of these roads which are vested in municipal authorities are not public highways—alright—A municipal authority may within its municipal area construct or put down a sidewalk or carry out other improvements along a highway—It does not say “along a public and common highway” such as referred to here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Cut out the words “common and public” and say “highways vested in Her Majesty.”

MR. MURRAY: It is in the interpretation Clause.

MR. BROWNE: In the interpretation highways mean common or public highways—but these sections refer to municipal areas and in municipal areas they cannot be common public highways, but this section refers to municipal areas.

MR. CURTIS: You can have a highway in the middle of the city. The Minister of Public Works could say that Elizabeth Avenue is not vested in the city but is a highway.

MR. BROWNE: How can he do that?

MR. CURTIS: Because he paid for building it, the city did not pay it. It is one of the things they got for nothing. It is being handed over by legislation presently before the House.

MR. BROWNE: I took an unfortunate example. Take LeMarchant Road.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would rather you took Bannerman Road.

MR. CURTIS: Well, take it—What are you going to do with it?

MR. SHEPPARD: I think, Mr. Chairman, the best illustration you could get of that is in the Town of Harbour Grace, with which I am sure my honourable friend is familiar. There the main highway passes through the municipal area but that highway has not been vested in the town council of Harbour Grace. All the other streets have been and the town is responsible for them, and under this Bill can do what they like with these streets. But the minute they come up to Harvey Street to make town improvements such as laying water lines or any other alterations then they can only do so with the permission of Public Works.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is exactly the case.

MR. BROWNE: Should it not be clarified. Take an example in this vicinity, Topsail Road.

MR. CURTIS: I do not think Topsail Road passes through any municipality.

MR. BROWNE: Lower Topsail Road originates in St. John's or Cornwall Avenue is a continuation of the Topsail Road.

MR. CURTIS: But it is vested in the city until it gets to the city limits.

MR. BROWNE: Yes and Portugal Cove Road and all the roads leading out of the City are roads within the city which becomes a road outside. Well it is just as much a highway inside as outside the city limits.

MR. CURTIS: But it comes within this Act when it gets outside.

MR. BROWNE: Well, is there some way to make it distinct?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that at the end of the third line, after the word "undertaken" there be inserted the words "along a highway vested in Her Majesty in right of Newfoundland" and then continue with the words "without the consent of the Minister, etc. I take it, Sir, that would clear up any misunderstanding that could set down terms and conditions for a highway passing through a municipal area, which still remains within his jurisdiction.

MR. MERCER: Which has not been granted to a municipal authority.

MR. BROWNE: I think the previous speaker referred back to Section 25 are common highways, public highways vested in Her Majesty—That covers it—that wording—I am not sure, but that is what I mean—There should be some reference to the type of highway over which the Minister has control and not leave it there as it is now, so that officials of the Department will know what is meant. I think that is a good idea.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To put it—along a highway jurisdiction over which is vested in the Minister of

Public Works—That would get the same effect—Let us put something in.

MR. BROWNE: My suggestion would be common, public highway referred to in Section 25 "tie it up with that.

MR. CURTIS: Actually this is comparable to the old Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Probably the honourable and learned member for St. John's South was not in the House when the old Act was debated.

MR. BROWNE: I was not.

MR. POWER: It is passed twenty years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We can be at this forever.

MR. HOLLETT: Time to build a road—I think it is alright as it is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, can we carry these four? It may mean we will have to come in next year or the year after and bring in some clarifying amendment.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps the Honourable the Attorney General will in third reading bring in something to make it clear—It is a common public highway referred to in Section 25.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

On motion Section 42 through 45 carried.

Clause 50:

MR. POWER: I went over the road yesterday afternoon as far as Holyrood and found some of the poles are about two and a half feet from the edge of the pavement. There are innumerable poles. That is all I have to report.

MR. MURRAY: It seems to me the most extraordinary—The situation is this: When a line is being erected the company concerned goes along and asks permission to suit their own conveniences, goes along to the Government and gets permission to lay a line of poles along the road. Subsequently the road is widened and all the poles are then in the middle of the road. And according to this Act, a Government because it has given its consent has to pay the company to take them out. That is most extraordinary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the wording does that.

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is quite so—I will give you one particular example: Take the Union Electric Light and Power in Catalina, they put in poles right through Bonavista Peninsula during the past two or three years. They had to get permission from the Minister of Public Works to put in the poles. But they had to pay a lot of money to buy poles, to put trails through and put wiring there and the Minister of Public Works would come back a few years later and use this very trail to build a road, and then feel they should be paid to take the poles out. I think it is unfair. The Government should pay what is a reasonable price.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But, Mr. Chairman, if the word is "may" and not "shall" it still makes it possible to pay where it is just for the Government to pay. But when it says "shall pay" there is no discretion left. That is the position today. It seems to me to be completely intolerable. The position today is that every time any one of the light and power com-

panies is required by the Minister of Public Works to move a pole out of the road, to avoid death for a driver or pedestrian, to move the pole costs the Government twenty-five dollars for every pole they move. Now that is absolutely outrageous.

MR. HIGGINS: How is that figure arrived at?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have no idea. It is twenty-five dollars a pole. I was complaining in Cabinet yesterday morning—Drive out to Holyrood and on the right hand side as you go out beyond Windsor's Poultry Farm in particular you have to watch you do not run into poles they are so close to the road. Everyone thought I was exaggerating, just like the honourable member for St. John's South—He thinks I exaggerate—I know he does—So I had my honourable colleague, the Minister of Public Works, go out, and I hear now for the first time there are poles two and a half feet from the edge of the road—and incidentally there were poles which were put up in the last three months. Now where they got permission is more than I know.

MR. POWER: I might say these poles are owned, I think, by the "Canadian National Telegraph."

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't care who owns them—What has that got to do with it? Who gave the "Canadian National Telegraph" permission—Who gave the "Canadian National Telegraph" permission—Who gave anyone permission in the last three months to stick poles two and a half feet from the edge?

MR. HOLLETT: Is not thirty feet invested in the Minister—Therefore I think all he has to do is tell them

to put back the poles and pay them nothing—That is the right thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let us make the word "may"—Is that agreed?

MR. MERCER: I still do not appreciate what the Honourable the Premier says in that connection. I appreciate the fact that the Government has to pay. The next section gives the Government a safeguard where it says—"if the amount cannot be so settled the Minister shall decide the amount and his decision is final and binding upon the parties. The Minister can say, "Alright we will pay you one dollar."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there are certain places where it might be unjust to take advantage of the different wording here—Take in the constituency represented by my honourable friend from Harbour Main and Colliers. Just prior to the election last year, I know it must have been urgent, there was a very big division made there and so great was it that the poles were right down the centre between the old highway and the new, I was astonished at the magnitude of the division made over there in that community, I did not see any cars pass over except my own. But I did see the whole staff of United Towns—and there were the poles right down the middle and a staff of the power company there changing them. I am sure it must have cost more than twenty-five dollars and I do not think it any benefit for them to get twenty-five dollars. That is the sort of thing this thing is intended to protect the company against. It would not be unreasonable to ask them to do it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, no Department of Highways yet! I move the Committee rise, report progress

and ask leave to sit again.

On motion Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole considered the matters referred to them Bill No. 2 and Bill No. 18 and directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received—Committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

On motion of Mr. Curtis all further Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 of the clock.

THURSDAY, April 11, 1957.

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

MR. M. LANE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of personal privilege—I would like to refer to a release from the "JC's" (whoever they are), St. John's, (Junior Chamber of Commerce) in this morning's paper of April 11th—Perhaps I should first of all give the background, if that is permitted.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, not in too great detail.

MR. LANE: It referred, of course, to my opening speech, my maiden speech on March 28, when I made certain references to St. John's. The allegation was stated here that it was a prepared speech and that I must have had that written into it. I must give them the information that it was not contained in my prepared speech

—It was said on the spur of the moment when a statement made by an honourable member of the Opposition kind of tickled me, and to which I took great exception at that time. The honourable member for St. John's—asked that the statement be retracted.

MR. BROWNE: Pardon me! To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think it was St. John's West.

MR. LANE: St. John's West—And I said, no, I still have no reason to retract that statement either in whole or in part, and I do not intend to do so. So that settles the first point.

In the spirit that I gave it I had expected, criticism from the honourable members of the Opposition. I took it in good parts. I also took criticism from the honourable members from my own side of the House, which I took in good parts. I also expected criticism from the waffle iron dealers as well, and I was prepared to take that and I did. But in this morning's paper I certainly feel that on personal privilege I cannot let the article go unchallenged. I cannot accept the statement in the release from the St. John's Junior Chamber of Commerce and the allegation made there. The part that I have underlined has charged Mr. Lane with gross ignorance. That is alright. Then approximately one half the membership of the government and a substantial number of his own Federation of Fishermen—These are two parts to which I take exception. As a member for White Bay North I am a member of this House. The work that I do outside the House is another job altogether, and, as I have explained to the press and radio on all occasions; what I do and say in this House is as a member of the House. Any information they ask I give to them as

General Secretary of the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen. I do not combine the two. And I feel that in my releases and any news I have given them I have done an exceptionally good job. I must thank them here and now for the co-operation that I have received from the press and radio at all times.

But here we have a group of citizens, boys I suppose, I do not know who they are—I would like to know who they are—"JC's". To me they are a group of nitwits. Perhaps I can sum up in that way what I think of them.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Perhaps the word "wits" is in error too.

MR. LANE: I may sum up in this way, Mr. Speaker, I have gone to a number of communities and during my visit somebody comes along and he says something, maybe, talking to you or maybe insulting you and somebody else comes along and says—don't mind him. He is silly—Well, we call him "the village idiot." Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Junior Chamber of Commerce—and I hope there are none of my friends in the press and radio members of that Junior Chamber of Commerce and if so I would like them to resign immediately—but the Junior Chamber of Commerce is the "Village Idiot" of St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Gossipy St. John's.

MR. LANE: Gossipy St. John's. I did not expect to get off from members of the House nor from my friends but I do take exception on personal privilege to abuse from this type of citizen, this type of youngsters, the village idiots of St. John's, immature

bedlamers who have been hoisted, fisted and kicked into jobs not because of their ability.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member is rising on a point of privilege or is rising to abuse whatever privileges he has.

MR. LANE: They have abused my personal privilege here. It is nothing compared to the way they have abused me and brought in certain matters which should never have been brought in. I will leave it at that, Mr. Speaker, and take up no more of the time of this honourable House. I say, as far as I am concerned the matter rests here. I do want to register my personal protest against these village idiots for their release in this morning's press.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before you call attention may I first say here that the suggestion made here yesterday by the honourable and learned member for St. John's South, that Mr. Perry be invited to address the members of the House was, I thought, an excellent one. I conveyed the invitation this morning to Mr. Perry and he has agreed to address the members of the House, and to do so at eight o'clock tonight. I asked him if he would object to the press and radio representatives attending. He said he would not. Therefore I see no reason why they should not attend, if they wish to do so. That will be at eight o'clock. I suggest we might hold it here in this very chamber, public only in the sense that the press and radio be present—I doubt that the general public would be particularly anxious to attend in any case.

Now, secondly, Sir, I thought the

House would be interested to hear a piece of rather pleasant news that I have received today from the O'Brien Gold Mines Limited of Ottawa. The letter is addressed to me and it says you will be interested to learn that plans for the developing of the Little Bay Copper property near Springdale have now taken definite form and that work is to go forward immediately. All corporate details have been completed and titles to the property are now transferred to the Atlantic Coast Copper Corporation, Limited. Several carloads of mine, plant and equipment are already enroute to Little Bay. A start is being made at once on three compartment shafts to go to a depth of one thousand feet. This will be followed by lateral development underground to outline and verify the ore bodies already indicated by diamond drilling.

Management of the operation will be in the hands of O'Brien (that is O'Brien Gold Mines, Limited) under the local direction of Mr. L. G. Huston, who is already in Springdale. A working force of approximately forty men will be required during the shaft sinking period.

Atlantic Coast Copper Corporation will be financed for the initial development programme by New Highridge Mining Company Limited, a Boylen enterprise, and by O'Brien's Gold Mines Limited. Equal working capital in an amount of six hundred and fifty thousand dollars has already been subscribed by these companies with options taken to provide an additional six hundred and fifty thousand dollars at a later date. There is no immediate plan for public offering of shares.

We are looking forward to the in-

teresting and beneficial participation in the exploitation of Little Bay Mineral potentials as well as to the opportunity provided for a working relationship with the Government and people of your province. Regular contact will be maintained with officials of your department of Mines; Department of Highways; Power Commission and other offices interested in the furtherance of the work. We shall be extremely pleased to give you any further information of the project which you may require, either by direct call to your office or the next visit to St. John's or by letter. I may say I was talking on the telephone this morning with Mr. O'Brien who expressed great confidence in the mine at Little Bay and the belief that it will rapidly develop into a substantial mine.

Presenting Petitions

None.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices of Motion

None.

Notice of Questions

None.

Answers to Questions

(See Appendix).

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I promised that I would table the terms of an agreement between Mr. Perry and the Government. I think I said that the terms were contained in an exchange of letters between Mr. Perry and me. (I writing on behalf of the Government at the specific authorization of my colleagues for that purpose.)

Therefore I table the copies of my letter of November, of November 5 to Mr. Perry in which I outlined what we wanted and his letter of November 23, in which he accepted the offer and stated the amount he would want to be paid, and my letter of December 19, following my return from Europe, in which I accepted his terms. I will table these letters and say this—Mr. Perry is paid this large fee that is mentioned here on the days when he comes to Newfoundland. Now he has been in Newfoundland for about five days altogether to date since he began or maybe six days. He does a lot of his work by correspondence, and we have all the departments of Government working actively gathering data for him, and Mr. Channing the former Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance and present clerk of the Executive Government is the liaison between Mr. Perry on the one hand and all of the Government services on the other. So that to avoid running up too large a bill by having Mr. Perry come personally and gather all the data we gather it for him at his direction and thereby keep well within manageable proportions. Because these experts do cost a lot of money.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table the reply to Question No. 23 (See Appendix).

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I have with me the answers to questions Nos. 74, 76 and 78 on the Order Paper of April 9, in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ANSWER 74: (See appendix).

ANSWER 76: (See appendix).

ANSWER 78: (See appendix).

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wonder if I could refer to an answer

the Premier gave me and ask for a little elicitation in the statement in the letter from Mr. Perry to him in which he stated the fee for services will be two hundred dollars a day. The Premier said, I believe, that was only paid when he came here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Practically speaking that is so.

MR. BROWNE: Only the number of days he spends here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not entirely so but practically so.

MR. BROWNE: If he spent time elsewhere on the work he would charge for that in the same way?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He has not resigned as the Director of the Canadian Tax Foundation. He is carrying on his regular work. This is done in between.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I drew the attention of the Attorney General to a rise of two cents in the price of bread. I have heard since that in some places it is going up three cents. And I asked if any machinery were available to check whether that was justifiable or not. I am not making any charges that it is not justifiable. It seems to be a large advance, and I was wondering?

MR. CURTIS: I would say, Mr. Speaker, I went last night and had a conversation with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply under whose department it comes, and I gathered from him it was his impression that his department was still able to operate under the price control regulations. But I may be able to give my honourable friend more information tomorrow afternoon, if not during this afternoon.

Orders of the Day

Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 2; No. 18; No. 28.

Deputy Speaker, Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

"A Bill, An Act Respecting the Department of Highways."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, yesterday we stopped at Section 50. The only change I have to suggest is in part 2, where it says the minister shall. I would propose we substitute the word "may," in case the word "shall" in Section 50 was left to stand.

Motion that the word "shall" in sub-section (2) of Clause 50 be deleted and the word "may" substituted therefor.

MR. BROWNE: I thought we were also going to deal with Section 43, 44 and 45. The understanding was that there would be something to clear that up, that the Attorney General would consult with his law officers in regard to a suitable amendment to make it quite clear he was referring to sidewalks over which the Minister has no jurisdiction.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was not that to be before third reading?

MR. CURTIS: I understood that point was raised but I gave an explanation yesterday which I thought was ultimately satisfactory to everyone. For that reason I did not refer the matter to my department.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I must say I had the same impression, that the Honourable the Attorney General was going to consult with the drafters in his department sometime before third reading to see if there

was any necessity in their considered opinion to clarify the position.

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps we might move on to the next Bill, and before the committee rises we might be able to do that.

"A Bill, An Act to Amend the Department of Public Works."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 8 was allowed to stand.

MR. BROWNE: I pointed out in that sense that the Minister's rights and duties are now transferred to the Minister of Highways a great deal of the work to be performed is exercised between two. There seems to be a conflict between that section and the fact that they are creating a Department of Highways.

In matters relating to public works the minister has and may exercise and shall perform all and every of the rights, liabilities, powers, duties and functions which were immediately before the date of the commencement of this Act by any Act or regulation by any order made under the authority of any Act or regulation or by any Order in Council or Order in Commission vested in or required to be exercised or performed by the Commissioner for Public Utilities or by the Minister of Public Works.

MR. CURTIS: I think that is clear—It is limited to matters relating to Public Works.

MR. BROWNE: That is what is meant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And in (7) it is specifically laid down what are public works.

On motion clause 8 carried. Clause 9 carried. Clause 10:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the Premier stated that in regard to this section and similar sections in the Highways Act he was not particular about it being there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have since learned it is in all the Acts.

MR. BROWNE: Is that so—It is not in the previous Department of Public Works.

MR. CURTIS: No. It is in all the others. It is just a stock clause.

MR. BROWNE: It seems to me to be a very broad power to be given to a Minister.

MR. CURTIS: It is harmless. We could have it stand for the moment.

Clause 11:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, what sort of an offence is envisaged by this section—\$200. Seems to be a pretty steep fine. There must be a very serious offence in mind there.

MR. CURTIS: Is not that the same as the old Act? As far as possible it is purely a breaking up of two Acts. I do not think we put in that \$200. I am inclined to think we took it from the former Act.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite sufficient for people breaking or damaging anything. To my way of thinking we will never stop vandalism without fines like that.

MR. BROWNE: Is it the same?

MR. CURTIS: It was one hundred dollars.

MR. BROWNE: That is what I thought. Now you have doubled it. They have just taken into account the cost of living, I suppose.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Inflation.

MR. CURTIS: I do not think it is important. It gives a discretion.

On motion clause 11 carried.

Clause 12:

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of great importance, because this has to do with all the expenditure which comes under the Department of Public Works and the minister. Now I do not say he did not have previously but certainly he has here power to call tenders and ignore them and give the tenders to his friends. I will say that—give tenders to his friends—He can give a report to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and give no explanation to the House of Assembly. Now we have asked here on several occasions what were the tenders called for any particular job and the answer invariably given is it has not been customary to give the tenders when tenders are called for, to the House of Assembly. Why? If the House of Assembly is properly to exercise its function of control of the public purse how can it be done if it is not given an explanation when an expenditure is made. Now it seems to me to be utterly reasonable to expect the Minister of Public Works to lay here on the Table of the House a list of tenders for any particular job and then explain to us if he has not given the contract to the lowest tender.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not think they are tabled in the House of Commons?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, they certainly are. Yes all tenders for jobs performed here costing hundreds of thousands of dollars, for jobs down to Twillingate, Carbonear, Bonavista Bay and all the numerous jobs have been

on tender and the tenders have been published. It seems to me invariably the lowest tender was adopted. There are tricks in all trades because there are tricks in that too, a contract is often given for a small job and then the contractor who gets that at a low tender gets in and when he gets his feet in is given a lot of work far beyond the original tender. However, that is not the point, Mr. Chairman. The point is we should have a definite definition such as in the Public Works Act before 1949. I do not know if it was adopted by the Commission of Government, but my recollection is that in the old days any work that cost over five hundred dollars should be put out on tender. Now I am not thinking on that figure of five hundred dollars but I believe we should have some figure say one thousand or fifteen hundred dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is a figure. The Revenue and Audit Act covers it. That is the law now. Tenders must be called.

MR. BROWNE: Well, while on the subject could we have the Audit Act Section read so we can be enlightened on this. This seems to me to be too loose and gives the Minister too much power.

On motion clause 12 stand. Section 13:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why that section is put in. Surely the messenger boy in the department cannot sign contracts on behalf of the Government. That seems to me to go without saying.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That does not do any harm.

MR. BROWNE: I do not suppose that contradicts the previous section which requires the Minister to call for

tenders. Could we have an assurance on that?

Clauses 13 and -4 carried. Clause 15 carried. Clause 16:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, could the Attorney General tell us whether that is in the previous Act?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is in the previous Highways Act. We passed it already in the Highways Act.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, it is exactly the same.

On motion clause 16 carried.

Clause 17:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on that one I have a note here—How does the Minister sell, lease or otherwise dispose of? Is there anything in the Act which states how?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, in the Revenue and Audit Act it says all property of the Government sold must be sold on tender. The Minister personally does not buy or sell anything, but he is permitted to buy and sell, but the law says the way in which he must do it is through another minister, the Minister of Supply, and by tender if the amount is more than five hundred dollars to buy and if it is worth not less than a certain amount he must call for tenders to sell it.

MR. BROWNE: We have the Audit Act here and have just taken a quick glance at it. We have not been able to find it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We did it on the recommendation of Mr. J. C. Thompson when Peat, Marwick, Mitchell, were setting up our whole financial system—On their recommendation we incorporated it into our Revenue and Audit Act.

On motion Clause 17 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, if I sent this over to the Premier could he tell us where it is. I cannot find it here. I have not looked through it all, of course.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe it is in the Supply Act which created the Department of Supply.

MR. HOLLETT: I have seen where a lot of machinery was sold by the Minister of Public Works, tractors and that sort of stuff.

MR. SMALLWOOD: When he comes to sell it is sold by Supply.

MR. HOLLETT: At any rate they usually sold for very small figures. I have never seen any tenders published or called for in the press or anywhere else. Maybe they have been. I have not seen them. I just want to make sure of that.

On motion Clause 17 stand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If we do not pass that he won't be allowed to sell.

MR. HIGGINS: That is a good thing.

MR. HOLLETT: I want an explanation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well the explanation is he can only sell through Supply, and buy through the Minister of Supply. No Minister of the Crown is allowed to buy a nickle's worth, one cent's worth—any purchases made are just. Requisitions from the Minister of Health may be a million dollars worth a year but he does not buy one nickle's worth. What he does is requisition and that goes to the Department of Supply.

MR. BROWNE: It says here he may enter into agreements.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But that is the way he purchases. Now the same thing applies to sales. The Minister of Health, the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Mines and Resources all ministers have to get certain things but they do not just go over and buy all they want. Requisitions are sent to the Minister of Supply who does the buying—similarly with sales. The Government are constantly selling old cars and trucks and equipment, and it is all sold in the same way.

MR. HOLLETT: That is what I thought. But it definitely says here the minister may sell and I have studied each line.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He sells through the Minister of Supply. That is the way he sells.

MR. HOLLETT: This tells him he may, and there is nothing against his doing it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Minister who deals with that is home sick this evening. If he were here he would give chapter and verse. He is home, sick in bed.

MR. BROWNE: In the absence of the Minister who is home, sick in bed, is there no one there to connect up these two Acts. It says plainly that the Minister of Public Works shall invite tenders—the Minister may enter into an agreement he deems necessary or advisable and the Minister may sell—and the Minister may buy anything he pleases—Then we are told it is the Minister of Municipal Affairs who does it, the Minister of Supply. Now the Premier knows what we are after here. There must be some reconciliation between these two powers—the Minister of Municipal

Affairs also has the same power. Certainly according to this section here the Minister has these powers and he can do it and nobody can stop him.

MR. CURTIS: If you look up the Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply Act you will see under section 6 of that Act, Chapter 16, duties, powers and functions of the Minister shall extend to include all matters relating to housing, to municipal affairs, price control, rent control, the procurement of all supplies for the public services, all matters in respect of supplies and services not specifically assigned to any other minister and such other matters as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council assigns.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Highways): I believe the distinction there is if something is to be purchased the minister must go to the Department of Supply but if the Minister of Public Works wishes to call for tenders for a road he can do that without reference to the Minister of Supply.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He does not do it with the building of roads.

MR. BROWNE: It has nothing to do with the building of roads now, the Department of Public Works. Supposing, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier wants to call for tenders for the construction of a building of the Memorial University to be done through the Department of Public Works, the Minister may call for these tenders. And I draw the attention of the Attorney General to the fact that that provision is too wide. The Leader of the Opposition has just drawn attention to the fact that the Minister may sell, dispose—It is not contained in the original Act in the Department of Public Works—it is

certainly not—Clause 17—that is the one dealing with rent and hire and has nothing in it about selling at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It appears we are not now following—What we are looking for is not in the Act with regard to sales of goods—not the purchase but the sales—That is governed by orders in Commission which is what we have been following to this moment.

MR. BROWNE: Until now you are going to put it in here.

MR. SMALLWOOD:: That may be so.

MR. BROWNE: That is so—It must be—It is not in the previous Act. There is nothing about sales in the original Act.

MR. HOLLETT: If it is necessary to sell—Sell by tenders of public auction.

MR. CURTIS: We get nothing if we sell by auction. It is the least productive way to sell.

MR. BROWNE: At any rate it would let the public see you are acting in a fair manner and not giving favours to friends. You have a lot of equipment you are going to get rid of, in the Department of Public Works and the Department of Highways, and you call in friends and say—Look here, I have a few cars and trucks there, if you want to take them we will let you have them for such and such a price—Is that the right way to do it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is never done that way by us.

MR. BROWNE: How was it done?

MR. SMALLWOOD: By the Minister of Supply.

MR. BROWNE: Under what power.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Under the Orders in Commission—Mr. Walter Marshall, C.B.E., Deputy Minister of Finance and Controller of the Treasury. That is by Orders in Commission which this Government has carried out faithfully always. These sales are made by the Minister of Supply always.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Commission of Government finished its duties about eight years ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Many orders they made are still the law of the land.

MR. BROWNE: Here you are going to put into the Statutes that power.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no doubt this Clause 17 in some respects contradicts that—

MR. BROWNE: It is intended to replace.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not by Government policy. It might be intended by the man who drafted the Bill.

MR. CURTIS: Someone said it was not in the Bill. If we look at Section 15 and 16 we find exactly the same clause. It is slightly different—but my honourable friend might be able to recognize the similarity.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition said he studied each line in it and—

MR. HOLLETT: I did.

MR. CURTIS: I quote sections 16 and seventeen of the original Bill—Perhaps my honourable friends will follow me. Any person appointed for that purpose by the Minister may summon before him and examine on

oath any persons he deems necessary respecting any matter relating to the business of the Department upon which their appearance is required and may require those persons to bring with them such papers, plans, books, documents, and things as he deems necessary to examine with reference to that matter and he may administer the oath to those persons and they shall be paid such amounts for their time and disbursements as the Minister decides.

(2) Every person summoned in accordance with subsection (1) who neglects or refuses to attend and be examined or to bring with him such papers, plans, books, documents, and things, as he is required to bring is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a penalty of twenty dollars and to a further penalty of five dollars for every day during which he neglects or refuses to do so.

17.—(1) The Minister may sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of any real or other property of Her Majesty in right of Newfoundland, not specifically assigned to any other Minister or department, when no longer required for the use of any public works.

(2) The Minister may rent, hire or lease any tools, machinery or equipment under his management and control to any person or firm for such period and subject to such terms and conditions as he may stipulate.

(3) All moneys received by the Minister under subsections (1) and (2) shall be paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

MR. HOLLETT: It says, "under the authority of the Minister." What is the authority of the Minister under this Act. How can he sell it? Is there not some regulation or some section of some Act which says how any Minister may dispose of property.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. I thought there was but there is not. It is an Order in Commission. It is an Order in Council. The Commission was not called "Council" but the Commission passed it in the days of Commission of Government and it is still known as an Order in Commission, and is still carried out by us.

MR. BROWNE: I might say the Attorney General is right to a great extent. But there is a distinction between the two clauses, because this one has the provision "when no longer required for use of any public works, it may be sold. That is left out here.

MR. CURTIS: No. Section 17 says—when no longer required for the use of any public works.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is wrong with the honourable gentleman? He is confused since he went to Ottawa. He is not the same man at all. His mind is not here. His heart is not here.

MR. BROWNE: I concede on that one.

On motion clauses 17 and 18 carried: Clause 19:

MR. BROWNE: Is there some other Act dealing with compensation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is one that is identical with the clause in the Highways Act?

MR. BROWNE: Where is the one providing for compensation because this one says—provided by this Act—

MR. CURTIS: Actually, Mr. Chairman, if I might say, we have under preparation now an "Expropriation Act."

MR. BROWNE: In other words it is still by this Act until you bring in that one?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, but I understand this Act does not contain sufficient powers of expropriation. And we propose to pass an "Expropriation" Act that will take in all the Acts in all the various departments and put them all in one Act so that there will be uniformity through the service. We are going to bring in an Act which will fix the basis of giving compensation. We will do that this session.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out this Act in the revised Statutes is not complete, as the Minister knows there is an amendment which extended the powers of the Minister in regard to expropriation. It is in 1953 or 1954. A couple of amendments have been added. Now then we pass this and it becomes law tomorrow and you have no provision for paying compensation.

MR. CURTIS: Except it shall be ascertained in the manner contained in law.

MR. BROWNE: This will be the law tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Obviously nobody is going to enforce it. There is some common law.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is existing legislation there at least, three different ways whereby the Government can acquire land.

MR. CURTIS: My honourable friend is right. There is an Act under preparation which undertakes to bring in this section—put it that way—

On motion clause 10 carried. Clause 20 carried: Clause 21 read:

21. A copy of any map, plan or other document in the custody of the Deputy Minister, certified by him or by the Chief Engineer of the Department

to be a true copy, is deemed to be authentic and is prima facie evidence of the same legal effect as the original for the purpose of any proceeding in any court or for any other purpose.

On motion clauses 21 through 25 carried.

MR. CURTIS: There was a clause allowed to stand—the clause about boards and such—if my honourable friend would look up the Department of Health Act, he will find it is Chapter 17, clause 13, page 169, he will find the same thing. And in Public Welfare, page 174, clause 14, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may establish such boards, etc., and in Municipal Affairs it is a standard clause.

MR. BROWNE: I understand the Board of Public Works was in existence many years ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think, Mr. Chairman, you will find that had an Act of its own. That did not grow out of a vague clause like that.

On motion clause 10 carried.

Clause 12.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In connection with clause 12, I learned this within the last two minutes from the Controller of the Treasury—A Treasury Circular governs that matter, and the Treasury Circular itself flows out of an order in Council passed by the Commission of Government—All the Government purchases and all the Government sales of goods amounting in value to five hundred dollars or more must be by Treasury Circular—and I can produce the Treasury Circular—I would be glad to table that here. It was passed before we came into office and we carried it out—property must be sold in the same way, that is by the

Minister of Supply—If the honourable gentleman likes at any time to table a question asking for the Treasury Circular I will be glad to table it.

MR. BROWNE: No, I do not doubt that. I am sure there must be some regulation of that kind. What I am concerned with is that the tenders should be published. Why should not the tenders be published? Because here you see all is necessary for the Minister is on his own to invite tenders and then act upon the tender. And in cases where tenders are called and it seems to the Minister it is not expedient to let such work to the lowest tender he should obtain the consent of the Governor in Council before not accepting the lowest tender. But do you not think the House of Assembly should be informed of that. Because after all the Government is acting between the time the House is closed and opened again. I submit it would be a good practice and would let the public know that everything was being done properly. You cannot expect people not to be suspicious when they see such things covered up and we do not get the tenders. Here we see "CMIC" getting all this work and Chester Dawe getting all this work and so on like that—these are supporters—closely associated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What gives the honourable gentleman the idea that Chester Dawe is a supporter. I doubt that he ever cast a Liberal vote in his life. Chester Dawe I thought was a Tory.

MR. BROWNE: He never voted for me in his life.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not dealt with in this Bill. That is a matter of general policy. Either we will table all tenders we ask or whether we will not—that decision is not affect-

ed by this clause in this Bill unless we are going to put a similar clause in all Bills—So we might as well carry 12.

On motion clause 12 carried.

Motion that the committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

On motion the Committee recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Chairman returned to the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the City of Corner Brook Act, 1955.

Clause 1, carried: Clause 2:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this is a very complicated section here. Is there anybody who can explain it to us what is meant by retroactive taxes. For instance under (2)—that means if they forget to do something last year and do not do it until next year they can go back two years and put in assessment taxes. This section is now going to validate it and it is going to become retroactive, and they can impose any taxes so omitted or invalidated upon any estate or person, and such rates and taxes shall be subject to appeal. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is unusual to introduce a subject of this kind. I do not know if my honourable and learned friend on my left, the member for St. John's East, who is experienced in the Council, can tell us whether there is such provision in the Municipal Council Act, but I do not remember any.

MR. HIGGINS: It has never been invoked.

MR. CURTIS: I do not know any precedent for this, Mr. Chairman. I may say I am sponsoring this Bill in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply,

and if it were not a Bill that the City of Corner Brook wanted to have passed promptly I would leave it to him to deal with. They made certain arrangements to make a loan, and all the arrangements collapses if the Bill is not passed before we adjourn. Let us take a case: Suppose there are three properties there—Two were properly assessed and taxed and the third one was assessed but some illegality about the way the assessment was made. Perhaps it was locked up and they could not get in. Perhaps there was some technicality which was not observed. Well, you got to choose between two things—You got to exempt that from taxes for the past year or make it retroactively—Well, what is the fair thing to do under the circumstances? Is it fair to make the adjourning people pay their taxes and allow this party to escape just because through some oversight or omission or technical breach it was not valid and not properly assessed. There is no question but that people who owned the house, who had the house, knew they would have to be taxed. They knew that the taxes had to be paid. They knew there would be some taxes. They knew they could not have none.

I do not like this kind of tax but the City of Corner Brook have asked for it. They are absolutely behind the new council and they have asked for this legislation. I see nothing unfair about it, although it is, I think, perhaps a little unusual.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney General would give any reason for asking for such legislation. I can understand any city council or town council having growing pains and making errors and that sort of thing. Did they give any specific instances of irregularities or informalities?

MR. CURTIS: I don't know whether any of the members for the district could enlighten us on that. Perhaps my honourable friend might know the type of errors made. The only one I did hear of would apply to a later clause, where the magistrate was appointed to conduct a plebiscite and went and conducted the plebiscite and after it was conducted he found that he did not have a written appointment, or something like that—absence of writing or something like that, some little defect. That is the type of thing I understood took place. I do not know whether the honourable member for the district knows the type of thing.

MR. J. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, I understand it fairly vaguely and not too thoroughly. I think one dealt with the fact of absorbing four municipalities into the city and the boundaries of the city extended and the new city area joined the normal town council areas of Corner Brook West, East, Curling, etc., took in them. As you know, Corner Brook was a town council itself in the sense not of the other town councils—You must consider itself in the sense not of the other town councils. You must consider the councillors and mayor of the city council of Corner Brook devoted their spare time freely and they have been labouring without the technical advantages that the City of St. John's has, without the advantage of starting from scratch practically, as St. John's did. Suddenly overnight the area grew in some cases without any control and without any proper discretion, and they find themselves trying to look after the problems of a city. In doing that they found themselves probably overlooking, through error, revisions of assessment in certain properties and areas—and there is a general feeling amongst the tax payers—they do not

mind paying taxes but when they hear tell of John Jones or Joe Smith not paying taxes they get the wrong impression that they might be receiving a favour from the City Council. This is not to provide a hardship. It is to correct any fault that may have occurred. As I said yesterday it is part of the period of trial and error. I think you will find if you study the council of Corner Brook there are members on it who are friends of our honourable friends on the opposite side as well as this side of the House. As I said, we are all working together regardless of political ideas for the betterment of our city. And this has been asked for with a lot of detail given, with proper consultation of their lawyers, Barry & Smith, and I think you can rest assured it is not done for any other purpose but the good of the city.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I do not notice anything about a rebate in case of over taxation. It does not say anything about that. I don't think Corner Brook, if they get a court of revision and start right from the very date everything is revised and properly appraised, will have any trouble collecting taxes. But to leave that out would possibly give leeway for errors in the assessors. In other words they could go to work and do half and say, what odds, we will do it next year and get it back in three years if we want to. That is a fair law for taxpayers.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to explain that. Possibly the City of St. John's does not understand Corner Brook. What he does not know when he made that statement is due to lack of knowledge when we formed the City of Corner Brook the assessment value of the Town of Curling and Corner Brook West and Corner Brook East and the assessment of the Town of Corner Brook itself. Corner

Brook is a company town primarily and the old homes there were built by the company and the valuation might have been unfair in respect to the valuation of the other town councils. And it is because of this, to get uniformity of valuation and appraisal that this request is made. And I respectfully submit to my honourable friend from St. John's North that these gentlemen know what they are doing.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to agree with the honourable member for Humber East. This is not the first amendment of the Corner Brook Act, indeed we had some difficulty in trying to trace it, it refers to Act 3' of 1955 already amended by Act 28 of 1956, which interpreted this clause, which is now being further amended by adding (b), (c) and (d). I can appreciate the reasoning and I must thank the honourable member for Humber East for his explanation which is one I can understand.

I presume, Sir, that this in no way infringes on that rather controversial subject of the School Tax. I notice the appeal is no longer to magistrates or magistrates or district court or court of revision—I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney General can say if the school tax question has any bearing on this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not at all.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): I might say, Mr. Chairman, this is just to tidy up any mistakes here or correct any errors because of the amalgamation of the five towns into one city. Naturally the towns as they were before had different ideas and different tax rates and all that sort of business. And in order to tie it in—when you have four or five towns come into one city overnight

as it were you must expect some errors—But the most urgent part of this Bill is and why it is necessary to get it through, why we want to get through this Bill and assented to is because until this Bill is passed they can do nothing in Corner Brook because this gives them authority to raise their bonds, which they have not got now. They just have not got it and cannot go ahead with their work.

MR. BROWNE: I do not understand why they cannot raise their bonds.

MR. BALLAM: They have a bond issue on the American market and there is nothing authorizing them to raise money except on the Canadian Market. I think you will see that later on.

MR. BROWNE: But, Mr. Chairman, "notwithstanding the lapse of time"—no matter how much time goes by they can go back ten years—It does not seem to me reasonable. I do not know how often they make assessments. It seems to me they make mistakes and they are the ones who should suffer—They cannot go back indefinitely—If it said a year or so but to go back two or three.

MR. BALLAM: It has only been a city a year.

MR. BROWNE: This will be in effect five or ten years time.

MR. CURTIS: No. We plan to bring in a new Act which we thought would be ready this year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A long Act like the City of St. John's Act.

MR. CURTIS: We have it here still not ready. This Act will probably be in force only until next session.

MR. BROWNE: Because next year, as my honourable friend pointed out, you have an amendment there dealing with interim collection of taxes—I do not know if the explanation given by the two honourable members for Humber whether that means that by taking in the different towns they have an assortment of assessments and they can go back and alter these. I do not think that is a good idea. They should have a new assessment. I do not think it would be right to go back and alter these assessments.

MR. CURTIS: I think, actually Mr. Chairman, the position was that when they took over Corner Brook City they took over the assessment roll the board were using and carried on that—But that was not in accordance with the Act—According to the Act they had to make their own—and instead of making their own they just used the Bowater's and carried on that—This is to legitimize the use of that until there is a further assessment.

MR. BROWNE: Could you tell us what is involved?

MR. CURTIS: The only thing, they borrowed a lot of money and have done a lot of work, and if you take from under their feet taxes they are depending on collecting you are going to jeopardize the city.

MR. BROWNE: Here is what I don't see—The Attorney General has said they took an assessment roll from the company and they acted according to that.

MR. CURTIS: And that was not legal under their Act. They had to make their own assessment.

MR. BROWNE: So they are going to make a new assessment.

MR. CURTIS: They will, but they are going to use this until they do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This legalizes their doing so.

MR. BROWNE: They are going to make a new one and make it retroactive.

MR. CURTIS: That is not the idea. They can in case they are not on the Bowater Assessment. They can put it in, I think—I think we can safely leave it to them—They have to be re-elected this year.

On motion clause 2 carried.

Clause 3:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, the position is this: section one says this is the section which they must follow in future but section 8 is to ratify the plebiscite—They had a plebiscite and all voted but there was a technical error in the plebiscite—I think it was that the revising officer was not formally appointed or some such thing. But there was a plebiscite. The vote was taken. They authorized it. And this is to save them having the same plebiscite on the same thing.

MR. BROWNE: Is the position that there was no authority in the first place?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, there was authority but it was through some technicality.

MR. BROWNE: I have the Act here. "The Council shall not incur indebtedness in excess of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars without prior approval of the voters of the city." There was no machinery in the Act I suppose to carry it out.

MR. HIGGINS: They went under the Local Government Act, I believe.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, another question I would like to ask—

what currency this money is payable in—It may be in lawful money of Canada or lawful money of the United States—Does that mean to say a person has his choice?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the Council has the choice.

MR. BROWNE: There is a big difference between lawful monies of the United States and Canada. Of course it means if they were to borrow money in the United States and give the people down there an option of collecting their money in Canadian funds they are going to lose five per cent.

MR. CURTIS: Actually this is not a Government guarantee—They are raising the money on their own.

MR. BROWNE: Why not—Were they not given authority?

MR. BALLAM: They were given the authority but did not use it.

MR. BROWNE: I think they were given the authority under the Guarantee Act. I have it here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At a meeting of the council a few weeks ago it was decided to try and as far as possible raise their loan on their own credit, without the guarantee of the Government. That was a decision to which a lot of publicity was given. The fact that we have authority to guarantee their bonds does not in fact mean they have asked us to do so.

On motion clause 3 carried.

Clause 4:

MR. CURTIS Under 4 (2) in the last line and "adopted for that year."

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Chairman, I suppose this provision has been inserted at the request of the

house issuing the debentures. It looks like that because I never heard of anything like that before. It is completely novel in this country. Supposing a man has a debenture and the interest is not paid he can take a writ and get judgment and then send the sheriff up to collect and he has to produce the assessment roll—Here is the roll—here is the rate as well—say eight per cent. Now say the debenture is ten thousand dollars he figures out how much is the total amount of tax and what the rate is and then how much should be added to that to give him his ten thousand. It may be .25 or .1 or something of that kind—It is quite new here. I might say that in other countries and certainly in the British Isles and in Ireland where they put in provisions of all kinds and add on to the rates. And whenever there is a fire that is added on to the rates. The rates go up very high as high as eighteen and twenty shillings to the pound. But that is new here. I presume that is the reason it is put there.

MR. CURTIS: It is put in in lieu of a Government guarantee.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I imagine the market being so tight the American House makes it pretty tough, that is all—not only high rates of interest—There is a very tight market in the world today.

MR. HOLLETT: Is it anticipated the owner will have to take action against the City of Corner Brook?

MR. CURTIS: It is something they want to be assured of—If you give a man a mortgage on a house you want to be sure.

MR. HOLLETT: The people of Corner Brook will be subject to the risk of having extra assessments put

on property in order to satisfy an unpaid debenture.

MR. CURTIS: I suppose we would almost be in the same position.

MR. BROWNE: No. I don't think there is any provision like that. I have never seen anything like that, not here.

MR. HIGGINS: We have not got that here.

MR. CURTIS: You get a Government guarantee.

MR. BALLAM: This is only required because they don't get it.

MR. CURTIS: These people are paying their own bills.

MR. HIGGINS: We are not saying a word about St. John's.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask this one question? Do the people of Corner Brook know the provisions of this Bill?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know personally.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, I could answer that—All the meetings of the council are open to the public, and you are well represented—I can assure the Honourable member for St. John's South they are well represented with a favourable press.

MR. BROWNE: Was this discussed?

MR. FORSEY: This was discussed in general and in detail. I imagine it must have been discussed in the town council in detail, and certainly at public meetings. I do not know if there were any meetings in private. It is not meant to do anything other than to help in the need there. We need money to carry on the things needed and that the people are crying for, roads and road improvements.

MR. HOLLETT: I have some doubt that the people of Corner Brook are going to be very grateful to us people for passing this—First they can go and borrow up to two million without the consent of the voters.

MR. CURTIS: No. They have a plebiscite. The effect of this Act is that the plebiscite is accepted.

MR. HOLLETT: It does not say anything about that. "The Council may, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council but without obtaining the approval of the voters, at any time and from time to time authorize the issue and sale of debentures in such principal amounts as the Council may deem necessary to provide money to repay or refund the whole or any part of outstanding debentures or other securities of the corporation."

Now we are going to allow the Council to do that without the approval of the voters and then allow the owners of the debentures to come in here and get a writ from the Supreme Court and get judgment against a city council for so much and then assess the people of Corner Brook the amount necessary to pay it back. I do not think it will be a good idea if anything ever comes of it, if this Act ever has to be evoked by the debenture people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I myself read with considerable interest the account in the "Western Star" of a meeting of the Government of Corner Brook at which this matter was discussed. The meeting was open to the public and the press of Corner Brook, and all of the councillors present expressed their opinion. The opinions were not unanimous, I think maybe one or two councillors expressed some mild dissent. But generally the Coun-

cil was pretty well overwhelming in its view; and its view was that they had to start early in their career as a city to be able to get their necessary loans on their own credit, to begin early in their career to break away from their dependency on the Government and on Government guarantees for floating their own bond issues. That appeared to be a very thorough account of it in the "Western Star" and I do not doubt that the same account appeared on the radio. And there was an editorial in the Western Star praising the council for their decision. I believe I saw some letters from the public again praising their decision. So that, while I don't think for one moment that the public of Corner Brook are aware of the details of this Bill, I believe that the general public of Corner Brook are aware of their city Government's policy to float their own bond issue without guarantees from the Government. Well now, once they make that decision it surely follows that a new city attempting to sell its promissory note, so to speak, in an amount of a couple of million dollars in the United States, a country which knows so very little of Newfoundland let alone of the City of Corner Brook, in a financial market which is extremely tight at the present time, would, I think, undoubtedly impose some pretty stringent conditions, and these conditions, if the city is to sell its bonds, must meet. And these conditions are set forth in this Bill.

Now if the city Government of Corner Brook wishes to do that I do not think we should worry too much here in this House. Now if the city Government of Corner Brook set out to do something quite unsound then it is our duty here in this House to prevent them, it is our clear duty

here to prevent it. But they are not attempting anything unsound. If the City of Corner Brook, which represents all the people of Corner Brook, floats the bond in an amount of two million dollars without the guarantee of the Government of Newfoundland then every last shop, every last bit of property, every last house in Corner Brook is surely the security for the bond. What else can be the security if it is not the general ability of the City Government to raise the money from the people by taxation.

MR. HOLLETT: Am I to understand then the situation was clearly and publicly announced in Corner Brook and the people clearly understood what they were up against before that plebiscite was run off?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That they understood the terms of the Bill now before us I doubt very much—I doubt that they understand it to the moment.

MR. HOLLETT: Do they understand they are liable for having the sheriff come in and raise the price of the assessment on their property if they default.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I doubt they have heard of that yet.

MR. HOLLETT: I am doubtful we ought to enact such legislation without being sure of the fact that the people in Corner Brook know exactly—Of course if I am given to understand as I am by the Honourable the Premier and the honourable member for Humber East the people are all for this why should I object?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not saying the people are all for this. I do not know whether they are or not. I do know the city Government held a plebiscite amongst the people, the tax-

payers of Corner Brook as to whether or not they were willing that the City Government should float a bond issue to raise money on the credit of the city with which to build roads according to their pretty ambitions programme. And the citizens in that plebiscite voted to authorize the city Government to borrow that money. That I do know. That is common knowledge. Everybody knows that.

MR. HOLLETT: Was that not under Government guarantee?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think not—No—The simple question was—"Do you agree city council should borrow two million dollars on the credit of the city and spend the proceeds on this road programme which has been outlined and is quite familiar to all the people." They voted yes, we are in favour. Then at a subsequent session of the city Government it was stated, it was decided that they would not seek the guarantee of the Government but would break away on their own and raise it on the credit of the city and nothing else.

Now I doubt very much that the average citizen in Corner Brook today realized what that means, if the city sells bonds especially in the United States—it might not be so much the case if they sold their bonds in Canada—but Canada is a very difficult country today in which to sell bonds—I doubt that citizens realize that the details of this Bill would then be put into effect in case of need—I doubt it. I doubt it.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, I must endorse the way the Premier said, so that my views would be made clear. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition expressed what he thought I said. The Premier says the people

were not aware of the details of this Bill in regard to the section on the bond issue to be floated. But they did vote, and the plebiscite was purely and simple to authorize the city to raise a bond issue for their road improvement. I mean, there was nothing in the plebiscite saying—"under Government guarantee"—nothing like that. It was purely and simply giving authority. As I said, in November there will be an election coming up, and I think if they are dissatisfied they will have the right to show this dissatisfaction. This is done because we cannot get the money any other way. To try and hinder it would be to stop all progress in the work.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, it must be realized by this House, at the time that plebiscite was held, the city of Corner Brook had been assured by the Government of a guarantee of a loan which they might raise, and it was understood by the people of Corner Brook that the guarantee would be forthcoming. Apparently the situation arose where under Government guarantee now money could be raised.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not the case at all. That is pure invention.

MR. HOLLETT: I say it is an invention.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Somebody invented it—not the honourable gentleman—there is not any truth in it.

MR. HOLLETT: Everybody else raised money on the guarantee or they tried—I grant you none of the new industries raised any. Why I do not know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Be fair. Why make a statement without knowing it

to be true. That is a very serious thing to say, an irresponsible thing to say, that the city of Corner Brook could not sell bonds.

MR. HOLLETT: I ask the honourable the Premier to take that back, that I made a statement untrue.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think the honourable member was lying and trying to deceive. But I say the statement is untrue. He either knows it to be correct or does not know it to be correct.

MR. HOLLETT: Well I am used to being bawled at every once in a while. But I want to make sure I am perfectly understood and the people of Corner Brook ought to know what they are up against under this section of this particular Act. And I am wondering if they do—As I say on the Statute Books there was an Act authorizing the overnment to guarantee a loan to the city of Corner Brook. I take it when the plebiscite was held most people thought they were going to get it under this guarantee. But it is from an American bond house apparently and you are giving them authority to go in and get a judgment for one or two million dollars when the interest is not paid, in our own Supreme Court, and have the sheriff go up and make assessments and have the money paid back. That has never been heard of in this country before, not to my knowledge, and I am wondering if we are doing the right thing.

MR. FORSEY: If Mr. Chairman would permit me: Would you explain to me what source would the people of Corner Brook have to know that under the Act any bond issue would be guaranteed by the government. Would the same source be available

to them now under this as was then? There was no special decree, no special statutory posting prior to the plebiscite, just a plebiscite conducted by the city. There was no Government regulation warning the people or advising the people of the conditions of the plebiscite. Therefore there is the same source of information, which you say they must have relied on at that time, is available to them now, which is the press and radio and attending meetings of the council.

What I am trying to say is, freedom of the press—and they have their meetings in public—You are talking about people's sources of information.

MR. HOLLETT: It was generally known an Act was passed in this House, authorizing a loan. I take it it was known generally.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I doubt it extremely just as I doubt they know today the details of this Bill. I do not think for one moment that more than one per cent of the population of Corner Brook is aware of the details of this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: I am quite sure there is not. There was a Government guarantee.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nor were more than two per cent aware that the Government had authority to guarantee a bond issue if the city asked, which the city has not done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind the committee that clause 4 was carried and we started to read items from clause 5.

MR. SMALLWOOD: (a) should be amended by cutting out the word "Provincial."

MR. BROWNE: No. 16. There seems to be a sort of unusual thing, and I think it is sort of incomplete.—"Every person who shall hereafter engage in transfer of any land within the city, shall within two months of such transfer, notify the council of the names of all parties engaged in the transfer and the location of the land being transferred."

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a pity that was not done all over Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, all docks, quays, wharves, ships and structure shall be deemed to be within and to be part of the city.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is surely arising out of that case in Port aux Basques a couple or three years ago in which the Town Council of Port aux Basques attempted to collect some city tax on a boat, or, I thought, it was on a building separated from the mainland.

MR. BROWNE: No, Sir, coal being discharged. It was argued they did not belong to the city or something and therefore not within the jurisdiction of the city.

MR. CURTIS: It just extends the limit.

MR. BROWNE: A ship of Bowaters comes in to load paper and the bond holders want to get money can go and assess and might tax the ship.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I doubt that Bowaters are subject to the Act because by Statute they are not subject to taxes of any kind.

MR. BROWNE: Even Municipal?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, they are exempt from especially that.

MR. BROWNE: Well, take the "CNR" boats.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or the cement mill or the gypsum.

MR. BROWNE: What is the effect of such an unusual provision, to have ships part of the city, what is involved?

MR. CURTIS: It just makes them part of the city for taxation purposes—That is, if you do business on a ship within the harbour it is part of it.

MR. BROWNE: Take ships that have a bar selling liquors to passengers, tourists coming down.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the law of Newfoundland they would come under, but just for tax purposes I do not know about a ship.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe there is any similar provision in the city of St. John's Act. I wonder if the Attorney General would tell me, other than the reason advanced, this should be here?

MR. MERCER: The city of St. John's boundaries, Mr. Chairman, run from the lighthouse across the Narrows. It runs across the Narrows but takes in the Harbour of St. John's. Their boundary runs along the shoreline.

MR. HIGGINS: I still don't remember anything in the city of St. John's Act which has quite that phrasing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not necessary if the boundary runs from Chain Rock because it takes in the harbour.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: The end of the cove is our jurisdiction for taxa-

tion, Job's Cove. We have no jurisdiction over the wharf whatsoever. That is Federal. At the present time all we can collect taxes for is as far as the waters' edge at the end of any cove.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this may be an infringement on the common law rights. Suppose Rockefeller's yacht comes down and comes into the wharf, or any ship comes down, I don't see how they can become part of the city and therefore liable to taxes.

MR. CURTIS: The idea is not to tax the actual property. If for instance one of these Water Street wholesalers goes around to Corner Brook in a boat and does business on the boat, it makes that boat city territory while it is there and so liable to the taxes that other vendors pay. Otherwise if a man goes to Corner Brook and does business from a hotel he has to pay taxes but if he stays on a boat he does not have to unless we make the boat part of the city for the purpose of collecting that tax.

MR. HIGGINS: I ask the Attorney General again, is there any precedent for that in any legislation?

MR. CURTIS: It is home made. Let us see in five years time.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Do you mean all the business taken you charge them there?

On motion clause 5 carried.

Motion, that the committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried.

MR. CURTIS: If we refer back to Bill No. 2, the Highway's Act—I have been in touch with the drafters of this legislation and they feel that

this definition that they have is covered in the situation. And I would suggest to the committee that since they have taken the responsibility for it we might let them worry about it.

MR. HIGGINS: In other words section 25 covers the situation envisaged.

Clauses 43, 44 and 45 were already carried.

On motion of Mr. Smallwood, the committee rose to report having passed these three Bills.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. G. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the Bill No. 2, An Act Respecting the Department of Highways and asked me to report same without amendment, Bill No. 16, "An Act Respecting the Department of Public Works with some amendment, Bill No. 26, "An Act Further to Amend the Corner Brook Act, 1955," without amendment.

On motion report received: On motion Bill No. 2, "An Act Respecting the Department of Highways," read a third time now, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Bill No. 18, "A Bill, An Act Respecting the Department of Public Works"—The Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed this Bill without amendments.

On motion report received.

On motion and with the consent of the House the Bill was now read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Bill No. 26, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to

them referred and have passed Bill No. 26, "A Bill, An Act Further to Amend the City of Corner Brook Act, 1955."

On motion report received.

On motion and with the consent of the House the Bill was now read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 3:00 of the clock.

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

FRIDAY, April 12th, 1957.

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

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege: My attention has been called to a news report appearing in the "Evening Telegram" under date of April 10th. With your permission, Sir, I will read the article. It is very short.

"Checked for his opinion on the holiday question Corner Brook Staff—Jack Forsey, Liberal member of the House of Assembly, Humber East, said Monday; any Government decision to declare a whole holiday for these establishments would be based "on preference of the employees." Mr. Forsey arrived in Corner Brook during the weekend and returned to St. John's Monday after discussing the holiday question in Corner Brook. He was recently appointed by Premier Smallwood to a Provincial Government select committee to study the existing holiday situation.

"Our big concern is to do the greatest good for the greatest number of persons," he told the Telegram in a telephone interview. "We'll be working mainly in co-operation with municipal council throughout the island."

"Of course it's an employees' holiday and our findings and decision will be based on the will of the employees. We plan to set up hearings in the various centres and they'll be given our primary consideration."

Affairs Minister Myles Murray is convener of the committee, consisting of five Assembly members in addition to Mr. Forsey. The group is to hold public sessions in the next two or three weeks and later submit a report on its findings to the Provincial Government.

Mr. Forsey said while here he would attempt to "set up some means of determining the preferences of the majority, possibly by conducting limited inquiries, with a view towards getting a wide range of opinions."

He added that consideration would also be given to requests from outside groups and these forwarded directly to the Provincial Capital.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a member of that committee. One meeting of that committee was held on Monday at the same time as the honourable gentleman mentioned here was in Corner Brook. I think it is grossly unfair—I hope the honourable member has been misquoted in this paper. If he is properly quoted, Sir, I submit it certainly puts a very grave handicap on the deliberations of this committee, if this committee is to be held out to the public as deciding what the employees want. That is not my understanding, Sir, nor other members of the Committee.

We were supposed to enquire into the whole question and report back to this House. I think, Sir, it is possible. Certainly, Sir, I think, it should be called to the attention of this House.

MR. FORSEY: Sir, rising to a point of personal privilege, may I have the paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Just a moment—The paper should be tabled in its entirety. While the House cannot take notice of what is said outside the House yet under these circumstances, since the member who spoke was a member of the committee he was within his rights in bringing it to the House. I will allow the honourable member, of course, to reply. Of course I do not think there can be a debate on this.

I might say it is expected that His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor will arrive in a few minutes to give the Royal Assent to certain Bills—The Sergeant-at-Arms has informed me that His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived—So if the honourable member wishes he may have the floor when His Honour has left the Chamber.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of this Province has at the 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 Trade Union Act."

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

A Bill, "An Act to Make Further

Provisions Respecting the Supply of Water in the Town of Carbonear."

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Community Councils Act, 1956."

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act."

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Highways."

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Public Works."

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the City of Corner Brook Act, 1955."

HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR: In Her Majesty's Name I assent to these Bills.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor left the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order: I have the honour to inform the House that at approximately 3:15 of the clock, His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor was present in this Chamber and gave the Royal Assent to certain Bills.

The Honourable member for Humber East, I believe, has an explanation to offer the House.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could not see the statement that the honourable member for St. John's East has read. I would like to read it, Sir. In the meantime I would

MR. HIGGINS: I think it was on page ten—"Study Holiday Question" is the headline.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Speaker, referring to that matter, Sir. I heard the article read. I think it is a misquotation. I am sure it is a misquotation

because in contacting Mr. Morris at the "Western Star" I gave strictly my own opinions because I stated that the Committee had not met therefore there was no ruling nor decision what the practice would be. It would not be decided until they met. I phoned the Chairman of the Committee, the honourable member for Ferryland District at 8:30 in the morning at his home, I had already found a petition was waiting for me from the business people of Corner Brook, and this petition was in favour of a transfer from Wednesday to Monday. There had been several requests for hearings in the Corner Brook area. I asked what he would suggest. Well, he said, no decisions on public hearings could be made until the committee had met—But as a member for the district and also a member of the committee any information I could gather would, I felt sure, be welcome. I did phone Mr. Morris of the Western Star and asked to make a release. Unfortunately that release did not come in the paper of Monday.

Now as to being "based on the preference of employees"—that is absolutely ridiculous, as the speaker must know.

MR. HIGGINS: I was not attributing anything to the honourable member—I merely said: "If he was misquoted."

MR. FORSEY: I did state, Sir, I felt in the area of Corner Brook general it would be difficult to ascertain the feeling with hearings in St. John's and just what the wish of those in Corner Brook was. My own opinion was, and I expressed my own personal opinion, that consideration would be given to the greatest good for the greatest number. That could be attributed to employees, of course. I

don't know. I will say quite frankly, there is a misinterpretation. The ideas I expressed to the press were entirely my own—Rather unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the "Evening Telegram" has the great art of picking up errors.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member's explanation is perfectly reasonable. I do say at this time: the House does not and cannot consider things said outside this Chamber. In this case I did allow the honourable member for St. John's East to raise this point because I think he needed some clarification as to the duties of the committee that had been set up. Naturally I would allow the honourable member who has given a release to the newspaper an opportunity to answer.

I might say, I am sure it is the understanding of every member of this House that the select committee which was set up by this House—and incidentally the committee was not appointed by the Premier and the members were not named by the Premier—the Committee was appointed by this House. I would like to stress that point—The views of all members who are interested will be heard and will be considered. I think that was the explanation the honourable member wished for. That is why I permitted a debate.

MR. BROWNE: Your Honour, may I say one word in reference to statements outside the House—If it reflects upon the proceedings of the character of the people. Now that was the imputation, that the honourable member for Humber East had prejudiced the issue he was supposed to try. That was a very serious allegation.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for St. John's South.

That is exactly the point I wished to make.

Presenting Petitions

None.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to report the Select Committee has considered the petition of the Maritimes Hospital and found that the Rules of the House have been complied with.

On motion report received.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member will give notice of introducing this Bill at the next meeting of the House.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to report the select committee on Standing Orders have considered the petition of the Congregational Church and found the rules of the House have been complied with.

On motion report received and adopted.

Notices of Motion

MR. BROWNE: To move that the matter of the expenditure of public monies by the Department of Public Works on Hefferman's Road at the Goulds, District of St. John's South in the General Election of 1956 be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections with instructions to the Committee to ascertain whether the Liberal Candidate by himself or with others endeavoured to be elected to the House of Assembly by bribery or any other corrupt practices and to report to the House thereon during the present session.

Notice of Questions

Notice of question on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett.

No answers to questions.

Orders of The Day

(Items 19 to 22).

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act."

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

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill—"An Act to Amend the Survivorship Act."

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

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill—"An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act."

On motion Bill 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 Further to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act."

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

Honourable the Attorney General moved the motion in the absence of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): I may say, Mr. Speaker, in

connection with these first readings, all the Bills have been printed with the exception of number twenty-one (An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act). The object of Bill number twenty-one is to clarify the situation as to shares that may be issued by Public Utilities. There are certain restrictions on the issue of shares in Public Utilities. This is to clarify the law in this respect.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act."

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this Bill together with the Bill immediately following on the Order Paper is designed primarily to bring insurance law uniformity or into conformity with what it is in other Provinces—It is in the interest of uniformity of legislation.

This Bill deals with two entirely different subject matters except in so far that both are connected with insurance. The first amendment to the existing Act deals with the operation of adding machines who sell insurance policies. That, as honourable members know, is very commonplace on the Mainland particularly around airports where you go in and deposit a coin in a machine and take out insurance policies. We have no such legislation in this Province. As a number of people are interested in putting in these adding machines here we want to have them properly controlled and regulated.

The second part is an amendment to the existing Bill, which is six or seven pages—(1), (2) and (3) deals with the licensing and regulation of vending machines which dispense insurance and is set up primarily so that permits

or licenses must be paid to prevent irresponsible persons with no backing from operating such machines.

The second part of the Bill deals with an entirely different subject matter. It prohibits discount on premiums in respect of accident insurance companies. I think it is regarded as very unethical for insurance agents to slip part of the premium back to clients, and this is definitely prohibited as far as life insurance is concerned. The object of the amendment of this Act is to do likewise with regard to accident insurance policies.

That, Sir, is briefly what the Bill is.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister could tell us whether any of these vendor machines are actually in existence in the Province at this time.

MR. MURRAY: No. There are no such machines at the present time. But we do not want them to come in unregulated or uncontrolled. They are very common throughout Canada, as the honourable member knows.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member speaks now he will close the debate. Actually in answering questions I think some honourable members are beginning to think they are in Committee of the Whole. If a member asks a question the honourable member to whom the question is asked can reply when he closes the debate. I do not want to see honourable members behaving as though they were in Committee of the Whole. I thought that might be a very good time to point out 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 Respecting Policies of Accident and Sickness Insurance."

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, as we all know, accident insurance coverage has been greatly expanded during the last few years particularly in industry where there is such a thing as group coverage for employees for sickness and accidents. Well in this Province we have no legislation whatsoever governing accident and sickness insurance. A Bill has been put up by the Association of the Superintendents of Insurance which is the Government regulating body on which this Province is represented. The idea of this Bill is to cover the complete field of accident and sickness insurance. The Bill we have before us is the one prepared under the auspices of the Superintendent of Insurance and identical in every respect with similar legislation in the other Provinces.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could move the adjournment of this debate, as I have not had an opportunity to see this before.

On motion debate on second reading adjourned.

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply:

MR. W. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Your Honour on your election as Speaker of this House. I feel sure, Sir, that the members of this House made a wise choice in selecting you as Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, all over Newfoundland there are settlements on the coast.

Practically ninety-nine per cent of them originally were settled exclusively by fishermen. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the days that these coastal settlements, communities, were settled it was of the utmost importance for the fishermen to be as near as possible to the fishing grounds. As the people of today know, back forty, fifty and up to a hundred years ago there were no engines for fishing boats and the fishermen depended on his own muscles for power to get him to the fishing grounds. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen in these days went to the most out of the way places in order to earn their livelihood at the fishery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that when these isolated settlements were originally settled the fishermen could not have had any idea of having these settlements connected up with the main settlement in Newfoundland by roads. As one travels along the coast of Newfoundland one sees numerous settlements out on islands. As I said, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen tried to get as near as possible to the fishing grounds.

Mr. Speaker, in Green Bay nearly half the population lived on islands. I think there are six or seven main islands in Green Bay, Little Island, Sunday Cove Island, Long Island and Leading Ticks. Now, Sir, when these islands were originally settled the people made their livelihood exclusively on the fisheries. In Green Bay, since 1950, so I understand, there have been nine settlements abandoned.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that all over the Province of Newfoundland the same thing applies, in every district outside the Avalon Peninsula are abandoning the small isolated communities.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland, so far as I can see, do not in this day and age depend exclusively upon the fishery. There are, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of settlements which have lost their original reason for existing. The people have left the fishery as a means of making their livelihood. Nevertheless, the vast majority of these people even though today they do not depend upon the fishery as a livelihood, still remain living in these isolated communities. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a matter of choice. These people who have gone into the lumber woods as loggers and lumbermen and into other various non-fishery occupations would, if they possibly could, move to larger settlements. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the reason that has not taken place to a greater extent is due to the fact that the people who are in these non-fishery occupations simply could not stand the financial burden of abandoning their homes or of paying the cost of having them moved either over the ice or by raft or floating them through the water to larger settlements.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that in Green Bay there are many lumbermen and loggers who would if they could move to larger communities, places where their children could obtain a better education, places offering greater opportunities, places where there are churches. There are so many small communities in Green Bay, and for that matter, Mr. Speaker, all over Newfoundland, many in which there may be five or six families and up to a dozen families that cannot afford churches. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if these people only had the financial assistance to move, the vast majority of them would move to larger settlements. On that matter, Mr. Speaker, I

have to agree completely with the honourable and learned member for Fogo when he suggested that the Provincial and Federal Government formulate a scheme whereby the people in these isolated settlements would be helped financially to the extent of a thousand or fifteen hundred dollars, depending upon the circumstances in each individual case. Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that at the present moment the Provincial Government helps financially any family to the extent of from two to four hundred dollars. Now Mr. Speaker, I do think that if the Federal and Provincial Governments got together on this matter and made a scheme whereby each individual family would receive help to the extent, as I said, of a thousand to fifteen hundred dollars—I know, Sir, that the original cost would amount to quite a sum, but I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the saving on school buildings, post offices, public wharves and the savings on new roads which will some day or another have to be built to these communities for the people that remain in them and the cost of repairing these roads each year will soon have been met if these people in these isolated communities which have lost their original reason for existence are moved to larger communities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not for one minute suggesting that the people in larger isolated communities who depend exclusively upon the fishery should be asked to move. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I realize that this plan will have to be voluntary, this plan of centralization cannot be forced upon the people. It will be up to the people themselves to move. I am not suggesting for one minute that the people who still depend exclusively on the fishery should be asked to move.

But, Mr. Speaker, people in these non-fishery occupations, as I suggest, to them it does not matter too much where they live. Most of the lumbermen, loggers, if they now live as most of them do in isolated places when they go to work they have to go long distances, from their homes. When they are away they know their families are living in isolated places. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that to them it would be a God send if they could only take their families out of these isolated communities, if they could only afford it, and have them placed in the larger settlements, settlements connected by road and with the Trans-Canada Highway. It would then be relatively easy for these men in the non-fishery occupations to return from their various places of work.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that in Green Bay the men who work in the lumber woods go all over this country. Some of them are down in White Bay. Some of them are in Green Bay and more are up around Badger and out around Glenwood. In other words, Mr. Speaker, they are in lumber camps all over the Province of Newfoundland. To them, I suggest, it does not matter too much what individual settlements they have their homes in as long as it has road communications with the Trans-Canada Highway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the largest settlement in Green Bay is the Town of Springdale with a population of over twelve hundred people. The settlement of Springdale is one of the fastest growing and most progressive communities in Newfoundland. Its progressiveness is due to a great extent to the energetic members of the Town Council in Springdale. Now, Mr. Speaker, at present the Town of Springdale has a water system, and I

think the time is fast drawing near when a sewerage system will be indispensable for the settlement of Springdale. However, Mr. Speaker, the most pressing need for that community at the present time is for electrification.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that a hydro-survey has taken place in the vicinity of Springdale, that the water power is there. But unfortunately at the present time, so I understand, an economic hydro project would leave a large surplus of power. Now, Mr. Speaker, as the members of this House are undoubtedly aware, there is a mining development south of Springdale is a place known as Gull Pond, and to the north and slightly to the east there is the settlement of Little Bay, and as the members of this House were informed yesterday by the Premier, this Little Bay mining development is progressing quite quickly. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the power needed by the Little Bay Mining Development and the Gull Pond Mining Development, should they progress to the stage of actual mining, will of necessity have to be hydro power. Should they progress to the stage of actual mining they will of necessity have to get hydro power and I say, Mr. Speaker, if these mining developments necessitate the construction of hydro plants at all these communities from Roberts Arm to and including South Brook, Springdale, Little Bay, Kings Point and Rattling Brook will undoubtedly receive electricity.

Mr. Speaker, further north on the North Shore of Green Bay, I understand, there is more or less an abundance of hydro power. Sooner or later this power will have to be developed, especially, Mr. Speaker, should the mining developed at Tilt Cove and

the fish plant at LaScie get into actual operation. When that does come, Mr. Speaker, the settlement of Tilt Cove and the settlement of LaScie in White Bay South will undoubtedly need a supply of electricity. The power is on the north shore of Green Bay, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it will have to be developed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that as a result of the Royal Commission on Fisheries the Government with the help of the Federal Government have built three or four experimental fish plants in this Province. I understand that these plants have been built at the places recommended by the Royal Commission. Now, Mr. Speaker, in some settlements in Newfoundland the people are under the impression that these plants are built at settlements recommended by the Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, unless I am wrong, I think that these plants have been built at places recommended by the Royal Commission. Mr. Speaker, should these experimental fish plants, fish stations, succeed I strongly recommend that the Government keep the settlement of Nipper's Harbour uppermost in their minds. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the settlement of Nippers' Harbour, for its size and for the number of fishermen there are there, at least according to what I have heard—I do not know from my own experience—I was informed a short time ago and from what I have been told, Mr. Speaker, it must be one of the most progressive fishing communities in Newfoundland. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, all the communities from Smith Harbour including Nipper's Harbour, Indian Burying Ground, Round Harbour, Snooks Arm and Shoe Cove are exclusively fishing settlements, and Nipper's Harbour is the largest of these fishing settlements.

The fishermen in Nipper's Harbour are badly in need of a breakwater. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, the Federal Government have surveyed the harbour at Nipper's Harbour and I have been informed that although no money has been appropriated for this breakwater for 1957 it will undoubtedly be in the estimates for 1958. For the sake of the fishermen of Nipper's Harbour, Mr. Speaker, and the fishermen in that vicinity, I hope that the Federal Government will make sure that it does not put off the building of that breakwater any longer than the year 1959.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I do not mention roads for the District of Green Bay undoubtedly I will be derelict in my duty. There are five main roads which need to be connected in Green Bay District. These five main roads, Mr. Speaker, lead to the five main isolated population centres in Green Bay. Now these roads are the roads from Point of Bay to Cottrell's Cove in the South-east section of the district; the road from Point Leamington to the head of Tickle's Arm in the South-east part of the district, the road from South Brook to Roberts' Arm and the road from King's Point to Jackson's Cove and the branch road leading east from the road connecting down to Baie Verte and the branch leading from that road east out to the community of Burlington on the north shore of Green Bay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not for one moment suggesting that the construction of these five roads will completely take the people of Green Bay District out of isolation. However, the construction of these five main roads will take the vast majority of the people out of their present isolation. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that each of

these roads is approximately the same length, anywhere from sixteen to eighteen miles each.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I leave the subject of roads I must give my own personal opinion of the subject of snow removal. Mr. Speaker, in the last eight years, the best eight years yet, the Government have built hundreds of miles of new roads. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, of the number of settlements taken out of isolation by the construction of these roads—But, Mr. Speaker, this point seems to have struck me—as soon as a community received a road, as soon as it has been taken out of the isolation in which it was from the time the first man ever walked into the individual community, as soon as these communities get the benefit of a road the people for some reason or another simply cannot seem to survive unless the road is plowed. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not for one minute suggesting that these roads should not be plowed. Of course they should if the people of Newfoundland could afford to plow these roads naturally they should be plowed. But, Mr. Speaker, as far as I can see the simple fact is that the people cannot afford to plow all these roads. All year round, that is during the winter months these roads simply cannot be kept opened. All rural roads cannot be kept open all the year around. What some of the people seem to forget is that they themselves through their taxes pay for the plowing of these roads.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the ideal position as far as education is concerned would be for every child in Newfoundland to receive at least Grade XI education. As we all know, that situation does not exist today in Newfoundland, and I think it will be quite some time

before it does exist. The reason is, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, simply the fact that the people cannot afford to keep their children to school for that length of time. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the same principle applies in the matter of plowing every road in Newfoundland. The simple fact I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that the people simply cannot afford that. Now, Mr. Speaker, anyone who has done any travelling around this country or who has studied the geography of the country is quite aware of the huge number of settlements in Newfoundland and the very small population. Now, Mr. Speaker, as most people are aware, there are only approximately four hundred and twenty-five thousand people in all Newfoundland. Put that all into one city and you will still only have a small city. Now I understand that at one time or another there were thirteen hundred settlements in Newfoundland. I know there are not that many today. Nevertheless there must be at least still a thousand settlements in Newfoundland, and the whole population of Newfoundland is only approximately four hundred and twenty-five thousand people. Now, Mr. Speaker, to get back to road clearing again, I do suggest that these four hundred and twenty-five thousand people cannot simply afford—because it is the people who pay for the building of these roads and for the repair of these roads and for the snow removing on these roads—they simply cannot afford to keep all these roads open all the year long. But some people do not seem to realize that there is no “Fairy God-mother” paying for the construction of roads, for the repair of roads for the plowing of roads and all the other Government services rendered the people. The people themselves, if they stopped to think, Mr. Speaker—I am

not suggesting Mr. Speaker, that the people in any particular settlement or in any particular district do not think of it, but if they actually do they will have to realize that it is they themselves who have to pay for the benefits they receive. At present, Mr. Speaker, the Government is trying its best to keep all the most important roads in the country plowed and open all the year long. It is simply impossible, I suggest, to keep all the roads open all the year around. I know, Mr. Speaker, it simply cannot be done through the taxes of the small number of people in this country at present considering the large mileage of roads which these four hundred and twenty-five thousand people have to keep in repair.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland has always been regarded as a fishing country. When you get in Newfoundland the farther north one goes the more one expects this statement to be true. However, Mr. Speaker, in Green Bay this situation does not apply. I am not making that statement myself, Mr. Speaker, or as a result of my own knowledge. I am simply making that statement as a result of the information given by the voters of Green Bay District in the official list of electors. Now, Mr. Speaker, I went through the official list of electors for the District of Green Bay. As everyone knows, every voter in Newfoundland lists his or her vocation, which is given in that list. In Green Bay District there were five hundred and fifty-one fishermen, five hundred and fifty-one fishing and nine hundred and thirty-two loggers or lumbermen. In other words you have approximately two loggers for every fisherman in Green Bay District. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do suggest that it is really impossible to say that Green Bay is a district depending mostly upon the

fisheries. It is impossible to say that when for every fisherman you have two loggers. That, Mr. Speaker, is not taking into consideration all the other various occupations of the people in the non-fishery trades and occupations. I have not checked for that.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are still in Green Bay certain communities depending exclusively upon the fishery. Most of these settlements are on the north shore of Green Bay. Taking in from the very last settlement of the north shore, Shoe Cove we have Round Harbour, Snooks Arm, Indian Burying Place, Nipper's Harbour and Smith's Harbour. Then, Mr. Speaker, before you really strike another fishing settlement you have to go south and east to the Island of Trayton. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are also certain settlements in Green Bay in which there is (and this is according to the official voters list) hardly a fisherman, such as the settlement of Port Leamington one of the larger settlements in Green Bay. As an example, Mr. Speaker, take Point Leamington and Paradise, Point Au Bay with a total population of eight hundred and fifteen there are only six fishing. Now I would just like to make one point clear here, Mr. Speaker. I am not saying there are six fishing. The people themselves said it when they gave their occupations for the voters list. There are six fishermen out of a population of eight hundred and fifteen. However there are one hundred and twenty-eight loggers in the settlement of Kings Point, in Rattling Brook there are thirteen fishermen and forty-nine loggers. In Springdale which has a population of over twelve hundred there are five fishermen and one hundred and sixty loggers and lumbermen. The settlement of South Brook has three fishermen and sixty-four log-

gers or lumbermen. The settlement of Roberts Arm has two fishermen and seventy-seven loggers or lumbermen. The island known as Sunday Cove Island consisting of the settlements of Port Anson, Wellman Cove and Mills Cove on the island has a total of six fishermen and ninety-six lumbermen.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Are these loggers also fishermen or are the fishermen also loggers or are they separate?

MR. W. SMALLWOOD (Member for Green Bay): These men have given their occupations as loggers and lumbermen. Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, should the logging industry fail most of these men would have to return to the fishery. Of course some of them at present, I should imagine, must do some lobstering early in the spring and salmon fishing, but their main occupations are as is given in the official list.

Mr. Speaker, the island known as Sunday Cove Island is one example of people who have quite a great deal of hardship getting back and forth to their homes, especially during the wintertime and spring. Nevertheless there are still only six fishing out there. All the rest are lumbermen. They have to go, as I was saying before, down to White Bay, down on the Baie Verte Peninsula and further up into Green Bay and some go in around Badger and Millertown and some as far east as Glenwood. In other words, Mr. Speaker, they go all over the country in their logging occupations, and to return home they have the greatest difficulty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last fall when I went down to Green Bay as a candidate I knew approximately five people in the whole district of Green Bay and

there are four thousand eight hundred and twenty-one voters in that district. The people of Green Bay District simply did not know me when I went there. However, Mr. Speaker, I went to practically every home in the Green Bay District. I did not manage to get into every home. However I did go into every home in every settlement that I managed to visit. There are two or three settlements I did not find time to go in. As a result of that, Mr. Speaker, I am here in this House. The people had to take me at face value. They did not know anything about me at that time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the voters of Green Bay District for placing their confidence in me last October. I hope, Sir, that before the next election the people of Green Bay will feel that in placing their confidence in me I did not deceive them in any way. There is just one little point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker. While campaigning in the District of Green Bay and since I have hoped, Sir, to fulfil the confidence the people had in me, but there is one point I wish to make and that is: no voter in Green Bay District will ever be able to say I made rash promises. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, I promised absolutely nothing that I myself did not have the absolute and complete control over. There were only two things that I promised that I would absolutely do for the people of Green Bay, and that was, Mr. Speaker, to answer their mail, which I feel that every member should do and undoubtedly is doing, and to advise the people as to whether or not any particular road would be built, any school or anything like that. I promised absolutely nothing except the fact that I would do all in my power to help the people.

Thank you, Sir.

(Applause).

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I notice it is 4:30. Perhaps the House would care to recess for ten minutes before I begin.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair:

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, may I first join with the other speakers who have spoken before me in offering my congratulations to Your Honour upon your election as first commoner of this Province. The fact of Your Honour's unanimous election is proof positive of the confidence of this House in Your Honour's ability to fill your high office with distinction and to discharge the duties that attach to it with impartiality and with integrity.

For my own part I assure Your Honour of my full and complete support in the matter of the maintenance of good order and decorum in this House.

I should like too to add my congratulations to the two honourable and gallant gentlemen who moved and seconded the motion for the appointment of a Committee to draft an Address in Reply. In keeping with tradition in this House both were new members making their maiden speeches. I thought it was altogether fitting and proper that they who were chosen to speak first in this new Parliament should both have been veterans of the two great wars that have been fought during this century to keep the free world free, to make it possible for free Parliaments such as this to meet. I want to assure both of the honourable and gallant gentlemen that their efforts were highly commendable and reflected great credit on them and upon their constituencies.

Finally I would like to offer my congratulations to all the members of the House upon their re-election or election, as the case may be. I think it would be in order if, as one of the veterans of the House, I were to extend to all who are taking a seat here for the first time a hearty and sincere welcome.

Now when I refer to myself as a veteran of the House I should go on to make myself clear that I am not a veteran in the sense that the Minister of Fisheries is, for instance, or the Senior member for Harbour Main or the honourable and learned member for St. John's South. All three of these honourable gentlemen had a seat in this House when I was still going to school. Nevertheless I have been around here now for a fairly long while myself, having come in for the first time with my election to the National Convention in 1946. Looking around me I note that time and politics have taken their toll of those who sat here then. As a matter of fact there are only four of us left; the Honourable the Premier, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Minister of Labour and myself. As a matter of fact we have been around here so long we are beginning to feel almost as much a part of the House as the fixtures themselves. Now that I come to think of it we have been around here for longer than some of the fixtures, the Speaker's Chair, the Treasury Table and the Mace, to mention three.

Two Sunday nights ago, Mr. Speaker, in the words of the popular song, I Made A Sentimental Journey. Eight Years and some weeks before that I had been invited to come to St. John's but the Premier who was not the Pre-

mier then, to be sworn in as a Cabinet Minister, on April 11th. 1949. On thinking back I think now I did not quite believe it, but I came anyway. I arrived in St. John's on March 31st. 1949. That night I took a walk around the central part of St. John's, out Monkstown Road, across Queens Road, down Church Hill, over Duckworth Street to Theatre Hill and up Theatre Hill to Rawlins Cross and home. I do not know exactly what I was expecting to see, if anything, possibly the citizens of St. John's celebrating their entry into Union by hanging Joe Smallwood in effigy on Rawlin's Cross. The city was quiet and everything went quietly. As far as I was concerned the only incident I ran into was that as I passed a certain corner on which was gathered a group of mannequins one of them called after me certain names that reflected both upon my ancestry and my patriotism.

Two Sunday nights ago, eight years afterwards to the day and to the hour I went over the same route. I made a pilgrimage along the same route. This time nobody undertook to call me any names. I stood on Rawlins Cross at midnight and the first eight years of union came to an end. Beyond any shadow of doubt and without any question they had been indeed the best eight years yet. I did not have to wait for the verdict of history for that. The evidence was all around me in our capital city and in every home and hamlet of our Province.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to avail of this opportunity to speak of three matters. The first concerns the district that I represent here. The second concerns the Department that I represent here and the third concerns the Province that I represent here.

With regard to the matter that concerns the district that I represent here, the debate on the report of the Committee to Draft an Address In Reply presents all the members of this House with what has been traditionally regarded as an appropriate opportunity to speak of the needs of their districts and to air the views and grievances in any way of their constituencies.

I have been asked by certain of my constituents to make their views known with regard to a proposal that is current right at the moment, that is the proposal that there should be two hours of daylight savings time provided for when daylight saving time comes around. As far as my constituents are concerned, or at least those of them who have written to me, they are against it. They point out to me that not everybody in Newfoundland works on Water Street in St. John's. One of my constituents has come up with what seems to me to be quite a reasonable suggestion. He suggests that if the members of the Board of Trade wish to enjoy an extra hour of daylight in summertime over and above the extra hour now provided for them, he suggests that they get up an hour earlier in the morning. As far as I am concerned the objection taken by my constituents is well taken. They have already had some experiences of what would be involved in two hours of daylight saving. They had it during the year of the last war. It resulted in a thorough disorganization of the normal pattern of living. You see, as things stand now there is a half hour differential in suntime between the east and the west coast, for the sun rises in St. John's at four o'clock on a summer morning but it does not rise in St. George's until four-thirty. If you add two hours of daylight saving to that situation what do you accom-

plish? It is to tap two and a half hours of daylight on to the tail end of the day on the west coast as the clock records it but you end up with having daylight in the middle of the night. I have seen it in St. George's during the years of the War, when we had the two hours of daylight saving. I have seen it when daylight lingers on until midnight or very nearly midnight. As I have said, it did result in complete and thorough disruption of the normal pattern of living. As far as I am concerned the objection taken by my constituents is well taken and I thoroughly agree with it.

With regard to the matter that concerns the Department that I represent here—This is perhaps as good an opportunity as any, since I got to speak of something. This has been on my mind for some time now.

I remember that as soon as I was appointed to the Mines and Resources Portfolio last year, last July, I was immediately offered the gratuitous and unsolicited advice by one of our local pundits that agriculture in Newfoundland is on the rocks.

Now as soon as I was in the Portfolio long enough to learn something of what it was all about I came to the conclusion myself that anyone who thinks that agriculture in Newfoundland is on the rocks has rocks in his head. I say here and now without reservation that greater advances in agriculture have been made in Newfoundland during the last decade and a half than during the previous century and a half. As far as I am concerned that is a matter that is not debatable. I do think it can be demonstrated, I think that if anyone will get in his car and ride around Conception Bay and keep his mind as well as his eyes open then he will see irrefutable evidence of the

great strides that have been made. I do think though that a number of Newfoundlanders are all at sea about the Government Agricultural Policy. This necessitates thinking back a few years when agriculture reserved acquaintance to those who grew potatoes and turnips and cabbage for home use and had enough over and above to sell. Because these same people no longer grow these vegetables the conclusion is jumped to that just about the end of the world for agriculture in Newfoundland has come and that the Government should be out beating the drums to get these people to grow vegetables again. What is forgotten is that very likely most of these people are now in alternative employment and can afford to buy more vegetables than they ever grew. As far as my department is concerned then the hope is that things will stay that way, that people will stay in these remunerative employments and be prepared to leave the farming to farmers.

I do not think that this is the place for me to deal with the Government's agricultural policy in its entirety with all the implications there are. But it will suffice to say for the moment that the Government's policy in all respects is as advocated in the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and is primarily concerned with the encouragement of commercial farming. So I am going to refer to the House the Report of the Royal Commission which forms the broad basis of the policy and concentrate for the purpose of my thinking here on two phases of agriculture, supplementary farming and commercial farming. In doing so I hope that I may be able to set the record straight for these people who seem to be all at sea about the land.

Farming when it began in Newfoundland when it was permitted to

begin was supplementary. I say when it was permitted to begin because during the seventeenth and eighteenth century farming was prohibited. It was not until the early nineteenth century that you could build a house in Newfoundland without the Governor's permission, and not until the early nineteenth century and formal title of land was given for farming purposes and farming began then as a means of supplementing the income of the fishermen.

MR. BROWNE: You forget the early effort by Baltimore.

MR. KEOUGH: I am speaking generally.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They were very early and very puny.

MR. KEOUGH: I am relying for my authority on the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture. They claim that farming when it began as a means of supplementing and stabilizing the income of fishermen by growing at home and during the fishing season a goodly part of family food requirements. As settlements of the island increased others besides fishermen turned to supplementary farming. The position has lingered on into our own time and has had a varying and at times a substantial impact upon our economy throughout the years.

Now supplementary farming was what all these people were engaged in who grew enough potatoes and turnips and cabbage for home use, who then kept a few hens and a pig and a few sheep and a cow, which very often were fed on scraps from the table, small potatoes, caplin and dried fish. They owned and they cultivated almost by hand their gardens, some large and some small, some near and some

far away, some productive and others unproductive. They dug and they cultivated with much the same tools as their grandfathers had used before them, and very often their wives and their mothers and their children had to pitch in and help them work the land. Now mind you, supplementary farming served a very necessary purpose in Newfoundland until quite recently. Our position in the past would certainly have been much more meagre without it, and our past would have been more full of misery than it was. But times are changing and the need for supplementary farming no longer presses upon us with as great urgency. We point to that among the other things as an indication of the better times that have come upon us. It has been noted before that no longer do you see women spreading fish on the flakes these days. Well it so happens that no longer do you see women spreading caplin on the fields either. I do not know if any one has regrets on either count.

MR. BROWNE: There are still some of them.

MR. KEOUGH: Very, very few.

MR. BROWNE: Go out to St. Phillip's and you will find it.

MR. KEOUGH: There are a number of reasons why we should no longer be particularly preoccupied with supplementary farming in particular. It is something that could have appeal only to people who are prepared to be satisfied with somewhat close to subsistence standards of living. At that level Government supplementary farming could have appeal only as helping relief measures. It is something that is integral to a depression economy and cannot logically form part of the policy of economic expansion, the kind

of policy upon which this Government is now firmly embarked.

Now having said that I should go on to say that while supplementary farming is not something to be specifically advocated and sponsored by Government, neither is it something to be deliberately discouraged. On the contrary it is a highly commendable practice to look after a family garden during periods that are not required for work at the occupations upon which one must depend for a livelihood. There is absolutely nothing wrong with keeping a few hens and a pig and a few sheep and a cow, outside working hours, if you are not a farmer. These activities will undoubtedly result in production of fresh vegetables and livestock products for home use and also very likely result in additional income for other necessities. As far as my Department is concerned we shall be only too happy and ready and willing at all times to give advice and technical information and assistance to such supplementary farmers on request. But we do have to make a choice between supplementary and technical agriculture as to with which we would be more concerned. That choice has been made and, as might have been expected, it is in full and strong support of commercial farming.

Commercial farming is that type of agriculture in which all those people who cultivate the land and who produce crops and live stock products do it for profit or gain. It may be practiced as a full time occupation or a part time occupation and may result in the production of a number of different products such as on a mixed farm or it may be confined to the production of a single product such as fur or eggs. Where specialization is undertaken it may be practiced in many dif-

ferent parts of the province, not only in the so-called farming areas such as the Codroy Valley and the Goulds, but in other areas where other occupations predominate, such as Trinity South. Interesting yardstick for commercial farming used by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in compiling its 1951 census was the cultivation of three acres of land or the sale of two hundred and fifty dollars worth of farm produce. Now I don't think that I should attempt here to argue the advantages of commercial farming as against supplementary farming, and I do not think I should either try to recount the main aids to commercial farming that my Department makes available. That perhaps is something that may more properly arise when the estimates for the Department of Mines and Resources are before the House. But I do think that I should avail of this opportunity to indicate for the record and for the House that the specific intent and purpose of Government agricultural policy is to encourage commercial farming.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as regards the matter that concerns the Province that I represent here—There is a matter pending which touches the lives of all Newfoundlanders and cannot help but have considerable impact upon the dimensions of our future. The matter pending is the implementation of Term 29 of the Terms of Union. All the members of the House know how Term 29 reads, and there is no need for me to give the text here. The chances are that by the time this year is out we shall all have heard the text of Term 29 so often that we will not only know it by heart but know it backwards. The House is aware too that recently the Government of Canada appointed a Royal Commission that Term 29 called for. I have no

doubt but that the distinguished gentlemen who constitute that commission will apply themselves to discharge themselves of the task which they have been charged with the utmost impartiality and integrity. I do believe that Newfoundland has every reason to be satisfied and every reason to be happy with the personnel of the Commission.

Now I suppose that everybody in Newfoundland has his own views as to what interpretation the Commission should make of Term 29. To some people the term means simply this—As of the end of last month, once the first eight years of union came to an end, we had reached certain levels and standards of public services and the task of the commission is to set as nearly to indicate the form and scope of the additional financial assistance that the Province will need in order to maintain these levels and standards. They take no account of capacity to pay, the burdensomeness of taxation has no meaning for them. Others take a larger view and hope for a more generous settlement. This much seems certain, that in great measure the shape of our future will depend upon what steps are taken to implement Term 29. Since I did not help to write the Terms of Union I do not pretend to know what Term 29 was meant to mean when it was drafted. However, I was a member of the National Convention where the arguments for Confederation were argued, and I do know what we had in mind in those days as to what should come of Confederation if Confederation should come. We had in mind that we should come by levels and standards not less than the Canadian average and certainly not less than the minimum levels and standards that would constitute the Maritime average. If when Term 29 comes to be imple-

mented it is not so provided for, then Confederation will not prove to be the many splendoured thing we thought it would, and some of us will have dreamed somewhat in vain and have spent our manhood without accomplishing our full produce.

I say, I have said before, Mr. Speaker, I believe it was here in this House, that the things we seek in Newfoundland are the simple things that ordinary folk seek everywhere, the simple things that all men everywhere in the world ask of life, butter for their bread and a home to call their own, certainly in some employment, some ownership of the mass of production, a hand in the management of their own affairs, a say in the shaping of their own destiny, and if it be possible, peace in the land in their own time.

It may well be that these are small goals but they are not little goals, and they are in any case what all the generations of man have asked of life. But it was expected that Confederation for Newfoundland would mean these things and somewhat more. We were to become part of a nation with the highest standard of living, with the highest standards and levels of public services of all the nations on the face of the earth with the one exception. There is no reason in the wide world, there is certainly no reason that I know of, why we should have to be satisfied with levels and standards less than the Canadian average, and certainly not less than the minimum level and standards that constitute the Maritime average.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we enter upon this new Parliament, as we advance to a crucial year in our history I have still to regard as unfinished business the work that I began for the people of St. George's District when they elect-

ed me to the National Convention in 1946, and I remember in this hour the words with which I concluded my final address to the National Convention in the early hours of that historic morning when after eighteen months and an all night session the National Convention ended. It will be recalled that that was the session at which the majority of the convention delegates voted to keep Confederation off the referendum ballot. I voted with the minority to put it on, to let the people decide for themselves the form of Government they wanted to elect. I remember that I finished with these words—I have said what I have said because I wanted the evidence in the record for all the time when it came at least to where it was necessary to defend in this very Convention the rights of the people of Newfoundland where were some of us, there were a few at least who did not seek to avoid the challenge, who were not afraid to speak the truth and whose voices were heard.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that should the need arise there will be some voices, there will be a few at least that will be heard again. I should go on and add that I do not anticipate that the need will arise. Our own Royal Commission has prepared a case which we believe to be unchallengable. As I have said, I am quite confident that the Royal Commission appointed by Canada will apply themselves to the task with which they have been charged with the utmost integrity and with utmost impartiality. I believe too that the Canadian Nation itself will wish to see such a disposition made of Term 29 as will be in keeping with its greatness, as will be an indication of that greatness in the eyes of all men and before history.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

(Applause).

MR. MIFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act."

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, as I said previously, all those Bills are primarily to bring our insurance laws into uniformity with those in effect in other Provinces.

We have an Automobile Insurance Act which was enacted here in 1951, at the time of the reproduction of financial responsibility for drivers and the setting up of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. At that time this Act did follow existing legislation throughout other Provinces. In 1956, at an annual conference of the Superintendent's Association certain amendments were suggested there, and these are set forth in the Bill as it is presently before the House. As I said, these amendments are introduced mainly to bring our law into uniformity with that prevailing in other Provinces.

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

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House could revert to Bill No. 23 (A Bill—"An Act Respecting Policies of Accident and Sickness Insurance.") I have studied it since and I agree with it now.

Item No. 16: Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting Policies of Accident and Sickness Insurance."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I moved the adjournment of this Bill to have time to be able to read it. What

I have found, I think, can be dealt with in Committee. The reason I was interested in this is because many years ago, 1936, I was associated with a group of people in the Civil Service who formed the Civil Service Accident and Sickness Insurance, and our system was very similar, as the Honourable member for Port De Grave well knows, as he was one of our directors during the whole time. That was a very simple organization by which we paid into the fund one per cent of our salary, I think it was, per month, and when a member became sick or had an accident he was entitled to fifty per cent of his salary up to a certain figure. That organization has carried on down to the present time, and I believe has prospered. It seems to me it is unnecessary to include such an organization with that sort of insurance companies that are included in this Bill. It is not an insurance company for profit. It is a co-operative organization and only members of the civil service are entitled to take out insurance under it.

MR. MURRAY: Does that come under the definition of a fraternal society?

MR. BROWNE: I do not suppose it could be called fraternal. It seems to me some consideration should be given to this before the Bill passes. Probably the honourable Minister who introduced the Bill may not have been aware of the existence of that organization to which I refer. Our society was based on the Railway Employees Welfare Association. We copied the provisions of that organization almost in their entirety. I do not know if there are any other sickness and accident benefit systems of that kind but I think this would apply to the Railway Employees Welfare Association

too, if that has not been put out of existence by the recent sickness and accident provisions that have been made by the Canadian National Railway for the benefit of their employees.

I think, Mr. Speaker, before the Honourable Minister concludes he ought to make some investigations in that direction.

Then, Sir, in regard to policies on the lives of miners, there are some unusual provisions to be found in that section such as I have never seen before. It seems to me to be contrary to public policy, for example, that a miner having attained the age of fifteen years (it says) has the capacity of a person of full age, and he may make a contract on his own life; he may deal with contracts on his life or which he has made before he was sixteen and may deal in contracts effected on his life, of his wife and children, or both.

Now can you imagine a child of fifteen years having those privileges, to look after his children. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker—

MR. SMALLWOOD: If he is married and has children who else is going to have it?

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is against the law for any one to have children at that age. I do not know if he can get married. At any rate it seems to me to be such a provision as is unheard of.

There are a number of other provisions which we can take up, I think, in Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BROWNE: Except I would like to draw the attention of the Minister in charge of this Bill to one of

the terms of the statutory conditions dealing with the right of examining the insurer. The insurer has the right and the claimant shall afford the insurer the opportunity to examine the person of the person insured—and also in the case of a death of a person insured to make an autopsy. Now, Sir, it has been my understanding that no one has the right to make an autopsy. The Minister of Health may be interested in that provision. I do not know if there is any law relating to autopsies because my experience has been, even in cases of persons who died in the street they get permission of the relatives, the nearest relative before they do it. There may be occasions where an accident occurs or a person is found dead then there is a right to conduct a magisterial enquiry into the cause of the death, and for that purpose, I believe, the magistrate has the power to order an autopsy be made. But it seems to me when speaking here of insurance companies and that insurance companies have the right to make an autopsy subject to the law of that Province—that would imply that there is a right subject to the law which prevents them from having one—I do not think we have in our law any provision that prevents him having one. All that our law has, I think, is the right to give to a magistrate conducting a magisterial enquiry the right to have an autopsy. So that I think the Minister ought to give some further consideration to these other three things, the question of the civil service co-operative insurance society; whether the Railway Employees Welfare Association is involved, because that involves a great many members of the railway; and the question as to whether the insurer should have the right given to him here to have an autopsy.

MR. MURRAY: I wonder if the honourable gentleman would inform me what Co-operative Society he is speaking about and are there any clauses here which would affect the Societies adversely?

MR. BROWNE: It seems to me the whole thing would be very elaborate for a society or scheme which is very simple and just involves persons making application to join. I do not suppose that the Statutory Conditions would cost very much. But I think an opportunity should be given to the officials of the society and the railway society to peruse the Bill—So if it could stand over for that purpose before the Minister replies?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House that this matter be adjourned, or could this matter be dealt with in Committee?

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps it could be dealt with in Committee, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It sounds to me as though it could be dealt with 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 Respecting the Policies of Fire Insurance."

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, it is rather a remarkable fact that although fire insurance policies have been issued in Newfoundland in the eighteen hundreds there was no legislation on our books dealing with policies of fire insurance up to three years ago, I think it was. The result of that was that several companies, as we know, were operating in Newfoundland here

who had their head offices in England and some on the Canadian Mainland and others in the United States of America. The result was that policies were in existence which were drafted in the head offices and some with British Statutory Conditions others with Canadian and others with American.

In order to remedy this, in 1954, we brought in an Act dealing with fire insurance, but we find although that Act has been in existence only a couple of years already it has become antiquated. Conditions of fire insurance have been changing—the use of atomic energy and that sort of thing has brought about a great deal of changes in fire insurance legislation, and it is needed now, under the recommendation of fire insurers to repeal the present Act into two and substitute the present Bill. It is what I would call a modification of the law relating to fire insurance. It deals with the formal policy, the rights of beneficiaries and it defines insurability and it sets forth statutory conditions which every policy should contain.

The idea, as I said, is designed in part to bring our legislation here in this Province into uniformity with the law relating to fire insurance in other Provinces.

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

Committee of the Whole on various Bills.

On motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

On motion Mr. Clarke Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

Committee of the Whole on Bill—"An Act Respecting Notaries Public."

MR. BROWNE: Is a Canadian Citizen a British subject?

MR. CURTIS: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: I know a British subject is not necessarily a Canadian citizen. There is something about it. I remember we had it up here before.

MR. CURTIS: We are all British; but all British are not Canadians. All Canadians are British subjects.

MR. BROWNE: No, I don't think that is so. Supposing a person comes from Yugoslavia and he comes to Canada and spends five years there and becomes a Canadian citizen, he does not thereby become a British subject. Supposing a British subject born in Hong Kong cannot get admission into Canada and there he is not a Canadian citizen. Therefore this does not appear to be correct. I would ask to have it stand over. I am sure of this; I have tried to get British subjects in England allowed in here and they are not allowed because they are of Asiatic origin. Therefore British subject is not what is meant here. I think it means Canadian citizen.

On motion Clause 2 stand:

Clause 3 read: Every person who is appointed to be a notary public shall, before he receives a certificate of his appointment, pay to the Minister of Provincial Affairs such fee as may be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

MR. BROWNE: I take it there is no fee now?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, a fee of \$25.

MR. BROWNE: There is a prospect of this being reduced?

MR. MURRAY: It would be a matter for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to decide.

On motion Clause 3 carried:

Clause 4:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister if this Act affects notaries public who are already practicing?

MR. MURRAY: Yes.

On motion Clause 4 carried.

Clause 5:

HON. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, that seems to be a bit stiff, I am afraid—

"The Lieutenant-Governor on the recommendation of the Minister of Provincial Affairs may without assigning any reason therefore revoke the appointment of any notary public whether made under this Act or before this Act came into force—

MR. CURTIS: That is standard.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know whether it is standard or not, it does not seem to do justice.

MR. MURRAY: I think possible malpractices may occur in the cases of notaries public, and the Lieutenant-Governor means the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I suppose some one should be responsible to see that people practicing as notaries public should carry on their duties in accordance with the Act, and if recommendation is made to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, if such is shown such person should certainly have it rescinded.

MR. HIGGINS: He has to give up the seal that he bought himself.

MR. HOLLETT: Should not the Minister of Provincial Affairs give the reason for the revoking of it?

MR. MURRAY: You might let yourself in for all sorts of actions and that sort of thing.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a short-cut where a person is under suspicion of having done something wrong, and the Minister of Provincial Affairs takes it upon himself to recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor that John Smith or John Browne should have his authority as a notary public rescinded. Now that might cause the greatest injustice. It seems to me, whether it is standard or it is not standard, there should be some safety clause in this to allow the man to appeal to the Supreme Court or somewhere where he could have justice done. I know it is not a thing likely to occur perhaps in our lifetime, nevertheless it stands there on the Statute Books giving to the Minister a power it seems to me he should not have. I think in all fairness those appointed to that position of notaries public (and I may say I am not one) should have some covering clause here to protect a man's reputation.

MR. HOLLETT: In any case is it not putting a bit of a burden upon the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council — It does not say "the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council" but "the Lieutenant-Governor" although the Minister says it is. I think it is unfair to ask him to fire somebody as a notary public without giving the cause. I do not think it is quite fair to him and I do not think it is a duty which he should have to perform—If you say "the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council" then of course—

On motion Clause 5 stand:

MR. FORSEY: Before we leave that, what about the second part of

the clause, which is one that concerns me—What if a person whose license was revoked did not produce the seal.

MR. HIGGINS: Then he is fined.

MR. FORSEY: So I thought. What if he lost it? I think there should be some clause to certify he lost it, or something.

On motion Clause 6 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister or the Attorney General if he can tell me whether a notary public in Canada can take oaths, say depositions or proof of documents in other provinces of Canada which would be recognized here? The reason I bring that up is because recently I had occasion to send a deed to a Commissioner of the Supreme Court in Nova Scotia, and I was told that it could not be registered because the Commissioner of Registry Court of Nova Scotia was not registered as an officer under our Registry of Deeds—It seems to me there should be some kind of regular procedure between the various provinces so that we could take not only notaries public, which I do believe we do as I have a good many documents come in from notaries public, but Commissioners who are not recognized—Perhaps the Attorney General might give some consideration to that.

MR. HIGGINS: That is perfectly true. I had an experience somewhat similar to that—The first and only occasion I appeared before a Committee of the Senate, and I possessed affidavits sworn to before Magistrate Penny as a Commissioner of the Supreme Court and the Chairman was not going to take it because it was not done by a notary public. It might be worth looking into.

MR. MERCER: On the same point, even if it is by notary public I find if I just take the oath and sign Isaac Mercer, Notary Public, and take it over to our Registrar of Deeds the Registrar won't accept it unless I have half a dozen others saying when and where—just will not accept the name, notary public, and the seal.

MR. CURTIS: Here in St. John's?

MR. MERCER: Here in St. John's. I believe your own department won't accept just the signature, notary public and the seal.

MR. BROWNE: I believe that is true.

MR. MIFFLIN: In probate matters the judge won't just accept.

MR. MURRAY: If this clause goes through they have to accept.

MR. HIGGINS: No, unless you appoint another judge who would be more amendable.

Motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, carried.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred, have made progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received. Committee sit again on tomorrow.

On motion of Mr. Curtis all further orders of the day do stand deferred.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 24th, at 3:00 of the clock.

WEDNESDAY, April 24, 1957.

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

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House of the Government's decision to request legislative authority in this present session for an increase of ten per cent in the salaries of civil servants, this increase to come into effect from the 1st day of the present financial year, that is to come into force on April 1st. We have decided that at the same time we will ask this House in the present session to declare a ten per cent increase in the salaries of teachers, this increase to come into effect at the beginning of the school year in September.

The cost of the ten per cent increase to the civil servants will be just under one million a year and the cost of the increase to the teachers will be about three-quarters of a million dollars a year for the present number of teachers. It would, of course, increase as the number of teachers increases. The cost to the Treasury of the increase to the teachers would come to less than half a million dollars in the present financial year. The total cost of the ten per cent increase in the present financial year will thus be about one million four hundred thousand dollars. Next year it will be close to two million dollars for the year.

The civil service increase of ten per cent will be paid to three thousand, nine hundred and eighteen persons in the civil service and three hundred and forty-two persons in the police and fire and penitentiary Departments. The increase to the teach-

ers would be paid to three thousand, three hundred persons in the present year. This is a total therefore of seven thousand five hundred and sixty persons in the present year.

In addition to the authorizing of this ten per cent increase there will be the following additional costs to the Treasury in the present year, if this House agrees, regular annual increases, i.e. the annual increment paid to civil servants; one hundred and eighteen thousand dollars increase additional; for nurses one hundred and ninety thousand dollars—promotions and upgrading one hundred and four thousand dollars, new appointments within the civil service five hundred and eighty-seven thousand dollars; total eight hundred and nineteen thousand dollars. This sum of nine hundred thousand dollars added to the one million four hundred thousand represented by the ten per cent increase to the civil servants and the teachers means that a grand total of two million three hundred and nineteen thousand dollars or close to two and a half million dollars will be paid out to the civil servants and teachers this year over and above the amount paid out last year.

As I have already said, legislative authority will have to be obtained in the present session for this increase of payments.

I have mentioned additional increases for nurses. They are to get the regular ten per cent increase which applies right across the board, but in addition to that they are to get an extra ten per cent, so that in their case the increase is really twenty per cent.

The police force, the fire department and the employees of the peni-

tentiary and prison camp will share in the general ten per cent increase in this present year.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Premier a question arising out of what he has just said in regard to new appointments, five hundred and eighty-seven thousand dollars—Could he give an indication of that large sum?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That will appear fully and in great detail department by department in the estimates and budget, which will come down fairly soon.

MR. BROWNE: It is a large amount of money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not actually new and appointed positions, it is the filling of vacancies and recruiting of staff to a large extent.

Presenting Petitions

None.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices of Motion

None.

Notice of Questions

Notice of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Browne.

Answers to Questions

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question No. 82 is now in course of preparation and will be tabled in this House tomorrow.

Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I draw to your attention that there is a notice of motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, there are three private members items on the Order Paper. This being Wednesday, they have preference.

Notice of Motion:

Honourable Member for St. John's South to move that the matter of the expenditure of public monies by the Department of Public Works on Hefferman's Road at the Goulds, District of St. John's South in the General Election of 1956 be referred to the standing Committee on Privileges and Elections with instructions to the committee to ascertain whether the Liberal Candidate by himself or with others endeavoured to be elected to the House of Assembly by bribery or any other corrupt practices and to report to the House thereon during the present session.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I move this motion seconded by my honourable friend from St. John's East.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that last year in the Speech from the Throne we were informed that the Government was planning to introduce a Bill known as "The Local Roads Board Bill" and that it was going to alter the system of expenditure of monies on local roads in Newfoundland to a radical degree—Instead of the people in the local communities contributing by their labour fifty per cent of the cost of the work on roads the Government was going to assume full responsibility for the expenditure. Later on in the estimates on the vote under the Department of Public Works for local roads the sum of seven hundred thousand dollars was voted under vote 907-03-02.

Now a Bill was introduced during the session, and we all dealt with it very seriously. I must say Sir that in

the back of my mind I could not help having the feeling that the Government, despite its confidence in the result of the elections, had in their minds the idea that a little money would not go astray just prior to an election, and it was largely with that in view that they altered what had been their policy with regard to local Governments in this respect.

Now the Bill, Sir, was an elaborate one which provided machinery for groups in local communities coming together and advertising a meeting, setting out the area which would be concerned in forming a local roads board. The Bill also provided for the quorum which should attend a meeting in order that it should be formed—that the road board could be formed.

I was very interested in this, and I think I took part in the discussions and studied the Bill fairly well. I know it was a complicated thing, and I could not see how it could be practically carried out in time for the election. So I was not surprised when before the end of the session an amendment was introduced which took all the bite out of the Bill, because it gave the Minister of Public Works the authority to recognize road boards which had already been established and had been in operation for several years. So that the number of communities that were formed under the Local Roads Board Act which was passed last session must have been extremely negligible.

Now, Sir, I was not so much concerned with the other districts, but was concerned with the district of St. John's West, which I represented at that time—Several persons came to me from this district to assist them in forming a local road board. Three

communities became road communities on the South Side Hill, St. Philips and the Goulds. These from the Brow came and asked my assistance and the men on the Blackhead Road represented by Mr. John Squires, W. J. Ryan, Ted Farnell and Mr. Vane and one other whose name I forget, came—and they put in a lot of work—I know the difficulty of getting even from a congested community like that a sufficient number of people to form a board. There are about fifteen hundred living up there and about seven hundred and fifty voters; and ten per cent meant that seventy-five had to attend the meeting. They had to have three before they were able to get a quorum. When they had the quorum put the programme before them and they were authorized to apply for recognition as a local road board. This was done.

At St. Philips they went through the same procedure, advertised the meeting and went around the neighbourhood. Only one per cent turned up to the meeting. They abandoned it after that.

At the Goulds they have had a meeting. Only half a dozen turned up. Then they came to me to assist them and to know if I could help. So I suggested that they would get the Parish Priest to announce from the altar a meeting would be held after Mass on the following Sunday, and I would go there and I would have the necessary forms, and I would help them to form this local roads board. So, after Mass on the following Sunday, which I attended there, there were about forty-five people from the area which was contemplated being taken into this road board, consisting of that part of the District which extended from Ruby's Line on the North to Big

Pond on the South and to Donovans' Road on the East and to the Back Line on the West, a considerable area from the Back Line to Donovans' must be a distance of six or seven miles and from the Back Line to Donovans' must be three, so that the area was fifteen or twenty or twenty-five square miles. Now the number of persons residing in that area was such that the number of voters counted on the voters list was about fifty-odd persons, and only forty-five turned up so we could not do anything.

But here is the interesting part—At that meeting I was asked by one of the voters who was present how much money they would get if they formed the road board. I said, as there were about a thousand people in the district, in the area, they would get about two dollars per head and that would be two thousand dollars. I got the answer—Oh, that is nothing. That would not fix the road to my garden. What do we want to have a road board for. Why can we not get the Government money direct from the Government. I was a little astonished at that statement until I found out afterwards that the gentleman in question was working for my opponent. Then I began to be interested. So I asked the people there when they could meet again, and it was adjourned until Thursday night, the night I was having a political meeting. Now I was being very careful not to mix politics up with this road board. I did not want anybody to think I was trying to take advantage of them—That is a fact—Believe it or not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly, just objective.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, just objective about this matter. It was postponed to Thursday. I got the information

that my opponent was having a meeting in the Goulds, the meeting to be graced by no less a person than the Premier. A meeting went ahead. I believe after the Premier went—I don't think it occurred when he was present but after he departed the question of the road board was considered. The people were told they did not really need any road board. My opponent was in the position to be able to have the work started Thursday morning. On Thursday morning he was going to have the work started.

Of course I began to see red then, I assure you, Mr. Speaker. I knew the people had been making an effort to get a road board. I had been helping them. Here was certainly a plain inducement to the people to put all their confidence in the Liberal Candidate. He was so important and had so many powerful persons that he could get the work started without any road board at all. So indeed it happened. On Thursday morning I went into Hefferman's Road and here was the work underway, blocks had already been placed along the road and gangs of men were around there shovelling and trucks were moving back and forth. So I enquired—Mr. Speaker, I went to a considerable amount of trouble to find out how it was done. I enquired who was in charge of the job. Nobody knew, then, who was in charge of the work. Nobody knew. Mr. Hefferman had three or four or five trucks working and there were twenty or thirty men employed.

Now I want to say that I am familiar with that area since 1909, that is nearly fifty years. I do not believe in the lifetime of anybody living there had been a cent of money spent on that road.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was high time.

MR. BROWNE: That is not the thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who got the credit for the road, which of the two candidates?

MR. BROWNE: Maybe I got the credit for having started.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We do not want a rehash of the election surely.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have the floor. I do not think I should be interrupted, and certainly not by the Premier because the Premier is the one who is responsible for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Blame the broad shoulders.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, when I found this work going ahead I came back to town and called up the Minister of Public Works who was not there. The Deputy Minister was not there. I got in touch with his assistant who knew nothing about it and with Mr. Crummey who knew nothing about it. I called the Auditor General to know if it were possible for money to be spent on a local road without having a local road board and could he do anything about it. No he could not. Nobody knew anything about it. Nobody could do anything about it, so the work went ahead.

Now I have no objection to the work being done in the proper way. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is certainly taking advantage of the Government's position, and my opponent was not so well entrenched in the Government that he was able to do that by himself, and there was

only one person in town at that time who could have enabled him to get that work going on schedule like he promised on Thursday. On Tuesday night the Premier attended a meeting—That was the Premier himself—the Premier must have interfered with the Department of Public Works and arranged with the candidate for St. John's South to have the work going in that District.

Sir, it seems to me that should be a matter that should be investigated by this committee. I asked two questions in this House, Sir, Nos. 21 and 22. Number 22 was a question as to how many road boards were formed. I did not get my answer to that. There were no road boards formed that I can find out except the one on the Blackhead Road—As my learned friend's father here used to say—"The whole thing is a cod"—It is just a bluff and blind. It was passed seriously and took up time here dealing with the Local Road Boards Act last session, then all the different local road board committees were recognized by the Government. The Local Roads Board Act, 1956, provides for the first time that local road committees previously in being could be appointed to serve as local road boards—So that all the old local road boards were recognized.

I have here the Department of Public Works, Local Roads Board Report for 1953-54, the last one that has been published. In that year there were only two local road boards in St. John's West and only one in St. John's South, the other being in Portugal Cove. Now if there were only one local road board how could they spend money under the Local Roads Boards Act without a local road board. I say they could not do it.

Now here is an interesting feature

—I asked how much money was spent and I was told four hundred and eighty—amongst the places receiving money, St. John's South two thousand hundred and ninety-four dollars, the road board on the Blackhead Road. Then I asked a question—By what authority were public funds expended in September, October, 1956 on the local road known as Hefferman's Road at the Goulds in the District of St. John's South. An enlightening answer came back from the Department—No one seems to know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is just about what that question deserved.

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Speaker. The Premier is making light of this. It is things like this that show whether a Government is being honest or dishonest, whether it is straightforward in its conduct or it is being corrupt—I suggest the Government was corrupt in this transaction—There was only one reason why it was started, and that was to try and get voters for the Liberal candidate in the District of St. John's South—That is why it was started and it was started irregularly and illegally. No one seems to know! No one in the Department of Public Works knew who had authorized it. Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that answer. There must be somebody down there who knew. I know Mr. Crumme did not know. Mr. Spencer could not have known—He was not in town. I know Mr. O'Neill did not know because he told me he did not know. He did not at that time. He may have found out since. From what source were the funds obtained? The answer is—907-03-02, the money provided, the seven hundred thousand provided for the local road boards that were to be appointed under the Local Road Board Act. Now I say that is illegal.

I asked the Auditor General if he could detect expenditures of that kind. He said no. What kind of an Audit Act have we got if the Auditor General does not know this work was started illegally.

Now, Sir, I know I am probably only wasting my breath and beating the air here talking about this matter—But is it not a serious matter if a candidate can get the Premier to go to the Department of Public Works and get him to spend money on a local road without having a local road board to recommend the work and to take charge of the work? I think it is, Sir. If the members of this House look upon this sort of thing lightly then they will look upon all lightly they have no respect for legislation; and the House, to let that pass here, Sir, becomes a mockery. We are powerless here in the Opposition. I never attempted or never thought of any one attempting to get money to spend on that road except through the information of a local road board. Who was in charge of the work? Mr. Dinn was a highroads official. He had nothing to do with the work at all. Mr. Crummey is the Superintendent of the Highroads and knew nothing about it. Who in the Department of Public Works? The Department of Public Works did not know who started the work. Who was it? There must be some person in the Department of Public Works who must assume responsibility for the job. Is there nobody can give us an account of how the thing was done, an honest straightforward account? Mr. Speaker, if there is not then monies can be spent by Government Departments without any authorization and without any legality.

Now, Sir, it is my contention that this money was spent to buy votes—

I would like to have this matter referred to the Committee of this House set here a few days ago, a committee on privileges and elections, to find out if that is so. Let us get to the bottom and find out who authorized that work, and not let the Department or Minister shield behind the answer. No one seems to know who authorized it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have made a case here for investigation, and I would like therefore that this matter be referred to the Committee of the House, the Standing Committee on privileges and elections, to investigate and find out how this originated.

The motion is seconded by Mr. Higgins.

HON. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take up too much of the time of the House on this matter. I think that the whole question has been very well and very fully and properly, I may say, explained to the House.

Bribery at elections, of course, is something which should be considered by every member of the House as something which is not in the best interest of our people. I am not saying that there was any bribery at this election, but I do say, when a Department of Government comes back with an answer like the one which was given to my honourable friend on this particular question, on the expenditure of some twenty-eight hundred dollars, the answer that nobody seems to know who authorized it. Thirty-two hundred dollars it was—I am sorry—Nobody seems to know who authorized it. Now, that, Mr. Speaker, to me is an indictment in

itself not only upon the Government but upon this House if we do not properly investigate it.

Why I think I can remember back just as far as my honourable friend on my left, and I certainly do well remember the Old Election Act of 1913. I believe it was section 149 of that Act which clearly stipulated—but that section has been taken out of the law now—but it clearly stipulated that no public works of any kind should be undertaken within ten days prior to an election except in the case of flood or fire or disaster. Now that section, I think, Sir, is something that belongs to every Government in the western world, or it did until we repealed it. It was absolutely considered essential that public money—

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is not a Province in Canada nor a State in the American Union that has that legislation, not one. We were the last in North America to change it.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it the Honourable the Premier investigated that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right. Before we changed it.

MR. HOLLETT: But surely it was a clause for the conduct of proper elections. We are all, Sir, as people prone to be swayed by the almighty dollar. I have no hesitation in thinking that we Newfoundlanders are no better and I do not think we are any worse than any other people—If our ancestors thought it worthwhile to put such a clause as that into our law, which stipulated that no public monies for public works, of that nature, be expended except in the case of fire or flood and so on, as I have already stated, then I think they must have known what they were doing.

In any case, having spent the money I do not think any Department of this Government or any Government should come back with the statement that nobody seems to know who gave the authority for the expenditure of this money. Because if nobody seems to know who gave authority for some thirty hundred dollars is there any reason why anybody should seem to know who gave authority for thirty-two thousand or three million two hundred thousand or what not? I think it is most important, Sir, that this matter be referred to a select committee set up to look into such matters. I don't think the House will suffer. I don't think the House will suffer. I don't think the Government will suffer—Because I am not in a position to state that any member on the opposite side of the House did ever attempt to commit bribery—But if something did happen that would impute such a charge to any members on the opposite of the House or on this side—

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no suggestion of that in the motion. The motion deals with someone not a member.

MR. HOLLETT: I fail to see how any candidate such as the person against whom this charge has been made could have had thirty-two hundred dollars of Government money spent without the sanction of somebody, and for the Department to come back and say nobody seems to know. That casts a suspicion on the Government. I would think it would be in the best interest of the Government and in the best interest of the House and in the best interest of honest Government, sir, if this House decided to refer the matter to a Select Committee on privileges and elections.

I do say I support what has already been fully explained by my learned colleague for St. John's South.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I thought when the Honourable and learned member for St. John's South gave notice of this motion the other day that he was trying to pull our leg—I thought quite seriously that he was joking, that it was a leg-pulling. Now I discover today that he is quite serious about it. I think he moved this motion because he is humourless and that the honourable and learned member for St. John's East seconded it because he is humourous. He seconded it frankly as a joke, whereas the honourable and learned gentleman who moved it is quite apparently serious. By his demcanor here today he means it seriously.

Now it is a joke whether it is meant as a joke or not. It is a joke. It is a farce. It is a cod. When this bit of road work was proceeding hundreds, literally hundreds of other pieces of road were proceeding all over this Island. Some of them were carried on by local road committees which had been appointed for one year to take the place of local road boards. Some of them were carried on by the newly formed local road boards and some of them were carried on by neither but just by the Department of Public Works. So that in one or other of these three ways literally hundreds of road building and road repairing projects were going on during the election, for some time or for some months before the election and for some weeks after the election. This is just one of hundreds of jobs that were proceeding. Now what is the difference in this job and hundreds that were proceeding over the Island? The difference is that the honourable and learned

gentleman for St. John's South was the Tory Candidate and Mr. Hubert Kelly was the Liberal Candidate, and that the two of them were trying with all steam up both trying to get the credit for getting something done for this particular road. One was going around trying to form a road board and holding political meetings and branching off from the political meeting on a road board and other perhaps, according to my honourable and learned friend, was doing the same thing. But the one who got the road built, apparently, was Hubert Kelly. In other words, if I can believe the story today of the honourable and learned gentleman, if that is correct and accurate statement of what happened, Mr. Kelly was more successful than Mr. Browne—and the Mr. Browne referred to was not the honourable and learned member of this House but a certain gentleman seeking election. Hubert Kelly and Browne both tried to get a few dollars to get a road repaired. Kelly succeeded. Browne failed. Browne got sore. What else is there to it than that? He asks us to take seriously and suggests bribery and corruption. In the Name of Heaven if that is the only job in Newfoundland that a citizen, a good, honest, God-fearing citizen, Hubert Kelly, a highly respectable citizen in St. John's West from an excellent family, as good as any family in this House or ever was in this House an excellent family, Hubert Kelly son of the Late Councillor John B. Kelly whose name is a household word in the West End. Hubert Kelly is an excellent citizen, a fine gentleman, as a citizen of the West End used what influence he had, so we are told, to get the Department of Public Works to spend a few dollars on a road. There is nothing spent, we are told, for half a century—I think Hubert Kelly should

be thanked by the people of Hefferton Road, and that he should not be abused in here by this gentleman who happened to win—Leave Hubert Kelly alone. He is out of politics. The election is over.

Now the honourable gentleman goes a step further and goes beyond his own motion. The motion is to find out if Hubert Kelly is corrupt. But the honourable gentleman says it was not Hubert Kelly but the Premier, not the Minister of Public Works. He was out campaigning in Grand Falls. The Minister of Public Works perhaps was influential in getting some money in Grand Falls District.

MR. BROWNE: Not very much.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Deputy Minister was away, home sick or something. The Assistant Deputy Minister was left in charge of that Department. All over the Island road work was going forward. I think we spent last year eight or ten millions or ten or twelve millions on roads, and this thirty-two hundred as a percentage of twelve millions, thirty-two hundred dollars spent unfortunately by Hubert Kelly. If it were spent by anybody else, not the opponent of the honourable and learned gentleman but say by the opponent of the honourable and learned member for St. John's East then he would be too humourous to bring it in here and if it were spent by the opponent of the honourable gentleman for St. John's Centre we would not hear a word, or by the opponent of anybody other than the honourable and learned gentleman never lets go. He is going to hound this gentleman. Why did he not take it to court. He waits until the two months were up—notice that, Mr. Speaker. He waits until the law which allows him to take it into court,

where, if he really believed, which he does not, if he really believed it was corruption and bribery then as a citizen his duty was to take it into court, under the Election Act. But no!—Oh no! He goes to Mr. O'Neill. He goes to Mr. Manning. He goes to the Auditor General. He goes to Mr. Crummey. He goes to everybody. He gets all the information and then deliberately—apparently deliberately—he waits until the two months are up, the two months within which he can sue and be sued by Hubert Kelly, waits until that two months expires when he might have sued Hubert Kelly or been sued—He waits—Then he asks us here this afternoon to pretend, as he pretends, that this work was a corrupt practice—Nonsense!

Already it has received too much attention, too much time of this House. I would suggest to the honourable and learned gentleman that he won his seat. He won, Kelly lost! The election in St. John's South was particularly clean. It was a clean election. Now the honourable gentleman says Hubert Kelly took some men over and offered them a drink of berry juice. I do not know. The only one I heard say it was the honourable gentleman himself. I never heard Hubert Kelly say. Now I have personally never done it. I have heard in the course of my political life and in the course of reading of other people offering candidates a bottle of beer. I never practiced it, but I have heard that kind of thing happened—And so, the honourable and learned gentleman says Hubert Kelly offered somebody a bottle of beer. Let us assume it is true. It is a very reprehensible thing. It is a very naughty, very wrong thing for him to have done. But apart from this one little item, the election was clean as clean as an election was ever

fought because Hubert Kelly does not know how to fight any other kind of an election. He is himself, as every honourable gentleman opposite knows—The honourable member for St. John's East knows it and St. John's Centre—Hubert Kelly is too clean and decent and honourable a man to play a dirty campaign. He does not know how and never did, any more than the honourable member for St. John's Centre does—two innocents abroad—Hubert Kelly and the honourable gentleman. They do not know how to fight a dirty campaign. He fought as clean as a hound's tooth. But he was unfortunately opposed by a very experienced campaigner, who I believe himself fought a clean campaign.

Now I participated a little in that election, one of the few, and only a token participation. I addressed, I believe, three meetings, the one to which he referred certainly, in fact I went in and spoke for ten or fifteen minutes and left again. I came out right away after speaking. I do not know what happened before I came nor after I left. Then I spoke at Petty Harbour and on the Blackhead Road. Now I do not remember another meeting. There might be a fourth. I remember these three, I do remember saying that the honourable and learned gentleman now the member for St. John's was an able man. I said that. I said he was an educated man, I said he was a man of good family and good reputation. I said Hubert Kelly may not be as well educated but enough, sufficiently well educated, I said, not to be the president of a university, but enough to get Hefferton's Road done and other jobs. It was a clean election. The honourable gentleman seems to think either that Hubert Kelly in opposing him has committed sacrilege. What does he think, he was not supposed to

be opposed? Leave Kelly alone. He is the fellow who lost. He fought a good campaign, cleanly. He lost it. Leave him alone. Maybe four or five years from now he will take another shot at it. Maybe when the honourable gentleman put this motion it was done before Mr. Power announced he was going again. Maybe he thought Mr. Kelly was running. Maybe he thought he would polish off Mr. Kelly with this motion. Now that it is all over let us forget—Let us vote on it and get on.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words, in reply. Mr. Speaker, this is my motion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not a substantive motion, I hold, Mr. Speaker—I do not see he has the right to reply.

MR. BROWNE: This is a motion to refer to a committee. That is a substantive motion, Your Honour, and I submit I have the right to reply.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to give that matter some time. I am not certain on that matter.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to reply to it.

MR. SPEAKER: Just a moment—I would like to look at this.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, under Beauschene, Rule No. 43, no member may speak twice to a question except in explanation of a material part of his speech which may have been misquoted or misunderstood, but then he is not to introduce any new matter, and no debate shall be allowed upon such explanation.

(2) A reply shall be allowed to a member who has moved a substantive motion, but not to the mover of an

amendment, the previous question or an instruction to a Committee.

(3) In all cases, Mr. Speaker shall inform the House that the reply of the mover of the original motion closes the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: What does the honourable member propose to do? In answering this what does he propose to speak to now?

MR. BROWNE: I propose to answer some of the statements made by the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member proposes to make an explanation?

MR. BROWNE: I propose to reply in the debate to the arguments raised by the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, that is well known, any honourable gentleman moving a substantive motion has a right to reply. But the point I make is that it is not a substantive motion.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, will the Honourable the Premier tell us just what a substantive motion is?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If I am ever elected Speaker I will be glad to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: I won't delay the House. I will give a ruling. I will postpone my ruling on this until a little later in the day, a little later this afternoon. So that I would suggest that the debate be postponed until later this afternoon.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, we might perhaps have a brief recess of ten minutes, the usual recess—Perhaps Your Honour might be able to look it up in the meanwhile.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes, after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: At the time the House recessed there was a difference of opinion as to the meaning of the word "Substantive" and whether a motion moved by the honourable and learned member for St. John's South was a substantive motion or not.

At the time I declared that I would like to have further time to study the motion and to look up the authorities because I think it is expecting too much of a Speaker to ask him to deliver a ruling on such a point as this immediately. It would be a very bad thing for me, Mr. Speaker, to get into the habit of handing down hasty rulings. I have spent the last fifteen minutes consulting the authorities and reading the motion.

I found (1) the word "Substantive" means independent and self-subsistent and not derivative or dependent. Boudreaux says, Page 45—Boudreaux Rules of Order — A Substantive Motion means the main or first motion or question to which amendments may be moved.

Probably the clearest definition of all is given by "May" Page 282, 15th edition—"A Substantive Motion is a self-contained proposal submitted for the approval of the House and drafted in such a way as to be capable of exercising a decision of the House."

Now the motion which we are considering is, I believe, such a motion. I must so rule, and allow the honourable and learned member for St. John's South to reply. But I would ask him not to repeat anything he said before.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for your ruling.

and I will endeavour not to repeat anything I said before. I want to reply because the Premier has, like a lawyer when in difficulties, instead of dealing with the motion abused the other side, and instead of my opponent or whoever was associated with him being considered in the wrong I am represented as someone who has prosecuted my defeated opponent. Now there is nothing further from my mind. I know the man. I know he had experience assisting politicians in Governmental matters. I knew perfectly well that he could not of his own volition get money from a Government Department when the Minister was away. I knew he would not be able to do that. I suspect and I have reason to suspect and I have reasonable grounds for suspecting that it was the Premier, who was anxious to see him elected and me defeated, who was the one arranged to have this—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I say in reply to that right now, the first knowledge that I had of the road, knew that there was such a road, as a boy I knew of that road, the first knowledge I had that there was anything done to that road any money spent any work done any question about the road was when the honourable gentleman tabled his first question in the House. Up to then I knew no more about it than the Mace does now.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier says that I must accept his explanation. Well that makes it even more puzzling. Who else had the power to go to the Department of Public Works and get work done on a local road without a local road board committee being in existence? Could my opponent have gone down

to see anybody down there and got it done?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not?

MR. BROWNE: Because he had no authority to go there, and there was no road board in existence.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He had knowledge it was needed. He was a citizen.

MR. BROWNE: A citizen—But out there all they had to do was form a local road board. They tried but they were not given a chance to do it. As I would point out again (I have to make reference to this) he made the statement at the meeting on Tuesday night prior to Thursday that he would have the men to work Thursday morning. The men were actually working on Thursday morning. So that any arranging to get the work done was done on Wednesday. Now I knew that was going on at the time. I knew it was going on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is repetition now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: No, this is not all repetition. The Premier may wave his hands as much as he likes in ridicule. This is a serious matter. I know the Government spent millions of dollars on roads throughout the country. I know that and I know most of it was spent properly and lawfully. But I am pointing out here the thing done unlawfully and that is why I am making a reference—There was three hundred and forty-two thousand dollars spent, according to this answer I got, through the different electoral districts, and the only reference to St. John's South was the one they spent on Blackhead Road, three thousand odd dollars.

Now listen to this question I asked—I did not have this at the time when

I was speaking previously—I asked the Honourable Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the following information—the names of settlements from which applications were received for approval of local roads boards, population, number of persons, amount of money allocated, etc. Sub-head 807-03-02 Local Road Boards.

Here is the answer—St. John's South, two thousand eight hundred and ninety-four. But, in addition to that, three thousand three hundred and twelve cents not in the answer, somehow could be spent if there was no road boards.

Now, Sir, I know that the Premier is going to use his influence in this House and that motion is likely to be voted down. I submit, Sir, to this House and all honourable members that this is a very serious matter, when a candidate can go to a Department—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—Can the honourable gentleman defy Your Honour—He was told by you not to repeat. He is just repeating his argument over again. He has not said one thing in rebuttal he did not already say in his main speech.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member did say before what he is saying now.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, there is just one point I want to make which I did not make before—The Premier said work was going on for months before the election going on during the election and going on after the election. This work started about the 17th of September and they got a message on the night of October 2nd when the poll was declared in

St. John's South, to stop the work. Now I think it is quite obvious to anybody the reason it was stopped was because it was only started for one purpose and that purpose had failed.

I move the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Motion put by Mr. Speaker—All Opposition members voted for the motion — all Government members voted against the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

On Division:

Ayes: Honourable Leader of the Opposition; Mr. W. J. Browne; Mr. J. Higgins; and Mr. Duffy.

Nays: Honourable the Premier; Honourable the Attorney General; Honourable the Minister of Education; Honourable the Minister of Labour; Honourable the Minister of Public Welfare; Honourable Minister of Health; Honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs; Honourable Minister of Supply; Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources; Mr. Strickland; Mr. Sellars; Mr. Clarke; Mr. Sheppard; Mr. Smith; Mr. Nightingale; Mr. Jones; Mr. Canning; Mr. Mercer; Mr. Whelan Mr. O'Driscoll; Mr. Lane; Mr. Strange; Mr. Windsor; Mr. Mifflin.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—I believe the honourable member for Burin's name was called.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Burin is not here, I noticed that. Any member present in his seat must vote, but we cannot have members voting who are not here. That is a mistake.

Motion lost twenty-three to four.

Orders of the Day

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, on the Orders of the Day I wonder if I could ask the Honourable the Premier a question relative to the loan Bill passed last year, and if any of that issue had been sold and if so how much?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have sold in Montreal in recent days four million dollars of the Province's Bonds and in New York two millions. The sale in the United States is the first sale of Newfoundland Government Bonds for about a quarter of a century, I believe or more, a quarter of a century perhaps.

MR. BROWNE: In 1930, I think.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A quarter of a century or more. This small sale is made on the advice of our financial advisers for the purposes of establishing our credit in the United States—mainly for the purpose of establishing, of carrying a credit for the Province in the United States, something which Newfoundland has not had for over a quarter of a century. Our feeling being that it is sounder for us to have both the Mainland of Canada and the United States as possible markets for our bonds for the future.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a subsequent question? Is this the same issue and at the same rate of interest. What price have we received for the sale of these bonds in each place and who are our financial advisers?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Our financial advisers are the Bank of Montreal. Our formal financial advisers we have also, Mr. J. C. Thompson and Mr. J. Harvey Perry. We have also the Auditor General and we have also the Controller of the Treasury, Mr. Wal-

ter Marshall. We have a number of advisers.

The answer to that subsequent question with respect to the exact terms of the loan will be tabled in due course. I would not attempt to give it from memory now.

MR. BROWNE: The reason I asked the question, Mr. Speaker, was because there was an item in the "Evening Telegram" of Saturday in which it was stated that the interest was five and a quarter per cent—and I have heard that from other sources. Would the Premier confirm or deny that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think I prefer to wait until the formal information can be tabled—That will be, I think, at the time of the budget.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have another question I would like to direct to the Minister of Public Works—In an editorial in the "Daily News" a couple of days ago there was a statement to the effect that a start would soon be made on the new highway from St. John's to Whitbourne, and tenders had been accepted for the first seventeen miles of the road—In the absence of the Honourable Minister of Public Works I wonder could I address the question to the Premier and ask him to tell us what route this is taking.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The road which is to form the Newfoundland section of the ninety per cent ten per cent arrangement of the Government of Canada and in the case of Newfoundland to be sixty miles. That is with regard to about sixty miles of the Trans-Canada Highway in this Province the Government of Canada will pay ninety per cent of the cost and the Government of the Province pays

the other ten. Within certain limits the Province concerned can select a portion of the whole that will be the ten per cent. In other words it is ten per cent of the whole Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland. That ten per cent in our case runs to about sixty miles. The Government of the Province can decide within certain limits where its ten per cent of the total mileage.

Our decision has been that that will be in our case from St. John's proper or not St. John's proper but a place near St. John's for example, Portugal Cove and Chapel Arm or Whitbourne, that section—My honourable colleague, thought as the Minister of Public Works, thought he would do that in three years, taking an average of twenty miles each. What he had done recently is to call for tenders for the cutting of the right-of-way and the burning of seventeen miles. That is not exactly a third of the sixty miles but it is in the vicinity. It runs from Holyrood, Hodgewater Line, that is to say, it runs from a point inside Holyrood which you would reach from Holyrood by means of the Witless Bay Line and then in a straight line from that point to the Hodgewater Line at a point where the Hodgewater Line is intersected by the Ocean Pond Road—In a straight line that would be approximately a third of the distance, approximately. Another third would be from here or Portugal Cove as the case might be, to that point inside of Holyrood. The final third would be from the point where the Ocean Pond Road intersects the Hodgewater Line. The thought is to do a third each year. For the third he would build this year he has let the contract—I am speaking subject to correction. My colleague has gone down to his office on important business. He

was here up to recess. He may not be back before we rise at six o'clock. My understanding from him is that he has let the contract for the cutting of the right-of-way and burning. All that has to be done before a certain date or another Department of the Government won't permit it to be done. The Department of Mines and Resources does not permit the burning after a certain date in the Spring or before a certain date in the Fall. So to get that part done, my colleague, the Minister of Public Works has called for tenders, received them and awarded the contract for the cutting and burning. He will, I assume, shortly, advertise for the building of the road over the same seventeen miles. Then, I assume, next year he will do the same with another twenty or twenty-three miles and also next year he will perhaps begin the paving of the road that he is now about to build. Then in the third year build a third and pave the second and so on. That is his plan.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier did not say what the route was going to be. I had asked him in detail what the route of that road would be. He did say a third would run from Holyrood, the Witless Bay Line to the junction of Ocean Pond, but from Witless Bay to St. John's what route is to be followed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know that. I know that the Department some three or four years ago or two years ago or hardly that, between one year and two years ago, submitted to me for my interesting consideration three proposals: One was that you would get to the vicinity of Holyrood by going along the Southern Shore to a point approximately near Witless Bay—re-build the Witless Bay Line and come towards Holyrood and from there go

by this route, Holyrood straight to the Hodgewater Line. Another was to widen and straighten the existing road around Conception Bay to Holyrood and a third was to go somewhere in between the Southern Shore on one side and Conception Bay Highway on the other. Now which of these three my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, will decide and recommend to the Government I do not know.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Premier one more question. Does he not think the House of Assembly should be considered in connection with deciding the route? Should they be notified?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Have we not notified the House of Assembly?

MR. BROWNE: Only after probing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman speaks like that he will do probing in the future and get no answers. He did his duty and I did mine. Why put an ugly word on that—"only after probing?"

MR. SPEAKER: This being Wednesday there are two motions standing in the name of a private member, which must be given priority, No. 23 and 24.

The honourable member for Placentia West to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Maritime Hospital Services Association Re-Incorporation Act, 1949."

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

The honourable member for Placentia West asks leave to introduce a Bill—"An Act to Regulate the Election of Trustees of Lands and Chattels for the

Queens Road Presbyterian Church in St. John's."

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

MR. SPEAKER: This is the end of private members' business.

Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply:

MR. MIFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, first of all I join with all the previous speakers in congratulating Your Honour on your elevation to the high office of Speaker of this Honourable House. I am certain you will carry out your duties with dignity and impartiality.

I also pay tribute to the honourable and gallant member for Harbour Grace, the mover of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, for the excellent treatment of the subject. I also congratulate the honourable gallant member for Bell Island who seconded the motion for his excellent speech. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, without exception the speeches made in this Honourable House so far have been of the highest quality and have covered practically every matter of importance. It is a problem therefore for one who has waited so long to find much new to talk about, and I feel sure I have your understanding if I say something which has been said before.

I intend, Mr. Speaker, in my brief remarks to say a few words about education in the Province and then take a quick run through my district and discuss the matter of fisheries and the factors which affect the fisheries.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most pressing problem which pre-

sents itself to the Province today is that of education. I believe that it is an absolutely impossible thing for us to lay too much emphasis on the provision of a programme of education for our people if this Province is to take its rightful place among the other Provinces in a fast-growing nation. Nobody will deny the fact that at the moment we have insufficient classrooms, accommodations and, Mr. Speaker, we have too few fully trained teachers. The situation is the result of a number of things. There are more students attending school today than ever before. They are leaving school at a later age, and the population generally is increasing.

We also in this Province are faced with the problem of how to strike a just balance between the academic and the practical. By the practical I mean the acquisition of special techniques which enable a person to earn a livelihood.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the Honourable Minister of Education tell this Honourable House a short time ago of the importance which this Government attaches to vocational training. I feel that this is a very important matter. Everyone is not equipped to continue all through school and university in the arts and in the professions. Indeed it would be a sad thing if every person were so equipped. However, practically every person is capable of receiving a good elementary education and carrying on through vocational school where he would be trained for the job he is most capable of performing. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it was the late Lord Tweedsmuir when Governor-General of Canada who said that what we are concerned with in education is to enable each and every youth of

every class including the poorest to earn an honest living and at the same time to equip boys for their life's work, to give them some background of education which will provide a wise perspective and incidentally fit him to be a good citizen. This Government, I feel, has done a great deal in recent years in the field of education, and I am sure will continue to do so. Indeed it showed real concern and appreciation of the educational requirements for this province when it undertook to construct the new buildings for the university. I feel also, Mr. Speaker, that the Government, within the limits of its financial ability, will allocate as much funds as possible for educational purposes. But I do say that if the Government does allocate as much funds as can be allocated we will still not have reached the desired position with respect to buildings and facilities and teachers. What is needed and needed right now in this Province is a wholehearted co-operative responsibility and the assistance of every individual living in the Province. When I say "responsibility" I mean financial responsibility as well as moral encouragement. It is foolhardy for any of us to feel that it is the obligation of the Government and the parents of pupils to stand the whole cost of providing educational facilities. The burden must rest on the shoulders of the Government and the people in relationship to their capacity to pay. Unless we get a situation whereby everybody in the Province pays for educational facilities then I am of the opinion that the problem which confronts us will be unsolvable. The investment is a costly one but it is absolutely necessary to our survival. I am positive that within a number of years the cost, the returns, will be much greater than the cost.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the District of Trinity North, which among others take in part of the Bonavista Peninsula. The other part of the Bonavista Peninsula is well represented by my honourable friend the Member for Bonavista South. In many ways we are closely tied up. We speak to each other, we traffic with each other, we trade with each other and many of our problems with respect to roads and fisheries are the same problems. Therefore the honourable member for Bonavista South and myself have worked out a policy of peaceful co-existence.

In the Bonavista, Elliston, Little Catalina and Port Union area of the Bonavista Peninsula about forty per cent of the salt cod fishery of the North East Coast is handled. The importance therefore, of this area with respect to the fishing industry cannot be over-estimated. I can say now that the industry is expanding in that area and will continue to expand. However for the satisfactory expansion of the industry several services are absolutely necessary. One of the most important is that of electric power. I am now happy to say that I did not have to share in the requests of my honourable friend the member for Burin and the member for Placentia West with respect to inadequate electric power. A few years ago the energetic general manager of the Union Electric Light and Power Company of Port Union recognized the necessity for more power. With the assistance of a guarantee from this Government that company was successful in financing a new power development at Lockston in Trinity Bay. This plant in conjunction with the plant which exists at Clarenville and the plant which is at Port Union will within a short time provide adequate electric

power to that area. The Government and the company are to be commended for their foresight and the action which they took in making this project possible.

Without this plant economic expansion of the fishing industry would have been almost impossible because it would have had to rely upon diesel power. Moreover the growth of Clarenville with its natural distribution centre and surrounding areas would have been greatly retarded. Again the social aspect with respect to this project cannot be overlooked. Already hundreds of homes in Trinity, Eastport, Champney's, English Harbour, Melrose and other places have had lights installed and the people are now enjoying the benefits of many electrical appliances. I can say that the people who have received this service are a very happy and grateful people and the people who have not yet received the service are looking forward to the day when they too will have these benefits extended to them. I do trust that within the next few years the power lines will be extended to New Bonaventure, Trouty, Dunfield and to other places on the Peninsula and then to Hickman's Harbour, Britannia, Petley, Foster's Point, Lady Cove, Elliott's Cove, and the other places on Random Island.

There can be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that good roads are absolutely essential to the economic development and social welfare of any area. I am certain that every person in the district which I have the honour to represent is indeed happy to learn that the Government proposes to embark upon a huge road building programme. During the past few years a considerable amount of work has been done on roads in part of the district which I represent. Random Island has been

linked with the mainland by a causeway and a reasonably good road has been constructed almost all the way around the island. There are several places which have not yet been connected and I hope, if the Government finds it economically feasible, it will see fit in the near future to connect these places. The road going south toward the Cabot Highway has been greatly improved, and various communities have been connected with this road. There are a few more communities to be connected, and I do believe that this will be done.

However parts of the Cabot Highway down to Bonavista Peninsula and around to Shoal Harbour are very narrow, and I believe, ought to be widened and ballasted and some parts should be rebuilt.

The roads in the Bonavista, Catalina, King's Cove, Port Union, Trinity Area require attention because they are absolutely necessary to the progress of the area and the fishing industry. I do believe that the Government will be considering this matter at an early date.

I said before that electrical power and roads are absolutely essential to the expansion of the fishing industry, and on Bonavista Peninsula the industry is expanding rapidly. The Government has given the fishing industry the necessary encouragement to expand by monetary assistance. The Department of Federal Public Works has done a great deal for the benefit of the industry by the construction of wharves, breakwaters and by dredging harbours.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believe that it is of the utmost importance that the Department of Fisheries of Newfoundland work in close co-operation with the Federal Depart-

ment of Fisheries the Department of Public Works of Canada and the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Department of Transport. This close co-operation is absolutely essential to the ultimate success of the industry.

Another factor which must not be overlooked is the fish merchants who pay every cent to the fishermen for their product which they purchase. The day of exploitation of fishermen has disappeared, and if it has not it must. It is unrealistic for us to think that the only persons who prosper from the industry are the merchants I do not mean a merchant does not or is not entitled to profit. Yes, indeed. But his profit must be a just and reasonable one and so the return to the fishermen and labourers must also be just and reasonable.

Another thing I believe the trade might well be advised to do is to pull up the curtain of secrecy that obtains from time to time with respect to market conditions and which obtain between the trade fishermen. The fishermen of the country must be enlightened as to conditions which obtain. With co-operation and trust amongst Government, merchants, fishermen and labourers I believe we can look to the future of the fishing industry with faith. If behind the faith we use energy and resources we must succeed. But if we approach it with fear and morbid doubts we are destined to fail.

Of course it is absolutely necessary to the success of any industry in Newfoundland that our young people be encouraged to stay and work in the Province. If we cannot keep the young people in the Province it will die a natural death. In order to do this many things will be required;

good schools, good roads, electrical services, policy of encouraging centralization of our people, municipal councils, activities, churches, and societies, good living conditions and wages and all that these things contain. I believe it is possible for these things to be brought about, and I am certain that this Government will do its part in this respect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks I have proposed to say that as a member I was happy to feel the friendly attitude which obtains among all members of this Honourable House, but this afternoon we had a tete-a-tete between the Honourable the Premier and the honourable member for St. John's South.

MR. SPEAKER: That debate is closed. The honourable member is now violating the rule which is called the rule of previous debate.

MR. MIFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I believe every person in this House sincerely believes he has a duty to perform to this Province and to the Dominion, and that he can make a distinct contribution to public life in the performance of this serious duty. Out of this automatically grow differences of opinion. But if it is at all possible let us resolve these differences to the better advantage of this country and to the prestige of ourselves.

MR. STRICKLAND: Mr. Speaker, with such a tremendous build-up through my honourable colleague it is only right and proper I should follow so closely behind him.

In rising to speak on the Address in Reply I want to associate myself with him and all honourable members on both sides of the House in sincerely congratulating you, Sir, on your elevation to the office of Honourable

Speaker of this House. Possibly I can do it in a little different way because quite often as I have been sitting here and listening to you and watching you very closely I have been reminded time and again of a passage of Scripture which reminds us that "He that humbles himself shall be exalted" for I can recall visiting this House on several occasions in years past and seeing you, Sir, just inside the bar of the House very quietly doing what you considered to be your duty, yet undoubtedly honestly trying to prepare yourself for the job to which you have been called. Mr. Speaker, I wish you well.

To the honourable and gallant Member for Harbour Grace who so ably moved that a committee be appointed to draft an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I sincerely congratulate him. I think he served notice to the House that he is to be heard from in the days to come. I firmly believe if what we heard on opening day is any indication of what the honourable and gallant member can do then he is an orator of no mean talent.

The honourable and gallant Member for Bell Island who gave such an account of himself when he so ably seconded the motion I sincerely congratulate him as well. I heartily endorse all the good things said by members from both sides of this House of the splendid job so well done by both of these honourable and gallant gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, I have come to this House from the old reliable stock of Newfoundlanders known as "the common people." I am a common man, Mr. Speaker, and I make no apologies whatever for that statement. I am really proud of my heritage of being

a common man. I am keenly interested, Sir, in the welfare of the common people of this country. That does not mean, Sir, I have no interest whatever in Newfoundlanders who are not in the category. Far from it I am deeply interested in the welfare of all Newfoundlanders and in fact all Canadians. But I must submit, Sir, I am convinced of this one thing; if every Newfoundlander is to have his rightful place in the great country of Canada then far more consideration must be given to the common man than ever he received when he was compelled to try and exist on six cents a day.

I have no desire whatever, Sir, to stand on the floor of this House and try to eulogize any Government who saved forty or fifty or sixty or for that matter a hundred million dollars at the expense of hungry children, uneducated young men and women, undernourished women, overworked fathers and very often ill-clad but because of the Christians we are supposed to be I only hope we find it in our hearts to forgive them long ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I want to make clear, and I don't want to say this to invite controversy from the other side of this House—I have some respect for the honourable gentlemen on the other side of this House, but I notice the honourable gentleman at times bends over backwards to try to give the new members on this side of the House some good advice, and undoubtedly with the best of intentions. I want to assure the honourable gentleman that personally I have taken note and I think it might stand in good stead in years to come if I continue in politics. But I am wondering if the honourable gentleman will be gracious enough to accept what I am going to say now with the same ap-

preciative spirit that I accept the many good things they threw across at us.

Who are the new members? Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more boring, more irking, more monotonous as far I am concerned than continuous repetition. Let me say this—The voters of Newfoundland or the voters of the outports—I will stop here and interject something else—I have no desire whatever to drive a wedge between the outports and the City of St. John's. I left the outports seventeen years ago to come here to get a living and there is no place on God's Earth I have visited that I would rather live than in the City of St. John's. But, Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly convinced the voters of the outports of Newfoundland heartily endorsed the statement I just made when they swept the Liberal Government back into power in October 1956 with the greatest vote of confidence any Premier in this world could ever hope to receive. What I am suggesting, Sir, is that Newfoundlanders are tired of the story of Valdmanis. They are interested in something different from that. They are tired of the history of the new industries. They have something else far different from that to be interested in. You ask a fisherman I have the honour to represent in this House what his concern is, and I assure you not one per cent of them will answer "Valdmanis." They have something else to worry about. Ask the loggers of my district the same question. I assure you they will never tell you it is the new industries. Ask the many thousands of our other primary producers of Newfoundland the same question. I submit, Mr. Speaker, their answers will vastly differ from either "Valdmanis" or the "new industries." I want to tell this House that their concern is my concern. I

will go a bit further and say—and I have learned this in recent months—their concern is this Liberal Government's concern. I am conscious of that or I would not say it. More than that I am certain that this Liberal Government is trying to find a real solution for every problem that our Newfoundland people are confronted with.

Now I am not going to try and fool anybody this afternoon, and stand on the floor of this House and say we have no problems in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, living in Newfoundland we are not living in the "Land of Cannan" but I am satisfied we have now left Egypt and we are on the way to the Promised Land, if that is possible. But there are the problems to be met. Mr. Speaker, in the district I have the honour to represent there are problems in connection with our fisheries—very serious problems—I am not satisfied, Sir, that this is the correct time or place to talk about them but I am satisfied that the Honourable the Premier knows of them. I am satisfied that the Honourable Minister of Fisheries knows of them and I am satisfied that my honourable colleague, the member for White Bay North, in his capacity as Secretary of the Newfoundland Fishermen's Federation, knows of them because I have seen to it they do know. I have talked to merchants in my district, to union officials in my district and to fishermen in my district, and I have come back to St. John's and have talked to the Honourable the Premier, the Honourable Minister of Fisheries and the honourable member for White Bay North. I am satisfied of one thing, Mr. Speaker, that a satisfactory solution can and will be found.

Now, Sir, I do not profess to be an authority on fishery matters, but being

the son of a fisherman I spent a lot of time in a fishing boat. I spent a lot of time catching fish. I spent a lot of time curing fish. For a number of years now I have been closely associated with different merchants in Newfoundland who have bought and sold Newfoundland fish. More than that, Mr. Speaker, I had myself, as master mariner, made some thirty-odd trips to the Caribbean Markets and have taken over numerous quintals of Newfoundland fish to that market. I submit to this House that possibly I may not be a greenhorn after all.

The honourable and learned member for St. John's South, I think it was, a few days ago made the statement that St. John's is the largest fishing settlement in Newfoundland. Now I have no figures to say the honourable gentleman is wrong. I take it for granted he is absolutely right. But I submit, Sir, that when we take up the fisheries of Newfoundland we have to think of Bonavista. We have a fresh fish plant there. We have a coldstorage there. The firm of J. T. Swyers & Company this year have built one salt fish drier capable of handling three hundred quintals at a time. I believe that is completed. They are now building another one that can handle six hundred quintals at a time, so that both in co-operation can handle about nine hundred quintals of fish at a time.

But we have some problems, as I said before, and I tried to educate myself thoroughly in all these problems. No man is too big for me to approach and none too small, because when I decided to enter politics and contest the District of Bonavista South I decided to give my people everything that is in me—that is my dedi-

cation—and in order to help to carry out that dedication of necessity I must learn of my people's problems. That is what I have tried to do. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied we are on the road to a solution of the problems.

We have problems in connection with roads in my district. I am happy the honourable member for St. John's East had occasion some time ago to drive down over the road from Clarenville to Bonavista Bay, I only wish he would go there more often. Mr. Speaker, from Clarenville to Southern Bay the road is in a very good condition for a gravel road, I cannot see where we can improve on it too much for a gravel road. But from Southern Bay to Bonavista the road is a real headache. Driving over that road a little while ago I was impressed with one thing, that is the quicker that the Government can bring into being some road building programme that will bring all the roads in Newfoundland up to a decent standard the quicker this Government will begin to save money on maintenance and snow clearing. I only wish we had a hundred and fifty thousand dollars to begin at it now. From Southern Bay to Bonavista, when I was there a little while ago, Sir, I notice they were using a bulldozer to clear snow from the road, and that bulldozer was making just three miles an hour clearing snow because that road is narrow and not built up. But from Southern Bay to Clarenville, Mr. Speaker, I discovered where the road is built up and the turn taken out they were using a truck plow and that plow was making fifteen miles an hour. The comparison is five to one, Mr. Speaker. I submit that can happen all over Newfoundland and this Government can save a lot of money in snow clearing by

bringing the roads up to a decent standard as quickly as possible. That is one of the answers.

I want to associate myself with my honourable colleague from Trinity North and say the road from Bonavista to Port Union as far as I am concerned should be paved and paved as quickly as possible. I did make some enquiries a little while ago about how much freight travelled over this road per year. As you are aware, Sir, Port Union and Catalina are the winter shipping ports. Beyond Bonavista there is not a winter shipping port. If anyone were with me a couple of years ago when we almost lost a boat they would jolly well know Port Union and Catalina are winter fishing ports, and all freight from Elliston, Bonavista, Newman's Cove and all the other small coves around there must go over that road. One of the merchants in that area told me a short time ago there are between seventy-five to one hundred thousand quintals of fish going over that road each winter. Mr. Speaker, I submit that with so much traffic as that passing over a road then the quicker that we can pave that road the better for all concerned.

There are a lot of problems in connection with roads in my district. I believe I can truthfully say that every mile of road in my district I have driven over. I do not know of one mile I have not covered, not one. I went to see for myself. I wanted to learn of the conditions that our people are faced with. There was only one way for me to learn and that was to drive over the roads. There are a lot of improvements needed in the District of Bonavista South as far as roads are concerned, and I shall be after the Honourable the Premier and the Honourable Minister of Highways

and the Honourable Minister of Public Works to do all that they possibly can for the roads in my district. I do not want to take anything else from any of the other honourable members, but I assure you, Sir, I want what belongs to Bonavista South.

The hospital facilities in my district are far from adequate. But here I must join forces with the honourable member for Trinity North again. We have talked this over with the Honourable Minister of Health and others, and we have come to one conclusion; that is that the answer to this problem is to build a regional hospital somewhere in the Clarenville area that would take care of the hospital needs from the District of Bonavista South as well as the District of Trinity North. That is the only solution as far as we can see at the moment.

Now, Sir, I say, and here is where I begin, I think, I must part company with my honourable colleagues on this side praising the "Canadian National Railway" so highly since opening day. I cannot honestly stand on the floors of this House, Sir, and I am not going to, and say the service rendered by the "Canadian National Railway" is good enough. Far from it, and I would not dare suggest just how far behind the time the service Bonavista receives from the "Canadian National Railway" happens to be. It is too far even for me to hazard a guess. I have today received the schedule for the Bonavista Branch Train for this year. According to this, Sir, I discover it is going to take a man twenty-four and possibly twenty-six hours from St. John's to Bonavista.

MR. HIGGINS: Hear! Hear!

MR. STRICKLAND: I have driven there in seven hours myself in my car.

To me that is ridiculous. More than that, Mr. Speaker, the train that leaves St. John's on Wednesday for Bonavista today has not got a dining car attached. That means you have to pack a lunch box when travelling on that train. Sir, that is serious to me. I want to register my protest as strongly as possible against such service. I think it is fifty years behind the times at least. Again, Sir, I only wish that my constituents in Terra Nova could hear me now. We have a situation there, Sir, that I am not in favour of. I have approached the management of the railway about it. I cannot get any definite answer on what will be done this year. But if you happened to live in Gander, Sir, and wanted to bring your car to Clarenville you can do so for ten dollars by using the rail ferry, but if you happen to live in Terra Nova, which is half the distance to travel, then they charge me twenty-five dollars for the simple reason the railcar ferry won't stop long enough for me to put my car on. To me that is ridiculous. I am not going to charge discrimination, but that is not service for this day and age, and I am wholly dissatisfied with it, and I ask the Government if there is anything they can possibly do to remedy the situation for this year let it be done and do it quickly as possibly, my recommendation would be for one day a week, preferably Friday or Saturday. I only hope we can make the necessary arrangements to give them one day.

Mr. Speaker, talk about service, a shipment of coal left North Sydney February 9th., a car of coal I should say, bound for Bonavista and Port Rexton. Two months later that car of coal was found on the siding up in Nova Scotia. To me, Sir, that is not service. I only can say that my people are very forebearing to put up with it.

I am not satisfied with it, and again to register my protest. I could go on, but there is one other thing that I should say if I want to produce evidence to back up whatever statement I make in this House: Last summer (and the snow on the Gaff Topsails could not be blamed for this) last summer I got a telephone call from Sydney one morning from a merchant there. He had purchased some fresh frozen fish in Newfoundland and he had made arrangements for that fish to go on the market in Boston that Tuesday. Do you know where we found that fish on the same Tuesday afternoon? On a siding in Port aux Basques. To make a bad matter worse excess charges had been paid on that car of fish. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me hasten to add, I am not blaming the "Canadian National Railway" officials in St. John's. I worked with them five years and have a lot of respect for them. I know them very well. I will go along with the honourable member for Labrador South and say now they are second to none in the world. But I maintain the programme for the operation of our Newfoundland trains and boats is made in Moncton or somewhere else and with little or no knowledge of conditions in Newfoundland. If the men in Newfoundland were given a free hand to make arrangements regarding our trains and boats very soon we would see a vast improvement in our services in Newfoundland. I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but I have said enough to convince this House and I hope convince the country that I am very much dissatisfied with the services of the "Canadian National Railway" in my district.

Now, Mr. Speaker, possibly I should say something about the North Sydney-Newfoundland coal trade, seeing I have been somewhat involved in or for

quite a while. First of all, I have a lot of sympathy for Newfoundland boat owners who have their boats engaged in that trade. I know what it is to spend two weeks tied on to a pier in Sydney waiting for coal. There are thousands of dollars lost annually to our Newfoundland boat owners for the simple reason that they have to lose so much time in Sydney waiting for coal. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one point I want to clear up. The officials of the company at Sydney will very often try to convince you these boat owners are to blame. Nonsense! Ridiculous. It is not so. I want to say without fear of contradiction that ninety-five per cent of our boats entering the Harbour of Sydney, North Sydney, their "ETA" is days ahead of time. The trouble, Sir, is low production—Demand is far greater than supply for the preferred coal that our Newfoundland people require. I do not blame Newfoundlanders for asking for preferred coal. When they have to pay from twenty-eight dollars to thirty dollars a ton for coal they cannot afford to pay for dust, and the best is not too good.

I will give you some figures to show you that production this year past, 1956, is much lower than 1955: Just take two months of the year, from December 16th, 1955 to February 16th, 1956, exactly two months, fifty-two working days. Newfoundland received twenty-four thousand seven hundred and ninety odd tons of coal, mostly small, brought from Sydney and North Sydney. This year December 16th, 1957 slightly over ten thousand tons. The coal was not available and Newfoundland boats were tied to piers in North Sydney as high as ten and twelve days waiting for coal. Still for all that they tried to blame Newfoundland boat owners for such lost time in Sydney. I

am convinced there is only one solution to this problem, and I submit to the House that this is a serious problem. Very soon we won't get men to go at that. They cannot afford it. I submit these boat owners and operators should be paid for time lost at Sydney. Now I am not foolish enough to suggest that the poor beggars of Newfoundlanders who buy a ton of coal should pay for this. It is not their fault. I think the only solution is to pass that bill back to the company when they are to blame for the time that is lost there. I have given it a lot of thought, discussed it with officials in the Government in Ottawa, with the Chairman of the Dominion Coal Board and others, and I think there is one possible solution. I am not so sure I should make it known in this House, but I am prepared to discuss it at the right time and in the right place. But I believe the time has come when we should do something because production this year to date is lower than last year. I received this information from North Sydney only two or three days ago. It appears now boats will lose even more time this year than last, and goodness knows they lost plenty. I think if there is anything possible to do to relieve the situation we should do it now and not wait until October and then have the same trouble as last year.

A lot of people wonder why our merchants do not stockpile coal in midsummer. I will give the answer to that one, Mr. Speaker—If a man stockpiles a thousand tons of coal he can count on twenty per cent degradation when he sells it, and there is no outlet for degradation in this country or very little; therefore none of our merchants can afford to do that. If we could find an outlet for the degradation then possibly it would be

the answer to the problem. But stockpiling is not profitable as an undertaking for any man. The only answer to that situation is service, not even subventions but the answer is service. The quicker that we can get the service, I think, the happier the boat owners and operators are going to be.

Possibly I should say something on our Newfoundland coastal fleet—Being master mariner myself for years I have read a lot, I have heard a lot about our depleted coastal fleet. Some have gone far enough to suggest the Government should undertake the building of another fleet like the Splinter Fleet. I cannot go along with that idea, Mr. Speaker.

Last summer I have gone every day in the week sometime during the day from early spring to late fall and visited the water front in St. John's and I have taken a lot of notes. I know practically all the Newfoundland skippers very well. I could go down in their fore-castle and sit down and have a cup of tea and have a talk to them and I find out a lot of things. In the early spring, Sir, it is no trouble to come into St. John's and load a boat in a couple of days and move out. But during July and August and September months I have known boats to be tied up ten and twelve days trying to get ballast enough to get north with. I cannot see how this Government nor any other Government can undertake the building of another fleet unless the prospects are better than that in June, July and August—But I have a suggestion possibly that might help. We have a number of boats in Newfoundland that are badly in need of repairs. I suggest, Sir, that the maximum life of Newfoundland wood is generally twenty years in boats. After that I don't want to go to sea in

her myself anyhow. I suggest that if a man who owns a hundred ton vessel can extend the life of that boat for ten years then he should receive half the bounty that is paid for building of boats in order that he might repair his boat—and we will save what we have.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Extend the life beyond twenty years by doing that?

MR. STRICKLAND: Yes, Sir, extend it another ten. They have at least eight or ten boats now they could rebuild in that way. I think it would take care of a lot of our boats. I have been approached on several occasions by master mariners in Newfoundland about the same thing. My own hope is that something can be done to help our men in this way. I cannot see the Government spending a hundred thousand or two hundred thousand dollars to build a boat and give it to me or someone else that has no interest in her. The general tendency is to say, the Government owns her—get all we can out of her and forget the rest of it. But if a man owns a boat himself then he has something to work for. If the Government can help him to repair his boat then I think in taking care of his own interest he will also take care of the interest of the Government in the boat. So I could go on and on and on, Sir, but I don't think I will go very much farther.

I do want to say this, however: I have been extremely pleased with the various Government Ministerial Departments in St. John's for their kindness whenever I have gone to their offices or called them on the telephone regarding some need in my district. Their doors are always open, their ears are open and more than

that their hearts are open. Here again I find that they are prepared to bend over backwards in order to help some needy soul. I thank them sincerely, and not only the Minister but their Departments, Deputy Ministers and other people who are associated with the various departments—It is wonderful.

There is a gentleman up there in the Unemployment Insurance Office. He has more work to do than any other two men I know of, possibly in that Department. Yet whenever I go up to his office and lay perhaps a dozen or fifteen or twenty letters on his desk he takes all the time necessary to find out the details and whenever possible to assist the man who has not received his unemployment insurance. We deeply appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and we want the public of this country to know we appreciate such efforts. It is wonderful to have men in office like that. As long as we keep officers, men of that calibre we can alleviate a lot of suffering that we have in Newfoundland.

I spoke about the fisheries. I should say a word about unemployment insurance for fishermen who have worked to make it possible for Newfoundland to receive it, I think, Mr. Speaker, in the early days of 1958. This will be remembered by a lot of humble fishermen in their private devotion to God and there will be sincere thanks from a lot of humble hearts when unemployment insurance is made available to them. It is something that should have happened long ago, and now we are happy it is to be a reality.

Mr. Speaker, before closing I want to say again that I entered politics with one ambition—It was not to be a good politician. That is the farthest

thing from my mind. But I want to be a good servant of my people. I want to learn of their trials and their tribulations and their troubles. I want to do all that I possibly can to help them in any way that I possibly can. In October of this year I went into the district of Bonavista South, and the good people of that district had to accept me on faith. A lot did not know me. True, the people of Bonavista did. But four or five years from now, Sir, if my life is spared to go back again, it will not be a question of faith then, it will be a question of what I have done. I want to be able to give a good account of my stewardship. I want to be able to face my people and say I have tried to do things honestly and sincerely for God and man. If I can do that, Mr. Speaker, I shall have no fear of the result no matter who my opponent may be.

Thank you very much!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the position of the clock, I move that all further orders of the day do stand deferred and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 of the clock.

—
THURSDAY, April 25, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave

to present a petition from the people of Wild Bight. The petition of the people is for the construction of a road from Little Bay to Wild Bight. I understand this road will cover a distance of approximately three miles. I understand the road at present is under some form of construction. It is possible, I understand, to get over the road for a part of the summer. And for a small expenditure, Mr. Speaker, I understand this road would be made possible and take the people of Wild Bight out of their isolation.

I strongly support the prayer of the petitioners and urge that the prayer of the petition be received by this House and that the petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Goose Arm in the Bay of Islands. The petition prays that a road would be constructed to link up the settlement of Goose Arm with the existing road now being used by Bowater's Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Mills. I may say that Bowater's have a road from Deer Lake to the bottom of Goose Arm, and this is within three and a half miles of the settlement of Goose Arm. The petitioners are praying that the road be extended to the settlement in order to connect it up with the road from Deer Lake.

I may say that there are upwards of one hundred people living in Goose Arm. It is one of the oldest settlements in Bay of Islands, where they engage chiefly in fishing and in lumbering. And they are very isolated and they have no road connection whatsoever. The building of this road

would mean a great advantage to the people. It would relieve them of their isolation and also enable them to do better for themselves by having a road connection with the bigger settlement of Deer Lake and the other parts of the Humber District.

I endorse the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, I give it my fullest support, and I would ask that this petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for reference to the department to which it relates.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the citizens of the community of Brent's Cove praying that the road be built from Baie Verte to La Scie. It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps the fifth or sixth petition. There are a number of places in Baie Verte Peninsula and in Green Bay all requesting the construction of this road. I believe my honourable friend from Green Bay South has presented one or two petitions on it, and I have already presented three besides this one. That road from Baie Verte to La Scie is approximately thirty miles in length and will have the merit of giving transportation in addition to the communities of Baie Verte and La Scie and would pass through the following communities, Ming's Bight; Paquet; Woodstock; Harbour Round and Brent's Cove. It would link these communities up with the important fishing community of La Scie and the important logging and mining community of Baie Verte. As a matter of fact Brent's Cove is only by land a matter of three or four miles from La Scie. It would have the merit of enab-

ling the residents of Brent's Cove to participate in the fishery development at La Scie without moving their homes.

I give my hearty support to this petition which again prays for the opening up of a road in what I consider to be one of the richest parts of Newfoundland, an important fishery area, a very important logging area and perhaps the most important mining area in the whole province.

I beg leave to table this petition and request it be referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for reference to the department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices 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 Summary Jurisdiction Act."

I further give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Penitentiary Act."

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): gives notice of questions on tomorrow.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Provide for Teachers by Way of Loans For Certain Purposes."

I give further notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill,

"An Act Relating to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association."

Answers to Questions

See Appendix.

QUESTION No. 83: (See Appendix).

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I had a question, No. 57, addressed to the Minister of Mines and Resources on the Order Paper of April 2—I wonder if the minister has the answer today?

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the replies to QUESTIONS No. 80, 57 and 24 (See Appendix).

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to reply to Question No. 82. I am just wondering if this question should have been directed to the Honourable Minister of Supply. However I have the answer to the question, and I beg leave to table the answer. (See Appendix).

I may say in connection with the heading "Labrador Affairs," there were about one hundred firms listed here that did supply the division in Labrador. I have all the names here. Also for the General Hospital, Mental Hospital and the Sanatorium I have the names and amounts here as well. That pertains to the vegetables supplied to these institutions. The names of the firms who supplied food to the infirmary, girls' home and training school and infants' home. I beg leave to table as well.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, could the Premier tell us if the Government car involved in an accident yesterday was fully covered by insurance?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask, if I may, who was the acting Minister of Fisheries in the absence of the Minister of Fisheries?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if his attention was drawn to the article in the "Evening Telegram" yesterday in which it was stated that the fishermen of St. John's were to have a fish market situated at the naval premises on Water Street West? Remember a few days ago I asked if any progress had been made in selecting a site, and the Minister of Fisheries did not know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer was correct.

MR. BROWNE: There is no foundation for that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not read that and cannot answer for it. I know the minister was correct.

MR. BROWNE: Can you tell me whether any developments have taken place since?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think that they have.

MR. BROWNE: Show that article to the Premier.

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to express my very warm congratulations to everyone who has spoken in this present debate but more especially to the new members on this side of the House who have participated. I doubt that there ever was a House in Newfoundland since 1832 that had a membership on either

side or both sides so high in calibre as the present membership of the House. Now, as the overwhelming majority of them are on this side it follows that the high quality is for the most part, at least numerically, on this side of the House. I think I can say there has rarely been abler men on the Opposition than there are today. But for me it was a particularly personal pleasure and a matter of very great personal pride that member after member on this side of the House expressed himself so eloquently, so ably, so interestingly. It was indeed a high standard of high speaking ability, a high standard of knowledge, a high standard of intimate acquaintance with the problems of Newfoundland. I hope that Newfoundland will never be served by a lower calibre of men than she has in this present House of Assembly. It would be difficult from the day when the present motion which we are debating was introduced up to yesterday afternoon, when the honourable members for Trinity North and Bonavista South spoke, to say who was the abler speaker because every day produced a very able speaker indeed, and you felt as you heard each of these speeches—Well, this is surely the high-water mark—Yet that highwater mark was exceeded on the following day.

I have been here as member of the House for the past eight years. And I was here before that for many years as a newspaper reporter, sitting in one or other of these two boxes. I came here before that. I came here for the first time about 1913 and possibly yes, 1912, when I was a boarder at Bishop Feild College, just a block away. I would come in here after school and sit up in the gallery. I remember hearing the great Sir Robert Bond—sitting approximately opposite to where I stand at this moment—

I remember hearing Lord Morris, standing approximately where I am at this moment. And from that moment on I have been watching this House from time to time. And I think I can say that the standard, the level in this House is higher now, since this House opened in this present general assembly, than it ever has been in my own recollection or within the limit of my own personal knowledge. I think it was very impressive, the way in which each individual member who spoke told the House of the problems of his district. After all we may try and we ought to try and be statesmen, to look at Newfoundland as a whole, to look indeed at Canada as a whole. But we can be statesmen to such an extent that we forget the particular segment of the general public that sent each one of us here. It was the people of St. Barbe who sent my honourable friend on my left to this House and not the people of Newfoundland generally. And while he must, of course, consider the problems of Newfoundland as such, he would be a very short-sighted member if he failed in so doing to consider the particular problems of his own constituents. And I detect more of that careful attention to the problems of the constituencies in this present session than I have seen in this House before.

Now I have several things I want to say myself, but before beginning to do so I think I ought to comment on one or two things said by the honourable gentlemen opposite. Unfortunately they have left me very little to rebut. Their speeches were mild. They were not argumentative. They were not very controversial. And I listened carefully for something to rebut. I made a few notes but there were only a few to make.

The honourable gentleman who is the Leader of the Opposition made two statements that I think called for an answer. One was the statement that Newfoundland is paying to Ottawa more than Ottawa is paying to Newfoundland. Now I do not think the honourable gentleman could have meant that literally. He must have had some mystical meaning of his own for those words. He could not have meant literally the simple statement that the people of Newfoundland are contributing more cash each year to the Treasury of Canada at Ottawa than the Treasury of Canada in Ottawa is contributing to Newfoundland. He could not have meant that.

MR. HOLLETT: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am glad to see him agree, he could not have meant that. I infer therefore that that was not what he meant.

MR. HOLLETT: Nothing mystical—Look at trade and commerce.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is now alluding, I believe, to the fact that if I go into the Royal Stores and buy a suit of clothes the price I pay to the Royal Stores includes a profit for the manufacturer of that suit of clothes, the Ontario or Quebec manufacturer, and on that profit paid that manufacturer in Ontario or Quebec the Government of Canada collects a tax, corporation tax, and actually, therefore I am the one who has paid that tax. That is the argument to which I think the honourable gentleman alludes. Now there is not any doubt of that. But when that factor has been taken completely into account, completely, and Newfoundland is credited with the amount that the people of Ontario paid the Treasury of Canada,

when Newfoundland is credited with that and that is added on to what the people pay directly to Ottawa in the form of taxes, when both are added up the total comes to an amount far below the amount that the Treasury of Canada distributes within the Province and amongst the people and Government of Newfoundland. If it were not so then Newfoundland would be one of the have-provinces. Notoriously Newfoundland is one of the have-not-provinces. Newfoundland is one of the Canadian Provinces receiving more each year from Ottawa than it pays to Ottawa. There are Provinces that pay more to Ottawa each year than Ottawa pays to them. For example, Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia and Alberta are the four great have-provinces that pay Ottawa more than Ottawa pays them. The have-not-provinces are Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan and Manitoba. These provinces receive more from Ottawa than they pay to Ottawa. And it is only because there are provinces that pay more to Ottawa than they receive that Ottawa is able to pay more to some provinces than those provinces pay to Ottawa, we being one of the latter. Now that is so obvious that it is not helping to clarify the thinking of the Newfoundland people to refuse to see it or to put up an argument to the contrary. It will not be argued, surely, Mr. Speaker, by the honourable gentleman, surely it will not be argued by him that each people in Canada, each province in Canada pays precisely to Ottawa what Ottawa pays to them. He won't argue that. He will not argue either that the people of each province pay the same amount to Ottawa, nor will he argue that Ottawa pays an equal amount to each one of the ten Provinces.

MR. HOLLETT: Excuse me, if I may, Mr. Speaker—The honourable the Premier is just referring to taxes alone. I was also referring to the difference of markets as of now and before Confederation. Now if when we increased the market to Canada by four hundred thousand people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Quite so—and what is sold in this Province from other parts of Canada, in so far as a profit is made on these things and the Government of Canada collects taxes from these products in this province.—Newfoundland is contributing to Ottawa—in so far as that is the case. But I say if you take that figure, and there is no precise estimate of it, and add it to the amount known to be contributed by Newfoundland to Ottawa, the two together do not come anywhere near equalling the amount that Ottawa contributed to Newfoundland.

Now there was another statement the honourable gentleman made and he was joined in it in a sense by his colleague the honourable member for St. John's Centre. The Leader of the Opposition said that in 1949 we had a cash surplus and a very small public debt. Now the member for St. John's Centre said nothing about the debt. He contented himself with a reference to the fact that we had a surplus. So that the two honourable gentlemen tell us that we had a surplus, a cash surplus in 1949. And one of the honourable gentlemen reminded us that we had only a very small public debt. Now there is no possibility of disagreeing with the two statements. The statements are quite true. It is true that we had a cash surplus in 1949 and it is equally true we had only a small public debt. But is it helping clear thinking? Is it really helping the people of Newfoundland to form

good, rational sound judgments merely to make these two statements? That is only part of the truth. It is true but it is only part of the truth.

The other part of the truth is that we have today, eight years later, something far better than a cash surplus. We have the roads that the spending of the cash surplus created. We have the schools that were not there then that have been built out of the cash surplus. We have the hospitals that we did not have then and that have been built out of the cash surplus. We have many, many public services and conveniences around Newfoundland today, we have housing, we have water and sewerage, we have electricity, we have a host of things in Newfoundland today that we did not have eight years ago. And these things cost money, and the money they cost was the surplus. Now admittedly, admittedly the surplus is not thereby accounted for in full. Some of the surplus was spent at other things. That is admittedly so. But it is not intellectually a proper thing to do to say only that in 1949 we had a surplus and a small public debt. That intellectually is not a proper thing to do. It is true. The statement is accurate. But the statement is incomplete and it lies therefore, not intentionally, but it lies unintentionally by stating only part of the truth.

Now I think, I do think, that the people of Newfoundland are well aware of the roads they have not that they had not eight years ago, the two hundred or more places in Newfoundland which in the last eight years have been connected up by road are well aware that the building of those roads cost money. They know that. They know that the cottage hospitals that exist today and did not exist, the clinics that exist and did

not exist, the health boats that exist today, the nursing stations that exist today and did not eight years ago cost money. And the people are well aware of these facts.

But perhaps it is a little ungracious of me to complain of these two statements made by the honourable gentlemen because, after all, the speeches they made were constructive and civilized — if I may use that word without appearing to be patronizing — they were fine constructive speeches.

Now the honourable and learned member for St. John's South said only two things that call for any comment at all. And that is rather an astounding statement for me to be able to make. Usually his speeches call for more than one or two words of rebuttal. Usually they are more provocative, more controversial, and get inside your skin more successfully than his speech did in the present debate.

He spoke of this Government laying waste our natural resources. Now, Mr. Speaker, when I heard that said I had immediately a picture in my mind and I suggest to you that this is the picture which must occur to Your Honour's mind and occur to the mind of the honourable leader of the Opposition, that these words will not bear any other computation nor interpretation than the one I am going to give them—Laying waste our natural resources can only mean slashing down the forests and letting the trees lie and rot on the ground, it can only mean setting fire to the oil wells, if we have them, and letting them go off in smoke. Laying waste our natural resources can only mean taking the minerals out of the earth and dumping them into the ocean and not making any use of them. Laying waste our natural resources—I search-

ed my memory with regard to the last eight years and I have no conscious recollection of any natural resources of Newfoundland having been laid waste. But I do remember about four or five years ago in the vicinity of Gander some contractor began to lay waste some of our natural resources, and I remember making a hot statement—was very angry about it—They were proposing to burn two or three thousand cords of good merchantable pulp wood. And I created a great stink about the matter, and they changed their minds very hurriedly and the wood was harvested and sold to one of the paper companies. Now this is the nearest I know to laying waste one of our natural resources of Newfoundland. Unless the honourable and learned member was referring to the fact that the Government have made a determined effort to bring concerns here to survey and measure and blueprint these natural resources with a view to developing them, unless that is what the honourable and learned member had in mind. It is true that we have brought into Newfoundland a great many very large and very reputable companies from England and from the mainland of Canada and from the Continental United States to conduct surveys of our timber, of our minerals, of our water powers. In some cases we have paid them cash for doing so. In other cases they have spent their own money to do it. But a considerable amount of survey work has been carried on and a great deal of blueprinting and mapping and some developing is about to commence notably in the Tilt Cove, notably in the Baie Verte, notably in the Little Bay, notably in Gull Pond, notably at Wabush Lake a development is about to commence.

But surely the honourable and learned gentleman does not mean us

to take that as laying waste our natural resources? Now if he does not what does he mean? Or was it just one of these phrases a speaker sometimes utters because no one challenges him, no one makes him produce his invoices, no one makes him prove his words. He, just in a sort of fit of oratory, says things like that sometimes and really he could not prove it if he were to save his life.

Then he said something else—He compared the prosperity in Newfoundland before and after Confederation, and he compared it in a very peculiar way. He compared it by telling us the bank savings of the people before Confederation and the bank savings of the people since Confederation, these past eight years, is this—With all the money circulating in Newfoundland in these eight years you might normally expect to see a vast increase in the amount of the people's investment of their money in life insurance and an equally vast amount of increase of the people's investment of their money in the form of bank savings. Now on the contrary I do not see that you have got the same rate of increase in investment by our people in life insurance in the last eight years that you did in the previous eight nor have you got the same rate of investment of the people's money by the people in the bank savings in the past eight years that you had in the previous eight years because what happened is this: In the past eight years the people have spent their money. They have not saved it. They have saved but they have spent it at a much more generous rate than they did in the previous eight or indeed the previous eighty years. Why? They have spent it building homes. They have spent it furnishing their homes. They have spent it buying clothes, better clothes and more

clothes. They have spent it buying more food—I would like to be able to say better food but certainly I can say more food. They have spent it buying motor cars. They have spent it building churches. They have spent it building schools. Our people during the last eight years have been on what I can only call the most enormous spending spree in Newfoundland's history. Why? Why have they spent their money so lavishly compared with what had gone before, not lavishly compared with Nova Scotia, not lavishly compared with Alberta, Ontario, British Columbia?

MR. BROWNE: It compares with Nova Scotia.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think not. I think even now the standard of living is much higher in Nova Scotia and we shall prove that in the next few weeks in another place. The standards and levels there are still very much higher than in Newfoundland. So I say we Newfoundlanders have spent money lavishly, with almost frightening lavishness, in the last eight years it is lavish only in comparison with what we Newfoundlanders did before the last eight years. By comparison to what is happening in other parts of the world it is still modest, pitiful, a pittance.

Now why is that? In the past eight years the people have saved less, relatively, they have invested less relatively in life insurance and have been spending more? Why? Why is that? Why does not the answer leap to the mind of every member of this House? Is there any member here who does not know the answer to that? The answer to that is that the fear is gone. My honourable friend here put it magnificently yesterday, one of the finest sayings I ever heard in this

House when he said we may not yet be come to the land of Canaan but we are out of the Land of Egypt. That is why our people are spending. They have lost their fear.

MR. BROWNE: The people feared a lot, but they were out of the Land of Egypt before they came to the Land of Canaan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are hardly quit out of the Land of Egypt yet—hardly yet. The people today are well aware that Newfoundland is beset by problems. They frighten you they are so many and they are so varied and they are so complex. The people are aware of that. The people are aware of that. The people are well aware that Newfoundland's problems are not yet solved. They know that because they are the ones who grapple with the problems, they feel the effects of these problems. But the people also know that the future is bright. They know that. They feel it in their blood. They feel it in their very bones. They feel that the long night is over and the dawn has come of an entirely new age for Newfoundland. We will go on from good things to better and from better to still better. We will go on. Nothing can stop us now, nothing can hold us back, nothing. It is true of a large part of the world, and we since Confederation are now part of the world whereas before we were a rock stuck out in the Atlantic, we were the Funks of North America, we were the Funks of the North American Continent before Confederation. Now we are part of the Continent. We are in the swim now, in the very stream of life.

MR. HOLLETT: There are no parasites on the Funks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The less said about parasites the better. Now the honourable and learned member for St. John's East and the honourable member for St. John's Centre said nothing that I heard that I could regard as exceptional or objectionable, and so I have no comment to make beyond saying that I enjoyed their speeches, as I did those of their colleagues and what their colleagues said was perfectly fine except for those two or three statements, which I submit, Mr. Speaker, with respect and with kindness, are arrant nonsense. Now even the best of men sometimes are guilty of a bit of nonsense.

MR. BROWNE: The honourable member for St. John's Centre you will remember said something worth noticing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He said something he is going to tell us about later on, how the Department of Supply buys materials and goods for the Government not by buying for those who tender at the best price but by those who tender at the highest price. I am still waiting with great interest for this information.

MR. DUFFY: I have it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have been up against this before and now I am up against it again, and I will wait with great interest.

MR. DUFFY: Some people had not courage enough to come across.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Lots have had courage. I have had people, businessmen, come to my office. We will see. My honourable friend should await his triumph until he gives his evidence. He must not try to have his triumph before that. Now before I move on I should like to pay tribute to Mr. Pickersgill for the part he has

played in the bringing of unemployment insurance about for the fishermen of Canada and particularly as we see it here for the fishermen of Newfoundland. Now I had no part in it. I think that two men can be thanked for the unemployment insurance, Mr. Pickersgill and the honourable member for White Bay North—two men—and to those two names I would couple the officers and members of the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen because the honourable member for White Bay North is an individual man and having no office would not have carried much weight. But as the General Secretary of the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen, given strong support by that Federation he was a powerful figure in bringing about unemployment insurance. But he will not take it amiss if I tell him he would have been wasting his time and his breath had it not been for Mr. Pickersgill. Now I will give the House an example, one small item of Newfoundland history.

I accompanied Mr. Pickersgill on his first election tour in Newfoundland, in the riding of Bonavista-Twillingate. And we got to Change Islands, or was it Joe Batt's Arm—at all events we were out at the head of a wharf, the two of us. And there were some thirty or forty fishermen surrounding us. And there was a Church of England clergyman, whose name I don't remember, I am sorry to say—And these fishermen were driving it home to Mr. Pickersgill, they thought it was a scandalous thing that everybody in Canada could have unemployment insurance and not the fishermen. And I said to them—"Look gentlemen, look, listen—I am all in favour of Unemployment Insurance for fishermen, frankly to tell you the honest truth, you do not want me to lie to you, you do not want me to falsify to you,

to tell you the honest truth as far as I can see you never will get unemployment insurance. There probably were some forty or fifty fishermen there in Joe Batt's Arm or Change Islands or one of the settlements in that area—I forget the name—who will remember that. And certainly the Church of England clergyman standing there—We had shaken hands with him and he was standing there. He will remember. And Jack Pickersgill spoke up and said—I don't know, I don't know, it would not be square just to say it is impossible, I would rather look into it. I am not going to promise it, but I will look into it. Now that is so like Jack Pickersgill. Not one of us here ever yet heard him make a promise.

MR. HOLLETT: May I suggest the Opposition in Canada forced it upon the Liberal Government in Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman may suggest, yes. There is no law against it. He won't be put in jail. And his honourable friend on his left may take credit for the fact that he spoke once or twice in the House of Commons, where I will say for him he was a good member and spoke up in favour of unemployment insurance and a lot of other good things as well. I too have spoken up in favour of unemployment insurance. All of us have had a shot at it. But the man who got it was Jack Pickersgill, make no mistake about that. That is the man who got it. That is the man who brought it about.

MR. HOLLETT: There had to be a man behind him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is quite true—There had to be a public clamour. But if there was not one man to take hold of it in Cabinet and put

it before his colleagues and brought them over to it. And when it was finally brought before the Cabinet it was not pitched out but listened to with some sympathy. If there had been no one to do that there would be no unemployment insurance for fishermen. Jack Pickersgill was the man who did that. And Newfoundland owes him a lot.

I did not know that anything was done about it, except a word here and there—It was only when the Cabinet ordered the unemployment insurance commission to make a study of it.

MR. BROWNE: It was studied for years.

MR. HOLLETT: You are not worried about his election are you?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I am not worried about his election. If we both were as sure of Heaven as Jack Pickersgill is of winning this election with a majority ringing across Canada that will be heard from one end of Canada to the other. If we could both be as sure of Heaven as he is sure of doing that in the riding of Bonavista, the Leader of the Opposition and I could be happy men, happier than we are, because we are not that sure.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I revel in this job. I glory in it. I love every moment of it from the moment when I wake in the morning until I go to sleep at two or three o'clock next morning. Every moment I am awake I love the work I am doing and love my job. There are other times when I feel that any man who is Premier of Newfoundland is the greatest fool in creation.

MR. HOLLETT: Don't say that. We don't say that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is because the honourable gentleman has

not been in this job. If he were in this job he would have his moments when he would feel that whoever took the job of being Premier of Newfoundland was the biggest fool in creation. And I will tell the House why:

If you sit back and take a look at Newfoundland—if you take a look at Newfoundland's problems—just count them up to start with. That is a good beginning. Just write them down, make a list of them. If you begin to realize the nature, the number, the variety and the complexity of Newfoundland's problems it is enough to make you not only walk out but to leave Newfoundland and go somewhere else where life must be easier surely than it is here on this Island. I said here earlier in this present session that I had asked all the members of the House on this side to compile for me an outline of the needs of their district. I told the House that, and added, if the honourable gentleman opposite cared to go to that trouble and let me have their lists I would be happy to have it. Well now they have not as yet all given me their lists, but most of them have. I have not as yet read them. But I have asked my colleague the honourable minister of Mines and Resources to have a great new map drawn for me, almost half the size of this wall and will take a great step ladder to get to the top of it. It will be the biggest map Newfoundland ever had. They have it up there now, and maybe they will have to build a building to get a wall big enough to put the map on. At all events on that great map of Newfoundland I am going to ask Mr. Burridge, our chief geographer, I suppose you would call him—He is the man I think draws pretty well all our maps—Mr. Titford and Mr. Burridge

two of them. I am going to ask them to put on that great map all the data of these reports that I have asked the honourable members of the House to prepare for me. If it is roads I am going to have the roads drawn on, if hospitals pictures of hospitals will be put on and so on, if hydro-electric power we will put transmission lines and poles on, if it is a ferry or whatever it is we will have it drawn on that map. And for the first time in Newfoundland's history, we are going to have a list of Newfoundland's problems. We are going to have more than a list we are going to have a map of them, a picture of them. Now I do not say that merely making a list of them and a map is going to find the solution. Some people you know feel when stating a problem that the mere stating of it is solving it. It is relatively easy to state a problem but not too easy to solve it.

As I say, I have not yet had an opportunity to read through these reports. But I will tell you what I have done, Mr. Speaker—I have taken a quick peep at them. Last night I worked quite late in my office going through these reports, just taking a quick peep at them. Some of them are very voluminous documents, and I take my hat off to some of the members, not perhaps all of them, but some of them. Some of them had districts which were not too complicated but others, such as St. Barbe and the two Labrador Districts, Labrador North and South, and the South West Coast some have problems very numerous and very difficult. St. John's as such has not got too many problems of the type that come under the jurisdiction of the House of Assembly. They have problems which come more under the jurisdiction of the City Council. In Labrador North you have, I suppose, a thousand miles of coast

line, and you have in that vast stretch of territory a handful of settlements. It has the biggest esquimaux population in Canada. And there are two problems that have to be faced and, Mr. Speaker, have to be solved. One is the problem of centralization of the population of Northern Labrador, the other is the problem of centralizing especially the Esquimaux population of Labrador. Now we have made a beginning at that.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker? Is the Premier aware that the late research on Esquimaux life is that it is better to leave them where they are rather than bring them in centre of population.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, I am reasonably familiar with the different theories on that matter. I have read a fair amount. And in the old Indian Affairs Branch and Esquimaux Branch in the former department in Ottawa I spent many hours discussing it with some of the greatest authorities in all of Canada on this matter. But we have actually made a beginning at centralizing the Esquimaux population by moving them from Nutak to Nain. Now in moving them we have the problem of housing, we have the problem of schools, we have the problem of hospitalization and then the problem of their earning a living. So we have been tackling that, but the problem is still a problem of great difficulty and great complexity.

It may not be generally known to this House but Happy Valley, which is a beautiful name, surely, Happy Valley is one of Newfoundland's newest towns—And there we had to provide hospital services, water and sewerage, electricity and roads. Now if that were the only problem Newfoundland had we could take it in our

stride and not even feel it. But then go to North West River, which is another very modern and progressive and energetic settlement. We have to build a road through from North West River to Goose. We have begun. We have to complete it. We have to provide water and sewerage, we have to provide housing for the Indian population we have living nearby. We have to provide electrification for North West River. And then for the whole of Labrador North where there are settlements or where there will continue to be settlements there are too the problems of roads and the eternal problem of fishery development.

Now I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that is a formidable list just for Labrador North. In Labrador South which is another five or six or eight hundred miles of coastline. Labrador South is as far from its northern tip to its southern tip as it would be to go from Cape Race to Cape Bauld. I suppose it is quite a bit further—sixty-five thousand square miles in area. It is twenty thousand square miles bigger than the whole Island of Newfoundland. We have there the problem of centralization of the population. Too many of the people are living in God Forsaken and one could almost say God Forgotten settlements that have no future and no hope of any future. They have to be encouraged and helped to move from such places into large places where they have a better chance in life. Therefore centralization is a terrific problem in Newfoundland—We got to provide roads connecting these good settlements. We got in Sandwich Bay and Alexis Bay a great problem of timber development. And we have a problem in that whole area of Labrador South of providing for more

lumber and sawmills—and an additional new problem we created ourselves by moving—I think my honourable friend, the Minister of Education when Minister of Mines and Resources created this problem by moving a number of moose from Newfoundland to Southern Labrador—Now we have the problem of protecting them and seeing they are encouraged and fostered and that they will multiply and flourish. So if you take the two districts of Labrador North and South, it is a man-size job and is going to cost an awful lot of money to provide a solution.

Then you come to White Bay North and you have immediately the problem of centralization. I was taken very much by what my honourable friend, the member for White Bay North, said in this debate. He struck a note, I thought, extremely valuable when he said that you have in White Bay North—that is another great stretch of coastline which, if you were to straighten out the indentations would, I suppose, run to a thousand or twelve hundred miles in length—There are along that coast a number of settlements that have only one virtue in the world as settlements, as places, and that is the fish are sort of plentiful there. But when you come ashore you are just among rocks. You have nothing in the world to appeal to people or attract them or make it livable for them. Only when you leave them and go out into the water you get into the fish—He said,—consequently to use these places for fishing and move their homes out into the few larger places that can have hospitals and medical facilities and good schools and where they can have electricity to light their homes and where they can have water and sewerage and some of the ordinary amenities of life, of modern civilized living.

So you have that problem of centralization and the problem of building roads to serve the new centralized settlements that would result.

Then you have the problem of providing an airport. You got to have an airport down there somewhere, generally in the vicinity of St. Anthony. You got a fish plant at Englee which lost money very heavily last year. The Government lent money to that plant with previous little hope of every getting it back. That is not a diplomatic thing to say but the fishermen and my honourable friend the member might well know it now—if that plant is opened again this year it will be only because the Government put more money in knowing well they will never get a dollar back, and are doing that to prevent the fishermen from being broken hearted. That is what they will be if that is not opened again this year. Because once fishermen get a fish plant, once they have it, if they are forced back into splitting and salting and curing their fish that is it—they have had it—that is enough—they quit. Once you got a frozen fish plant somehow or another you got to do your best to keep it going, always, of course, with the hope in the back of your mind that things will change in a year or two or three or four or five and the market become such they can even operate at a profit or break even. Therefore we have that problem on our hands.

We have the problem of St. Anthony. Now St. Anthony is a place for which I have a very warm spot in my heart. They have been awfully good to me in the Confederation fight—My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition probably remembers what was to me a beautiful and artistic and poetic when they held a meeting of five hundred people de-

manding Confederation and putting on record they were Confederated to the last man and woman. And there is not anything within reason I would not do, within my power, for the people of St. Anthony. Anyway they have three terrible problems.

MR. HOLLETT: Are they all happy now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, they are not happy nor never will be. It is not given to be happy here below. Man wants but little here below nor wants that little long. That is now true in St. Anthony because there they want electricity and they demand it. They want sewerage now—On the South Side, the Hospital Side, the main part where the hospital is they have water now but they have no sewerage. And they want it. And on the other side across the harbour they want water. How that is going to be done is more than I know. It has got to be done. It simply has got to be done. Then they have the problem of municipal organization. And above all, overriding everything they have their problem of fishery development. In White Bay is one of the great areas of Newfoundland still left as a fishing area. It is like the District of Ferryland where virtually every man, I think, up there is a fisherman or just about every man.

MR. BROWNE: Not any longer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh yes! What are they doing if they are not fishing—On the Southern Shore and St. Mary's Bay and out on the Cape Shore you still have one of Newfoundland's last great fishing areas just as you have in White Bay and just as you have it around Fogo Island.

In White Bay South, which is represented by the Honourable the Min-

ister of Education, you have this great problem of centralization again. Centralization—How many settlements in that district might perhaps be, with assistance and encouragement, helped to move around from their twelve or thirteen places with no future. There is no future in them. You cannot go ahead in those twelve or thirteen places and build homes and gardens with the feeling that your sons will occupy them and your grandchildren. You cannot do that. There is no hope of posterity and very little pride of ancestry either in those twelve or thirteen places, and these people in them got to be aided to move out.

MR. HOLLETT: You are painting a bad picture of Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am painting a picture of the problems. And no matter how hard or black we have to face that picture if we never did before. We have to do it. Then to serve these settlements to which people will move from settlements which ought not to exist there will have to be roads, quite a system of roads, electrification. There is a great problem of electrification down there. There is the problem of providing a hospital because that district, taking in Baie Verte Peninsula on the North, Partridge Point on the South, Cape St. John and all in between is where this great new asbestos mining development is going forward. There will have to be municipal organization. I was handed only this afternoon as I came into the Chamber a report just completed, a report and recommendations on the development of the Baie Verte Peninsula by a sub-committee under Minute of Council No. 66. By that Order in Council we created a sub-committee of deputy ministers to make a particular study of Baie Verte Peninsula. Such great

development is about to come there, you see—You have the Tilt Cove Mine. True that is this side of Cape St. John—the great Tilt Cove Mine—Mr. Boylen told me on the phone this morning from Toronto that it will begin to operate in September. You have that great mine. You have the great asbestos deposits about which I hope to have quite exciting news before many years, let us say, so that the radio stations won't be ringing me every hour on the hour and every half hour for the next week or so—let us say within the next year I hope to have some news about Baie Verte.

MR. BROWNE: Better than other asbestos.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. I could say that when I get around the Island. So far I have only gotten to Baie Verte—Wait until I get to Bluff Head. Here is a report of what has got to be done in that great area of Baie Verte to prevent it becoming a slum—a slum—Not just a picture, Mr. Speaker, if you get a great mine at Tilt Cove and Baie Verte and fishery development at La Scie, if you get these developments going you could have this happen—people would pour in from all around the Island, especially from Notre Dame Bay and White Bay pour in looking for jobs and getting jobs and then begin shacking and bringing their families in. All quite without any order, without any orderliness, without any rhyme or reason or without any regulations you could very quickly have slum areas grow up. And you must prevent that. That calls for planning in advance. And here—I have not had a chance to read it, this involves hospitalization, doctors, nurses and problems of electrification and I know it involves a network of roads because you cannot get a great industrial development

and expect people to live in isolation. They got to be able to get aboard a car, if they have a week end off, and drive to Corner Brook, Grand Falls and Gander and back. You have to have a network of roads and municipal organizations—At this point we should resign and leave off, or else my colleagues should admit now this problem is enough to scare one.

Now in Green Bay you have again the problem of centralization. You have that problem in not all but nearly all the districts of Newfoundland. You have the problem of electrification. The people of Springdale are up in arms demanding electrification. They say the power is there to develop and why is it not—Why are we still using kerosene lamps or why is it we are still put to the expense of operating diesel systems. At Nipper's Harbour they want a fish plant. At Little Bay Islands they want a fish drier. There has to be municipal Government organizations in Little Bay, in Tilt Cove in Great Gull Lake. These are the three new mining towns about to be born. They got to have municipal organizations, streets and roads, electricity, water and sewerage. They got to have them if we are not going to have another Bell Island. Not while I am around we are not. I will get out before I see another Bell Island grow up in these mining towns. I will have more to say on Bell Island when I come around to it. And roads—again roads—the eternal question of roads, road connections and better roads and wider roads and snow-cleared roads that can be used all the year around. My honourable colleague the Minister of Highways if he has any hair in two years in the future it will be as white as that of the honourable member for St. John's North.

Grand Falls—roads, electrification, hospital extensions. They have a hospital in Grand Falls which is only, I suppose, a shadow of what is needed—and an airport—Grand Falls cannot be left much longer without an airport. It is absurd to think that that great industrial town in the interior of Newfoundland is left without a runway, without a landing strip for aircrafts. It has got to have one.

Gander—roads again, electrification—I am not thinking so much of Gander. I am thinking more of roads and electrification for such places as Lewisporte, which, as the member for that district told us the other day, is growing so rapidly with an influx of people from around Notre Dame Bay. They have to have electrification. At Gander there is a gigantic problem looming up, that is the hospital. We have a hospital which we operated since Confederation and before the Commission of Government operated there. There is a new town just being built in Gander, a brand new town. The Government of Canada says, well there is the town and there is the airport—the hospital ought to be in the town. It is in the airport. Why not shift the hospital to the town. It is all very well to say that. The cost would be staggering. We already had a staggering cost to build two great new schools in the town—a Roman Catholic and a Protestant School, at a cost of over half a million dollars each. Due to the fact that Gander as such is ceasing to be a town, the airport—and the town is built two or three miles outside, a brand new town, one of the most beautiful in all Canada, one of Canada's newest and most beautiful towns. And if we have to build a hospital in that new town of Gander it will cost an enormous sum of money. There is the problem of housing. I do

not know how many tens of thousands of Newfoundland money has gone into co-operative housing. The people of Gander Airport have taken hold of co-operative housing with vim and I think perhaps they are leading Newfoundland in showing the way and in setting the pace for co-operative housing. We have these great problems out there. Then there is the problem that we cannot even tackle. How long is Gander Airport going to be a great airport? How long? Will the time come in the next five, six, eight, ten years when the greatest aircraft of the world will no longer use Gander Airport, when Gander Airport might perhaps become a military airport? The people of Gander ask themselves that question. Business men putting up large department stores and other business establishments in the new town they have built are asking themselves the question—Is there really a life ahead of the Town of Gander or is it a flash in the pan? That is a problem that I am glad we don't have to solve—That is the one for the Government of Canada.

In the district of the honourable the Attorney General—Twillingate District there is the eternal question of roads which never dies, the question of electrification, which is growing in Newfoundland to be the second or third problem. We have right around the whole island people in rebellion, in revolt, against kerosene oil. There is practically a mutiny going on in people's minds today. They not only want roads but electricity and telephones and improvement in the telephone system, communications. Do you know you can be ten or fifteen or twenty miles away from a place such as Gander or Grand Falls and might as well be two or three thousand miles because communica-

tions just do not exist, or if so, they are so unsatisfactory it would be almost better if they did not have them at all. At the town of Twillingate they have the very vexing question of the fish plant. The Fisheries Product plant there is an extraordinary story, absolutely extraordinary. And I only hope the Attorney General and the member for Trinity North will never come to blows about it. Actually what happened is that the money that was lent to build a great fish plant at Twillingate was somehow or another given to the town of Catalina and has resulted in building a huge plant at Catalina about twice as large as we lent them money to build. But the plant that we lent money to build at Twillingate has not materialized. I think some work was done clearing away the site and they got the foundation down and there it is. It is a problem to turn you grey. If I had to deal with it in Opposition then I would say—You have the Government—you solve the problem of the fish plant in Twillingate.

Now there is the problem at Twillingate of centralization and the problem of an airport. But there is another problem—New World Island and that is to build a causeway to connect New World Island with the Island of Newfoundland, which means that New World Island, which contains the town of Twillingate and perhaps ten or twelve other settlements will then cease to be an island—That will have to be done—That will have to be done.

MR. HOLLETT: How long would that be?

MR. SMALLWOOD: About the same length as Hefferton Causeway which connects Random Island. As you know, this Government built so many causeways, roads and bridges we

even forget the name sometimes. In Fogo district, the member for Fogo, who is not here at the moment, would agree that problem No. 1 is the building of an airport and problem No. 2 is the provision of a modern ferry service that will connect Fogo Island with Carmanville. Now from Carmanville we are building a road into Gander, and in that fine Harbour of Carmanville that road will serve the whole of Fogo Island and Change Islands. But there must be a modern ferry service to bring them into Carmanville so that they could take cars and buses and drive into the Trans-Canada Highway which passes through Carmanville and there goes east and west. In other words they will be really brought into Newfoundland.

The hospital at Fogo has to be enlarged. A bait depot has to be provided in Fogo, although we are dealing only with Provincial problems not Federal, nevertheless we have to mention a bait depot which is imperative-ly needed at Fogo. The fish plant at Change Islands I am afraid that Mr. Monroe is compelled, he says he is compelled, I am informed and am forced to accept his statement, he is compelled to close the plant at Change Islands and to close his other plant at Long Harbour in Placentia Bay, on the grounds that this year he has to cut his garment according to his cloth and that he dare not process in all these plants. The market just won't be able to absorb the output of all the fish plants in Newfoundland today and these two must be closed, and that he dare not process in all these plants. The market just won't be able to absorb the output of all the fish plants in Newfoundland today and these two must be closed, and that he is closing these two plants.

We have roads to be built on Fogo Island, a network of roads to be completed. But above everything else fishery development, because Fogo Island is again one of the great fishing areas we have left in this Province.

In Bonavista North, my own district, we have to continue the building of roads, a network of roads. This year with the help of my colleague, I am serving notice on him now in case he has not heard before—we expect him to build the road from Indian Bay to Dover which will then give us final and complete connection from Gambo right around to Musgrave Harbour. There is only one gap left and that is between Dover and Indian Bay. And we want that built and we want it built at both ends at one time so that we meet in the middle and get the road completed this year. I think it is fourteen miles. What is a mile or two in the Premier's district—We hope to get that road completed this year.

Electricity—The people on the north side of Bonavista Bay are up in arms, Wesleyville, Badger's Quay, Valleyfield, Pound Cove, Brookfield, Newtown all that north side of Bonavista Bay are up in arms demanding Hydro-electric development. Well I am glad to say that the Union Light and Power Company of Port Union have submitted to me I have not had an opportunity to go through it—a great proposal which will take in, I think, two or three million dollars. They are prepared if they can sell, bonds—we will guarantee them. And they would launch a great new Hydro-electric project at Gambo or in the vicinity of Middle Brook. They would develop Middle Brook and carry power down into the North Side of Bonavista and eastward as far as to cover Glover-

town, Salvage, Happy Adventure, Pound Cove and all along that section. And you have in the great new town of Glovertown, which is growing like Lewisporte and Springdale and like Freshwater up here in Placentia, so rapidly. Each time you go there it looks like a new town with people pouring in from the islands. The next thing they are going to have a problem of water and sewerage. These problems, Sir, are as real, as alive to the people familiar with them as they are right here on the floor of this House, although they might seem far off to honourable members not familiar with these areas of Newfoundland.

In Bonavista South, the district of the honourable gentleman here behind me, we have choice, I think we have got to pave the road between Bonavista proper and Port Union, Catalina and Port Union—I do not think there is any choice in the matter. Bonavista town is the greatest fishing town in the whole Canadian nation. I have been in nearly all of them, in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec and in the most important ones in British Columbia and Newfoundland, and I say Bonavista is Canada's biggest fishing port and Catalina between eleven and twelve miles away is a great shipping port in winter for Bonavista and also in its own right a great fishing and industrial centre. A great new fish plant has been built by Mifflin there, the relative of my honourable friend, the member. His relative just built a huge new salt fish plant. Monroe built a very large modern fish plant and the Union Trading Company plant at Port Union two miles away is one of Newfoundland's largest. So that you have three great fish plants in Catalina and Port Union and in Bonavista, Canada's biggest fishing port. Now how can we

much longer refuse to pave that road between these great centres of our Newfoundland fishery.

MR. HOLLETT: You have been to Burin?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have been to Burin. Burin is a great fishing port but in Bonavista you have the biggest in all Canada, without the shadow of any doubt. I know Burin is his native town, a magnificent town and fishing port but it is not as big as Bonavista. Do not forget the fish that keeps Bonavista going is all of it shore fish. For the most part the fish that keeps Burin going is the fish brought in by some seven, eight or nine draggers. While that means a big volume of fish it does not necessarily involve so many fishermen. It takes far more to keep a fish plant going with inshore fishermen than with draggers. We have to think of the freezing plant at Southern Bay, a duplicate of the one at Dildo. Over in Dildo, as the House knows, we have a new fish plant to serve the mink industry and we have to build another similar one in Southern Bay in Bonavista because that is another place the pothead whales come in, in case some year the potheads do not come to Trinity and do to Bonavista. We have to have a plant there, and I suggest later on we will have to have another plant in Placentia Bay because pothead whales are known to come in up there as well.

The people of Terra Nova, the settlement, are up in arms, bitter, bitter and hostile and disgusted and angry, as they have a right to be, because the Trans-Canada Highway by-passes them. And they are demanding a connection with the Trans-Canada Highway. If the town of Terra Nova is to

continue, and I say "if"—I use the word "if" deliberately because if between eighty and ninety thousand horsepower of hydro is developed on Terra Nova River there may have to be a shifting of the railway by a number of miles and a complete disappearance of the present settlement of Terra Nova, to be relocated maybe miles from where it is. I say, if Terra Nova is to continue it is unthinkable that they should be left in physical isolation. We have the problem of roads. We have the problem of telephones and in Bonavista South the problem of an airport, electrification and finally the problem of hospitalization. Now here is where I think my honourable friend the member for Bonavista South and the honourable member for Trinity North have to get together and agree as good party men as good followers and supporters of this party on where Bonavista South and Trinity North can best be served by means of a new hospital to be built. Is it Clarenville or where is it? They will have to agree on that before the Government can build it. We won't build a hospital, certainly, until you agree. I do not say we will build it then but we certainly won't build it until you do agree. You do agree—Well, that is a great step forward. Now I am going to finish Trinity Bay before I suggest a recess—I am going to finish Trinity North. On Trinity South I have something special to say so I will leave it until after recess.

Trinity North has the same problem of roads and also the problem of centralization. I think perhaps centralization is more necessary in Trinity North than it is in Bonavista South. I think there are far more settlements in Trinity North than there are in Bonavista South. I know Bonavista South like the palm of my hand and

I know too in Trinity North you have got in the South West Arm and Three Arms a large number of settlements. I do not mean to say it has got to be law or it has got to be because they are to be forced. I mean that in the nature of things it is logical to suppose that the people, if encouraged and assisted sufficiently. It has already started.

MR. HOLLETT: It will cut down on the districts then.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not out of the district but from one spot to another in the same district. Then there is this same problem of hospitalization and the same problem of paving the road from Catalina to Bonavista. Now, Mr. Speaker, that brings us to the head of Trinity Bay, and I think you will agree before I come to Your Honour's district at all, that the number of problems from Cape Chidley to approximately Clarenville is very great indeed, and that it is going to take a tremendous amount of effort and a tremendous amount of money to solve these problems. They have got to be solved, there is no question of that—they have got to be solved. If not I suggest that five years from now this Government will be defeated in these districts. I suggest that we must solve these problems and if we don't we will be kicked out, and if we do not solve them or most of them we will deserve to be kicked out because these are Newfoundland problems. I have now talked about practically one third of the Province, Cape Chidley to Trinity Bay.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in Trinity South the picture is fair-

ly conventional compared with other districts of the Province. They too have the problem of roads, not so much the building of additional roads as the improvement of the ones they now have. They have also a problem of electrification. Now they are not too badly off in that regard but there are still a few sections of the district lacking completely in electrification, which is a regrettable thing in view of the fact that the poles and transmission lines either pass quite near to them or just falls short of actually doing so. It does not require a great deal of expenditure to give them complete electrification that they need to have. Then again the telephone system needs to be improved. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I could almost say that in virtually every part of Newfoundland today better telephonic connections are a pressing need. Some centralization is needed, I believe, in Trinity South. Some municipal Government development is needed in Trinity South. And now the main problem of Trinity South—When I was working years ago preparing the case in favour of Confederation I went through the census for every district of Newfoundland to see how many persons there were of seventy years of age or more and how many families and how many children, making my estimate for each individual settlement of the island, how much money would come in for family allowances and old age pensions each month. I was astounded to find the average age in Trinity South was the highest of any part of Newfoundland, that is to say, the average age was higher, meaning that there were more old people by comparison than in any other part of Newfoundland and fewer young people. Now there was an extraordinary high proportion

of widows and an extraordinary high proportion of widowers, and generally the age limit was quite high. Now that indicated to me that something was wrong, something was happening to the Southside of Trinity Bay.

MR. HOLLETT: Another problem?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What was happening was this—Economically there was nothing to hold the young people and they were leaving. Young men and young women were leaving the southside of Trinity Bay so that as a result the average age increased very steeply, and young people were leaving because the district lacked sufficient means to make a living. That is to say there was nothing at all in Trinity South except the fishery and the cable office at Heart's Content. Now the cable office itself has become only a shadow of what it used to be. There was a time in Heart's Content when the cable office employed a couple or three hundred people, during the first world war and for some time afterwards. Then modern developments, modern submarine cables eliminated the need of so many people.

The problem is essentially an economic problem. These people over there just ache for something economic. That is one of the reasons why I was so keen on establishing the mink industry over there. Of course the main reason was that that was where the potheads were in the main. Principally the potheads come into Newfoundland at Trinity Bay. They come into other places but principally in Trinity Bay, Chapel Arm and South Dildo where the Arctic Fishery plant was. So we decided to put the mink industry over there. Now, Mr. Speaker, the House, I am sure, will be in-

terested in hearing a little about this mink industry.

At the moment there are sixty odd ranches, sixty-three mink ranches. They have eleven thousand breeding mink, and they are worth five hundred thousand dollars—eleven thousand and breeding mink on these ranches worth five hundred thousand dollars. The ranches themselves, their buildings and installations are worth five hundred thousand dollars, so that you have a total investment there now, in these two, of one million dollars. Now of the five hundred thousand dollars invested in ranches and their installations and the five hundred thousand invested in mink, of that million dollars the Government have lent to the ranchers two hundred and ninety-three thousand dollars, of which a considerable amount has since been repaid. Indeed the loans are all in very good condition, with one or two defaults. These are due, I think the House is well aware, to the fact that two of the ranchers concerned turned out unfortunately to be alcoholics and went on the bat from the moment of arrival in Newfoundland until they had to be helped back to the mainland by the Welfare Department, in the meantime having lost every cent they owned in the world. It is not generally realized that Dildo Area has become one of Newfoundland's fishing centres—That sounds extravagant. Let us give an example: Last year the whale men handled three million five hundred thousand pounds. That is whale meat. Now the whale meat goes to the co-operative meat plant and the whale fat goes to Arctic Fisheries Products Plant. The two plants lie there side by side at Dildo South. The whale fat was four million two hundred thousand pounds. Now O'Brien Fisheries or what they call "Newfoundland

Quick Freeze" have established with some financial assistance from us, a filleting line in the co-operative plant, or attached to the plant, and last year they put up one million two hundred thousand pounds of fish fillets. Now the fish for the mink feed, frozen for mink feed, because you see the feed primarily is whale meat and fish mixed together with other things, fish for the mink, frozen, was six hundred and sixty thousand pounds; and squid, salmon and other products totalled one million seven hundred and seventy thousand pounds; making a total last year of eleven million two hundred and sixty thousand pounds — That made the Dildo Area one of Newfoundland's biggest fish handling centres, from an area that was virtually derelict—certainly I said "derelict"—It has become in two years one of the biggest fish handling centres in the whole of the Province of Newfoundland having handled last year eleven million two hundred and sixty thousand pounds.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask a question? I believe the Honourable the Premier stated the loans totalled something over two hundred thousand dollars. That does not include the loan to the Co-operative Society?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is correct—that is true—the loans to which I referred were loans made to mink ranchers, two hundred and ninety-three thousand dollars, of which they have repaid a substantial amount. In addition to that the Co-operative Society of Mink Ranchers, not individual ranchers but their society, received the loan with which to build the very modern freezing plant in which the whale meat and fish are processed and frozen and in which, with quite an addition, the O'Brien Brothers have been able to fillet one point two mil-

lion pounds last year for the American Market.

Now what will give perhaps a more graphic idea of the importance of that area in the past two years is the number of people who earned a dollar in the last year. The number is as follows: In the plant itself, in the Co-operative plant to which I have referred, thirty-two persons—Now the fishermen who handled the whale meat on the slipways and all the fishermen who supplied O'Brien's, that is Newfoundland Quick Freeze, which they filleted and handled, three hundred and fifty fishermen. In the fish plant itself, that is O'Brien Fish Plant, the filleting line, men and girls, one hundred persons—on the whale boats fourteen persons and in the Arctic Fisheries Plant and fishermen supplying the plant sixty-four. Then the ranchers themselves and their employees one hundred and three, a total of six hundred and sixty-three persons given jobs, not perhaps the year around. Some of them are for the year around but most of them are seasonal. But all together they were paid last year six hundred thousand dollars in wages.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that Newfoundland would rapidly become the richest province in Canada if in every area of that size in this Province, an area stretching let us say from New Harbour around to Chapel Arm or a little beyond, if every area of that size in Newfoundland could have six hundred odd persons each year drawing some pay for part of the year and drawing a total of six hundred thousand dollars, then Newfoundland would be one of the richest of all the Provinces of Canada. Now there are areas of that size or even smaller in Newfoundland that have much more than six hundred persons working

and who draw down far more than six hundred thousand dollars between them each year. These would be the industrial centres and other centres as well. I am proud of the fact that this Government have brought that mink industry to Newfoundland. It has not been uniformly successful. It has not been uniformly and unvaryingly successful nor will it be nor will it ever be nor can it ever be. It will have its ups and downs and it has already had its ups and downs but it goes ahead a little more than it slips back, and today the mink industry is tremendously advanced in Newfoundland compared with what it was one year ago and two years ago and three years ago. I believe a year from now it will be even more firmly established than it is now. I believe a lot of the kinks have been ironed out and that they are on the way to success.

I come now to the District of Carbonear, Bay-de-Verte: There one of the greatest problems is one that is going to cost half a million dollars, five hundred thousand dollars, the extension of the water and sewerage system in the town of Carbonear. You still have roads, roads to be done in the district of Carbonear. Although there is a considerable network most of these roads are not much better than berry and woods roads, criss-crossing the peninsula down there, with the main highway running through different communities of the district. There is some considerable job yet to be done on roads. The road to the Cottage Hospital at Old Pelican most definitely has to be enlarged in fact I think we have some hope of doing it in this very year. We hope to solve that problem in the district of Carbonear, Bay-de-Verte, to enlarge the cottage hospital at Old Pelican. Then the new hospital at Carbonear, not

yet open for business will no sooner be opened, in my view, than we will have to consider the enlargement of that as well, not that I don't agree, Please God, this year. Let us get it opened first and taking in patients. But it won't be long before the hospital at Carbonear will have to be enlarged.

In Harbour Grace they have a problem similar to the one in Carbonear, Harbour Grace proper. They too have a great job to repair and extend their water and sewerage system. That is going to cost them a quarter of a million dollars. They too have the problem of roads. It is not as intense as the problem along the north east coast; the south coast; Placentia Bay; the southern shore of Conception Bay. The oldest part of Newfoundland next, to St. John's having roads for a longer period than other parts of the island but are not satisfied and with good reason they are not satisfied. And so a lot of work, and a lot of money has got to be given yet for improvement of their roads. They have to get telephone connections which do not exist today. In Newfoundland today in a great many places there are telephone systems admittedly, but very inadequate and above all the logical sequence in this modern age it is ridiculous to suppose it is sufficient to have a phone, you can take down and cock it and ring it and shout and read into it and have lines coming down all along, receivers coming down—you cannot do business, cannot have a secret conversation. If a telephone conversation cannot be confidential and secret something is seriously lacking and some improvements are greatly needed in the telephone system. In Shearstown, one of the important farming sections of Conception Bay, there is need of an ag-

ricultural exhibition building to be erected on agricultural exhibition grounds. That is one of my own ambitions, personally, to see a good show put on in Shearstown because these people are—

MR. BROWNE: When are you having one here in St. John's?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I believe this fall. I would not swear to that but I believe there is a good big show coming up this coming fall. Yes, I have shifted the jurisdiction to Provincial Affairs. This fall I believe a big exhibition is coming up in the new stadium. Now talking of Shearstown, they are about a quarter of a mile from the highroad, striking off to the left, opposite Bay Roberts, and a quarter of a mile in the road you meet Shearstown and continue for about a mile and a half, still in Shearstown and still going in the straight road then inside of Shearstown there is a little settlement and inside there some very striking new farms. One has been started in there by Mr. Mark Gosse. A number of people have done a lot of land clearing, and it is one of the most interesting farm sections. Then the road comes to a stop and it is absolutely necessary that this road be continued, that it not be a dead end but that it should continue through the country. The road does not go anywhere. It just comes to a dead stop inside Mark Gosse's farm. It should continue across country to meet the Hodgewater Line, which it would do somewhere at a point where the new Trans-Canada Highway will intersect with the Hodgewater Line. This would mean that a man wishing to come to St. John's from Grates Cove or say from Old Perlican or Carbonear or anywhere in between or from Harbour Grace or Spaniards Bay could leave the Conception Bay

Highway at Shearstown and drive through Shearstown, Butlerville through the country to the Hodgewater Line and get on the Trans-Canada Highway instead of coming all the way in to Holyrood.

MR. BROWNE: He does not have to come that way.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or go along Roache's Line or the Hodgewater Line and get on to the Trans-Canada Highway that way. But if you live, in Carbonar or Harbour Grace or below that and want to come to St. John's or want to get on the Trans-Canada Highway you want to get on as quickly as possible because it is going to be a perfectly straight, level paved highway within the next two or three years. So the quickest way would probably be to drive to Shearstown Road across country and join up in the vicinity of Hodgewater Line. The logical thing the people want is to drive through the country up new country no doubt into farm land but mainly it will be a throughway to get on the Trans-Canada Highway. There are about seven miles still to be done to complete, which means building another seven miles to complete it from the end of where it is now to the Hodgewater Line.

Now in Harbour Grace, before I leave it, there is another problem which is really not a problem for the Government in one way of speaking but yet is an intensely interesting one. Harbour Grace is the home port of two draggers serving the large fish plant of North East Coast Fisheries. The crew members of the draggers are south west coast men, and they have the problem of holding their crews, and getting them to settle, leave the south west coast and settle down in

Harbour Grace and become Harbour Gracians, to supply steady crews for these boats.

In Port de Grave we have the problem of roads, we have some places to be electrified, the Hodgewater Line to be electrified, you have the Goulds, Hodgewater Line, Georgetown; Roache's Line is already done. One of the most profitable lines the company has is Roache's Line, one of the most profitable lines they have built anywhere in Newfoundland is the line they have built in Roache's Line because of the income they have from people who buy power from them. Go and ask them sometime. Ask them how long it took them to pay off the installations of the line out of their income now from Roache's Line. Since we came into office the last time, October 2, they have gone right into North River, right on inside. It is very good indeed. And in Port de Grave, strange as it may seem to some people, there is the problem of fishery development because out there in Port de Grave and then outside Port de Grave proper, you have still one of the most energetic group of fishermen found anywhere in Newfoundland.

Then I come to the district of Harbour Main. And here I wish every member of the House could do what I have had the pleasure of doing several times, leave St. John's in a helicopter—and there is an opening there for the honourable gentleman if he would avail himself of it—Leave St. John's in a helicopter and fly along the Southern Shore of Conception Bay. I would like the honourable member to come with me sometime in a helicopter and fly from here to Topsail. Now from Topsail, going from the salt water about a couple or three miles at the height of a couple or three thous-

and feet and fly then to Holyrood, and you will see a sight that most people don't even realize exists. The lie of the land is such that you have some eight or ten long valleys running at right angles to the salt water. These valleys are separated by rather high flat ridges. And these valleys are three, four, five, six, seven and eight miles long, each of them, and the ridges between, separating the valleys equally as long obviously. And either at the top of each ridge or at the bottom of each valley or both, running at right angles to the Provincial Highways as you go in are very obscure and unspectacular roads. I advise honourable members sometime when they find opportunity to turn off that road and go down to in about six miles to the left and on both sides of the road literally dozens of farmers with between twelve, fourteen, fifteen and seventeen acres of land, which in Newfoundland I call postage stamp arms. Nevertheless they are not bad on Newfoundland standards. And valley after valley and ridge after ridge and you can go in there eight or ten or maybe twelve miles, certainly seven or eight miles. The real view you get is in a helicopter. In a helicopter if you see something interesting you point to it and the pilot comes lower and lower and shows you and you get a magnificent view of it.

The most extraordinary thing, there are far more farmers in that South Shore than there are in my honourable friend's district out in St. George's. I would say it is the biggest farming section of Newfoundland. It was a discovery I made about four years ago, and since then every chance I have had I drive down these roads—and if I do a little politics members of the House won't complain. But do go down and investigate and see these

people and see how they developed the land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of the district of Harbour Main is more roads in through these valleys and criss-crossings and opening new country for farmers because here is what is happening: The people of the South Shore are very good farmers really interested in the land, really like the land. That is rather unusual because for the most part they are of English and not Irish decent. You do not strike the big bulk of people of Irish descent until you get to Seal Cove or Holyrood. There are some between Topsail and Holyrood but they are mostly of English decent. So one would not expect to find them attached so much to the land. In Newfoundland for the most part when you find people sentimentally attached to the land you find they are of Irish descent—But it is not on the South Shore out there.

MR. BROWNE: It is not so in St. Phillips either.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is perfectly true. Now that is a problem. Electricity is still a problem which must be solved. Why I could take you from St. John's, six or seven miles and the people there have no electricity no more than they have down by the North Pole. In Harbour Main district there are still places where electricity is the problem.

MR. BROWNE: St. John's North too. That is also true in the district of St. John's North.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now they have just opened a magnificent new regional high school in Foxtrap, Church of England. I am told there is need of a great new regional high school for the Roman Catholics in the

other end of the district, Conception Harbour, Holyrood somewhere out there, to cost, I suppose, another quarter of a million dollars. Then there is the suggestion of a new airport now, an airport as an alternative to Torbay. There is a beautiful spot in there, flat level land, virtually fog free, unlike Torbay. It is just beyond Kelligrews in back on the level of the flat land inside. It would be a pleasant drive to St. John's and again and again planes could land there when they cannot land at Torbay when indeed the plane has to go back and land at Gander. I believe you will see that airport built out there. A committee of progressive-minded people from the South shore of Conception Bay have been meeting on the matter, discussing it with the two members of the district and me—and I believe you are going to see something come of it.

There is another problem in Harbour Main district and that is cold storage. May I say this. The rubber plant building, the building in which the rubber plant existed at Holyrood, the ill-fated, abysmally unsuccessful rubber plant, the building itself is large admittedly and it is a substantially built structure, and we have had people examining it technically from the standpoint of converting it into a very large modern coldstorage plant. Now we have something like that in the back of our minds. We have had department of Resources and department of Fisheries people, Mr. Pat Murray; Colin Story; and others going into the matter. We have had cold storage experts, structural experts—we have had this thought in the back of our minds—nothing may come of it, but if it does not come of it, it has got to come from somewhere.

If you think of Trinity Bay, the bottom half of it, think of all of Concep-

tion Bay, the whole of it right down the North Shore of Bay de Verde and all of the Southside and the centre of Trinity Bay and the Southern shore, Ferryland district and St. Mary's Bay and the east side of Placentia Bay. Just think of that area in your mind and you will realize, if you look at the map you will see that Holyrood is almost in the dead centre of that great area just described. Now that area happens to be not only a very considerable fishing section in Newfoundland but a very considerable farming section as well, because we are all aware of the Cape Shore sheep and cattle. They have been proverbially, for half a century, a source of mutton and beef for the butchers of St. John's. They have gone up there every year buying their sheep on the Southern Shore; St. Shott's; Trepassey; around Conception Bay. And don't forget when we talk about sheep one of the main problems in Newfoundland for sheep raisers is the fact that due to the absence of cold storage facilities drives them to the unpleasant necessity of marketing his lambs, all the lambs of Newfoundland raised from all the sheep by all the owners must be marketed in Newfoundland within two or three weeks. That means, naturally, dumping. It means flooding the market, it means feeding the population far more lamb and mutton than the population can reasonably absorb in so short a period. But if it were spread over ten times as long a period, ten months instead of one month, then the consumption could be correspondingly greater. And this cold storage plant could be the great centre for mutton and lamb and for beef. Because there again on the South Shore of Conception Bay you have the biggest cattle raising section of this province. I think that would be true from Topsail say to Indian Pond,

where there is probably the biggest beef raising section in Newfoundland. They have the same problem. It is heart-breaking. I have been up against it. I have attended meetings of the cattle raisers of Conception Bay. They too have their meat to market at the same time, and glut the market and they come to the Government and ask, will the Government buy and supply the institution. Well, then we have made our contracts with people to supply the institutions with beef and all we can do is go to these suppliers and say—"For God's sake buy some of the cattle of these people who are up against it." Again if you had a great central cold storage the beef could be stored and the owner could get a cash payment on account and get settled up when the beef is finally sold and disposed of, spread over a longer part of the year. The same thing applies in berries. At the present time the berry industry in Newfoundland is worth as much as a million dollars a year. It allows people in Conception Bay too old and feeble to get jobs for wages, nobody will employ them but they can go out and earn, some years three, four and five and six hundred dollars in a month or six weeks in the berry picking season. This berry picking business can be made very much bigger than it is but it must be taken out of monopolistic hands in which it is at the present time. At the present time it is the owners of two or three cold storage plants who are in the position to buy berries. But if anyone who can find a market in the United States can buy and he can do that only if he has access to a cold storage to store and pack. If anyone could buy them there would be real competition among the buyers and pickers and the public would benefit. That again would

be a purpose for this cold storage plant. I can talk for at least half an hour on that because we have thought a lot about it and we are hoping to salvage some of our losses in the rubber plant by turning it into what would be a very great and economically useful institution for a large and important part—

MR. HOLLETT: No isolation? What about Carroll cold storage, can they do anything?

MR. SMALLWOOD: A relatively small place which deals mostly in squid. Monroe, I think, owns it—It is owned by Fisheries Products, Mr. Carroll is only the manager employed as manager. I think Monroe owns it. And it is not at all big enough. Now I come to Bell Island.

MR. O'DRISCOLL: Do you think you can do it in twenty minutes, Sir? I doubt it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On Bell Island their needs are simple.

MR. O'DRISCOLL: No laughing matter.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nobody is laughing. They are simple, they are easy to state and they will cost a good many millions of dollars to satisfy. First and foremost, I would place the hospital—first and foremost—A place of twelve thousand people living on an island, living seven miles from the city of St. John's or even ten or fifteen miles from the city of St. John's on the mainland would not be serious, but being on an island and working in a hazardous industry, underground, hard-rock mining, it is scandalous they have not got a hospital. Now I have announced over there publicly that if the public, if they will contribute then the Newfoundland Government will

contribute and we know that the Canadian Government will contribute and they can have a magnificent hospital. But we do not want to start just one more Government hospital. We want the people of Bell Island to take the bull by the horns themselves and manage it. We want the public management of it by the citizens of Bell Island. I think that is stating the case pretty adequately. I don't think there is any doubt that the people of Bell Island are going to take us up on that and are going to have a hospital.

Now a water and sewerage system: We have spent thousands of dollars. We had two if not three separate engineering companies make surveys of Bell Island in this connection. How do you go about it, is it possible and if so how do you go about supplying the people of Bell Island with fresh water. There was a proposal that the water be piped down over the cliff somewhere there between Bauline and Cape St. Francis, piped over the cliff down into Bauline and barged across to Bell Island and pumped out of barges into a great reservoir. There was that proposal. There was another proposal that the salt water be pumped out of Conception Bay and put through a plant which would take the salt out of it and turn it into fresh water. There were several proposals by these engineering firms. We know that the cost is going to run into millions of dollars to provide Bell Island with water and sewerage systems. But until that is done Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation who are prepared to spend more millions on Bell Island, not perhaps now in the credit squeeze, not perhaps now when money is so tight and when the whole policy of the Government of Canada is to clamp down on credit, not now but eventually, next year or

the year after they are prepared to spend millions on housing on Bell Island. And God in Heaven knows that it is needed. You only have to go once to Bell Island to know that one of its greatest needs is for a really sweeping housing project running into millions of dollars. You will not get one million, Sir, not one cent from them until first there is a water and sewerage system.

Road System—Roads to be paved—As the member for the district so perfectly well says, so truthfully says, you cannot hang clothes out, you cannot go out nor send children out to play without everyone and everything turning red with red dust, the red dust from the mines. You got to pave the roads of Bell Island. And my colleague the minister, might as well stop talking to the Minister of Economic Development and listen to this because he is the one who has to find the ways and means to pave the roads of Bell Island. It has got to be.

There has to be an airstrip built over there. The Government of Canada, I think, already allocated eighty-five thousand dollars in the current estimates and the Newfoundland Government is supposed to match it and put up an airstrip. I am afraid DOSCO rather jumped the gun by going and building one of their own. Sometimes I feel like going and saying to Mr. Dickie, you made a place of your own now go play with it and do not go bothering us any more. I sometimes feel like telling Mr. Dickie that. Perhaps we can get over that difficulty and have an airstrip on Bell Island in addition to the one the company itself has just built.

Then finally there is the question of a ferry: That is in a way the most

difficult problem of all, I put it last because I don't think it is the most important. I think it is the least important of these six, hospital, water and sewerage, roads, housing and an airstrip and ferry. I think ferry comes sixth in importance because the problem itself is well underway towards a solution. I would put it up on top if there were no ferry and no one were interested in providing it—then I would put it on top, naturally. But I think the problem is in the way of being solved. I do not know how far I should go actually without hurting people's feelings, people whose feelings I respect. I am thinking particularly of Mr. McLellan, I have the utmost respect for him. I have considerable regard and respect for Mr. McLellan. I think he got a raw deal out of the bus company. I think that. I think he got a raw deal out of the bus company. I know that he has put the last cent he owns in the world into this ferry service, and I know that if he loses the franchise and loses that contract that he is a ruined man. So I do not like to say anything to hurt his feelings. I do say that the interest of the people of Bell Island and the interests of the people of Newfoundland who have to go to Bell Island and even more the twelve thousand who live on Bell Island are paramount, are above the interest of Mr. McLellan. And I have the feeling—and I am choosing my words very carefully now—I have the feeling that the Public Utilities Commission will probably feel it incumbent upon them to cancel the license, the franchise—I feel that—I do not know—But I feel it. I feel further than that, as Mr. McLellan owes the Government a hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars principal and twelve thousand dollars unpaid interest on that principal, a hundred

and forty-seven thousand dollars, and as the services given, while undoubtedly the best that he could give has been lamentably lacking, I feel that a new deal will have to come. I feel further that we are very near that new deal. I think it is the end of this month is the deadline for Mr. McLellan financially. Now he has been trying to float a bond issue, trying to raise money to pay off the Government and pay off other creditors and purchase another boat. Whether he will succeed or not I do not know I doubt very much that he will succeed. I doubt it very very much, and I am sorry for him.

There are others keen and anxious to take over the operation of a ferry service. There was for a while a proposal that the company, DOSCO, together with the Town Council and the union, all three, acting jointly in a formal partnership would be prepared to take over and operate a ferry service. That collapsed, I understand, because the union, a meeting of which was called once or twice to consider the matter was attended by so few members that the matter was dropped, and the union having failed to support it the council decided to drop the matter. So that as far as I know there is no one on Bell Island prepared to jump in and take over and operate a satisfactory ferry service. But here in St. John's I have been approached by three separate interests, very separate interests, one of them I do not take too seriously the other two I do. Whether they would be prepared to assume the Government loan and unpaid interest and take over the same boats and the Government have a stake of a hundred and forty seven thousand dollars which we put up, not to make any more. We do not want to make any money trying to help the public of

Bell Island but we don't like to lose that one hundred and forty-seven thousand dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Is there not a mortgage on one of these boats?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. I said other creditors—What the exact outcome will be and when that outcome will come I am not able to say at the moment. But I think it will be within a relatively few days from now. Then I think I have exhausted the problems of Bell Island. Next I come to St. John's and I think I will dispose of it today, because they can be very simply and briefly stated.

There are many members on this side of the House, not all but many members who would say, the shorter the better. I do not feel that. I feel that St. John's with seventy thousand Newfoundlanders living here, Newfoundlanders who are just as good as they are—but we are all Newfoundlanders, and seventy thousand of us live here in St. John's. I do not think you can dismiss that many Newfoundlanders. It is true that a part of those seventy thousand are represented across the floor here. After all the Opposition only represents a part of St. John's. But we represent a part of St. John's. We represent all the province and a great section of St. John's.

MR. BROWNE: We represent the true spirit of it.

MR. HOLLETT: We represent Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "The true spirit of St. John's"—perhaps I had better stop right here and better not say anything about this true spirit of St. John's. However, there are three things, one big and one not so terribly big—St. John's needs first and

foremost, above anything else, a great harbour improvement programme. Now I have examined in great detail the proposals—I examined these details some four months ago, three or two months ago, and they struck me as being excellent. I am absolutely opposed to St. John's becoming a national harbour. As long as I am Premier St. John's will never be a national harbour—While I am Premier never—Rather than do it I would walk out.

MR. BROWNE: Why?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because I don't think St. John's ought to be, unless we could have two. If we were to have two I might. I think I would go for Corner Brook, but I don't say I would not go for St. John's as a second national harbour. But if we are entitled to only one and one only, if there is only to be one it will not be in St. John's while I am around—and I think the Government has the choice.

MR. BROWNE: Why?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think St. John's can be made into a magnificent harbour with magnificent facilities without it becoming a national harbour. I have had this on my mind and have been saving it up—the privilege of naming one national harbour for Newfoundland is the Government's, when I do it I will do it as the nominee of my colleagues, it will not be purely personal, I will do it as a representative of the Cabinet—I have been saving up the privilege of naming the national harbour to be Bay D'Espoir. But St. John's could be made into a perfectly modern harbour, and I believe it will. And I believe it will take millions of dollars to do it, and I believe Canada is good for it, and I believe Canada will foot the

bill. But then the use of it will be paid for by those using it, which is perfectly alright. But there will be a great increase in efficiency in this port for loading and unloading, a great saving in trucking and vast improvement in this harbour programme that I have seen, if adopted, and I have no doubt it will be adopted.

Another Federal matter for St. John's is a fishermen's wharf. I believe that if the proper site can be found—I do not hold with using the one up by the Municipal basin, I think it is too far west. It would be infinitely more preferable to see it in a more central part of St. John's. Now that is Federal. Provincially, as far as this Government is concerned, we have to have a great public building, and that I hope to be the biggest in Newfoundland, bigger than either of the new great federal buildings, the great customs building and the great new post office and probably bigger than those two put together and even larger than the big new ten story single officers quarters at Argentia. I have a lot of correspondence on it. The matter is beginning to come to a head. And we think of a magnificent great building that will house three thousand provincial civil servants.

MR. BROWNE: Where are you going to get the money?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Money—Well, the honourable gentleman can worry about that when we can't get it. Start worrying—and the honourable gentleman will have a long wait before it comes to that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A new public building—a new cancer wing on the General Hospital, a new children's hos-

pital or else a new big wing of the General Hospital as a children's hospital, a great new university which, please God, we will soon be able to call tenders for, I hope within the next three or four or five weeks, however long it takes the architects to complete the drawing up of specifications, which won't be long. We need Heaven only knows how many new schools in St. John's—Heaven only knows! The great new and magnificent high school the Roman Catholics are building by St. Patrick's Hall I pass every day. It is apparently going to be a magnificent structure for girls, and a similar one for boys—that is only tapping the surface of the problem—The Anglicans, the United Church, the Salvation Army, I would say ten or fifteen million dollars will have to be spent on schools here in St. John's in the next three, four or five years. As the city is growing the young juvenile population is growing and we had better just throw in the sponge if we cannot provide our children with decent schools in Newfoundland. Let us cry "failure" and give it all away if we cannot give our children the schools.

Roads—Some honourable members will be happy to hear we got to do something for roads around and in the capital. They will not be the first we will do. They won't be the first. Those people who have no roads at all not even half a mile we will give these people roads first of all. Some people don't like it but I only laugh at them. They don't mean anything. They vote against us anyhow. They can't do any worse than talk against us, hate us, despise us. That is all they can do. After they have done all that, we win and win and win, and they have the pleasure of hating us. Let them have that pleasure. Don't deny them that little bit of satisfac-

tion. We will build the roads where they are needed most, and where they are needed less we will build them last.

MR. HOLLETT: Where most? Where there are sixty thousand people or what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Telephones—There are still places within six and seven miles of St. John's without telephones. Parks—Playgrounds—Additional fire fighting facilities. The Attorney General never ceases to press for a new fire hall in the west end in addition to the one that is up there. We have now three. We need another one. Some people hold it should be municipal but there is a tradition that the fire protection services of St. John's are the responsibility of the Government of Newfoundland and we do not propose to shed that responsibility.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the Premier—I may make myself unpopular in St. John's but it is now passed six o'clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was about, having completed St. John's—not annihilated now, finished off but completed my observations on the great city of St. John's.

MR. HOLLETT: You tried to annihilate it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I never tried to do that, not really tried. However I have concluded my observations on St. John's and I will turn tomorrow to the rest of the province. Then having dealt with the individual districts that remain I have some general observations to make about Newfoundland as a whole. I hope to complete my remarks tomorrow afternoon, and I now have pleasure in moving the adjournment of the debate.

On motion the debate on the Address in Reply adjourned until tomorrow:

On motion of Mr. Curtis all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred, and the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at three of the clock.

FRIDAY, April 26th, 1957.

The House met at 3.00 of the clock, in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Presenting Petitions

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Supply): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Sunnyside, Trinity Bay.

The prayer of the petition is that they be given the advantage of electricity by way of an extension of power lines by the Union Electric Power Company at Clarenville. I might add that some substance may be given to the prayer of the petition by remarking that in the same vicinity we have a hospital lighted at present by diesel generators, and an extension of power lines to that vicinity would enable us to give the hospital the advantage of light and power at a much cheaper rate than we are doing at the present time.

I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, ask that it be tabled in the House and referred to the Department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for reference to the Department concerned

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from

the residents of Hearts Delight praying that the local road, which at the present time leads from the main road or highroad to the Government wharf, be redesignated as part of the highway system. The petitioners point out that at the present time this road is not in a fit condition for the continuous heavy traffic which plies to and fro.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petitioners and beg that the petition be tabled and referred to the Department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for reference to the Department to which it relates.

MR. W. R. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Middle Arm. The prayer of the petitioners is for the construction of a highroad from Kings Point to Harry's Harbour.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this petition is in support of one from the people of Harry's Harbour and Jackson's Cove. Although this road will not directly serve the people of Middle Arm, it will serve them to the extent that at present the road when it is constructed to Burlington it will be approximately nineteen miles to hospital in Springdale whereas the road, if it is constructed from Kings Point to Harry's Harbour will save the people on the north shore of Green Bay approximately six miles by water and the people will be able to drive by car a distance of thirty miles to the hospital at Springdale.

I support the prayer of the petitioners, Mr. Speaker, and ask leave to have it tabled and referred to the Department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for reference to the Department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table a copy of some regulations originally amended by Minute of Council governing the approaches to St. John's, and for the purpose of clarification and comparison I draw attention to the same. Attached to the same copy is a copy of the old regulations and also a copy of the early subdivision regulations made in 1952.

MR. BROWNE: I presume, Mr. Speaker, that these will be published in the next Gazette?

MR. HEFFERTON: I believe they have already been gazetted.

Notices of Motion

None.

Notice of Questions

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask the following questions. (See Appendix).

Answers to Questions

Question No. 84:

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the answers are being prepared.

Orders of The Day

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the increase in the civil service, I wonder if I could ask the Premier if this ten per cent increase is a straight increase or graduated? Is it a straight ten per cent increase per individual?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The salary of each individual civil servant is increased by ten per cent.

MR. BROWNE: It does not apply to members of the Board of Liquor Control and Members of the Department of Highways?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not apply to employes of the Department of Public Works who are not civil servants. It does not apply to those who are civil servants. In the Department of Liquor it most assuredly applies to established civil servants. Now there are in those Departments those who are not established or pensionable and whether it applies or not I am not able to say from my own personal knowledge but I could certainly find out.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Finance I wonder if I might ask the Honourable the Premier to give the House some indication as to what time the budget would be brought down?

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend, the Minister of Finance, had intended bringing the budget down on the 30th of April and all plans were made with that in mind. Since then he has been obliged to go to New York accompanied by the Controller of the Treasury, in connection with the recent small loan floated in the United States. He will be there all this week, and that will delay the bringing down of the budget. It will delay it by at least a week. I believe—I think the 30th. is Monday. I would not swear, but I think the following Monday—Say the Monday or Tuesday following, something of that order. I would not like to be bound by that statement.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply if he can tell us if there is any activity going on in connection with the committee I believe appointed to investigate the fringe areas. I think the committee is called—"A Committee To Investi-

gate the Problems of Metropolitan St. John's"—and if he could tell us if there is any likelihood of anything being done this year? The reason I ask, Mr. Speaker, is because a lot of people have property who are not allowed to build at the present time and they would like to know.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, I might reply that there were several meetings, at least three, held by the committee appointed for the purpose. A firm of consulting engineers was appointed, Canadian Engineering Consultants. They are actually at work at the present time making such a survey. We estimate that we may possibly get the result of that survey within the next two or three months.

Orders of the Day

Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply:

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD: (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend in behalf of all members of the House a very cordial welcome to Mr. Strong of Little Bay Islands, Green Bay, a former member of this House. I believe he represented the District of White Bay here in 1928 to 1932, or something around that time.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I told the story of the occasion when Mr. Pickersgill and I were on some public wharf and had been asked by a group of fishermen, and there was an Anglican Clergyman, whether something could and would be done to provide unemployment insurance for fishermen. I was not able to remember yesterday either the name of the place nor of the clergyman in question. I now learn that the place was Herring Neck. I think I said it was Joe Batts Arm or Change Island, around that area. Actually it was Herring Neck.

The Attorney General, as a matter of fact, was present on the occasion. The clergyman was Rev. Mr. Buckwell, an Anglican priest who has since died. Now by a coincidence this forenoon the honourable member for Labrador South, who was in my office, on leaving my office ran into the widow of the Rev. Mr. Buckwell, and she recalled the circumstances. As a matter of fact what happened was that there was a meeting that day of fishermen and it was attended by the Reverend Mr. Buckwell and the secretary of the meeting was Mr. Buckwell. She told the honourable member of Labrador South this morning how the fishermen met with Mr. Buckwell to discuss what points they would put before Mr. Pickersgill and me when we should arrive. The principal point they agreed to be put to us was the question of unemployment insurance, for fishermen. That is how it happened that on that public wharf that day in addition to the thirty or forty or fifty fishermen who were present the Anglican Priest also was there. That is how the matter was raised. That was the first time when Mr. Pickersgill was directly asked the question, if he would try to get unemployment insurance for fishermen. It was a historic occasion, small and obscure, nothing spectacular about it and certainly nothing dramatic. But from that small occurrence a very large object has grown in Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: What year was it, 1953?

MR. SMALLWOOD: A month or so after the Coronation. Immediately after the Coronation the election campaign began, whenever the Coronation was, I remember Coronation exceedingly well and I do also the election. I do not remember the year in which either one of them was held.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): 1952.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am glad to put on the record the name of the place and the name of the clergyman, the Late Reverend Mr. Buckwell, an Englishman by the way, a native of the United Kingdom who served here for some time before his death.

Yesterday I left off my discussions of the needs of the people of Newfoundland when I was thinking about Bell Island—St. John's and then Bell Island, and I have come now to the District of Ferryland.

I said here yesterday that I thought that Ferryland was one of the few places left, Ferryland District, that whole shore, one of the few places left in Newfoundland that could truly be described as a fishing section. You have the great White Bay, you have the great Fogo Island and area, you have New World Islands, you have the Port De Grave section over here in Conception Bay and you have the whole of the Southern Shore virtually from Petty Harbour right around to St. Shotts, you have a large part of St. Mary's Bay and some parts of the east side of Placentia Bay and you have part of the boot, so to speak, of the Burin Peninsula and part of Placentia West, you have Fortune Bay, Burgeo, and you have a little on the St. Barbe Coast. Now that is about all that is left in Newfoundland of what we used to regard as the great fishing population of this Province.

Ferryland is still very much a fishing country, that whole shore. Virtually every man up there is a fisherman. Now it is true that in the last three, four, or five years a small number of them have not been fishing but rather they have had jobs down

at Goose Airport or even in Greenland and some of them had jobs in the hydro-electric development that went on up there in the past three or four years and a few had jobs on the various bases here in St. John's etc. But for the most part even the men who worked at the hydro-electric development, and I suppose there were about two or three hundred of them in all at its peak over a period of two or three years, even most of these men today, I imagine, are back at the fishery. There is one thing about the men of Ferryland District and indeed right up around St. Mary's up to Trepassey and St. Shotts, they like fishing, they like to be at fish and they do not ask much more than an opportunity to earn a decent living at the fishery, and if they earn a decent living, to use a very famous saying, "Christain decency and frugal comfort"—the honourable and learned member for St. John's West will recognize the illusion if no one else does. They ask for nothing else more — I see two others have recognized it as well—They do not ask for much more than a chance to live decently and support their families and their institutions by hard work in the fishery. But they do object to the hard work without the reward.

Now the needs of Ferryland District are really simple. They do want the road up through the Shore to be a much better road than it is. I personally feel that it ought to be paved right around for the whole of the distance because tourists who will come to this part of Newfoundland and arrive here in St. John's, by car or whether they arrive here in St. John's by air or by boat, land in St. John's those tourists will have two places to go, one that is superb, terrifically beautiful drive around

Conception Bay than which there are few places in the world, in the whole world, much more beautiful. Now we have grown so accustomed to it we do not realize that. We do not realize the beauty of the present highway, not the new one to be built—The new one will be straight and level and paved where one can make fifty sixty and seventy miles an hour, and if in a hurry to go to Gander or Corner Brook that is the way. But for a drive to follow that highway around Conception Bay to Carbonear you will go through scenery not equalled in many parts of the world. It is not foolish patriotism speaking now when I say that. If you want to go through settlement after settlement for a hundred miles of fishermen the only place, going from St. John's and to get there quickly, is up the Southern Shore. So for that reason if no other that road should be paved for its whole distance, and more ought to be widened out and straightened and a good surface put on it, as in any other part of Newfoundland.

Electrification is a very burning issue up there. They complain with great bitterness, and I think very justly, that they are the source of a lot of hydro-electric power that is being developed up there and yet that energy is not used in the main or even at all in some parts to illuminate that shore but is taken off the shore to develop the mines of Bell Island and light the houses and churches and schools and buildings of Bell Island and St. John's. They do want the electricity carried right up the shore. I know myself that in Trepassey you have an extremely important industry there in that very modern fish plant which is dependent on very high-cost diesel electricity. Now that is a problem that is crying out for solution.

I know that the honourable and learned member, the Solicitor General, the member for that district, has the matter very much in mind. I know that he has had many consultations on it—and I feel optimistic—the thing is going to be done. Certainly whether it is done or not it is needed to be done.

Another thing they need is a decent telephone system. As a matter of fact the telephone system in a good many parts of Newfoundland is archaic, out of date as though it belonged to Noah's Ark. It is terrible signs of the backwardness of Newfoundland that in so many parts of this island they still are served, or are not served, by an antiquated telephone system. It is nevertheless one of the real problems of the people of Newfoundland. We will see that poles are set well back. We won't have any more of that nonsense of poles at the side of the road.

Now another problem is rather a striking one—I don't know if the member for the district will like this or not but I have to say it—You have in Trepassey one of the finest fish plants in Newfoundland and that means in the world, because we have some of the finest fish plants, modern fish plants in the whole world and one of them is at Trepassey. Trepassey including the immediate area, i.e. St. Shotts on one side, Brigus Bay and so on, on the other side, as an area is not able to support that fish plant with enough fish to keep it going. There is a terrific problem of supplying that plant. Actually what is needed is to settle maybe two hundred new fishing families into Trepassey. Now this fact is not known, but Mr. Monroc had the idea of bringing in Portuguese fishermen, making a deal with the Government of Portugal under which a consid-

erable number of Portuguese fishermen would be brought in and settled in Trepassey. We put our foot down on that. We are absolutely opposed to it, not because we don't like the Portuguese. We do. The Portuguese are fine people. Not because we thought it would be a scandalous thing to begin bringing hundreds of Portuguese or any other fishermen into Newfoundland while we still have hundreds of backward isolated little fishing settlements peopled by fishermen with still no other way of making a living but by the fishery. I said: bring them first into Trepassey. Now my first preference, speaking as an individual, just as one human being, was that small places in the Ferryland District itself be invited to move up and settle in Trepassey. Then there was a proposal that they be brought there from up the South West Coast. I opposed that very strongly on this ground, they were proposing to bring Protestant fishermen into Trepassey, which is, I think, exclusively a Roman Catholic settlement. If they had done so it would have opened up the problem of building a new church, a new school building and perhaps a new parish hall, whereas the church that is there can take dozens if not hundreds more, and the schools that are there, with a very slight addition, can handle twice or half as many more children, with the same number of teachers. Then the people would be homogeneous, they would be like-minded. In other words where today there is unity there ought to continue to be unity and if people are brought in there let them be of the same denominations. Now if it were a Protestant settlement I would take the same position, that we should not go creating problems in solving one, do not create another.

There is the problem of a great fish plant crying out for fish and the people of the area are not being able in fact to give them the amount of fish they need. Now that is a very heavy problem. We have six or seven hundred thousand dollars or something of that nature of public money taken out of the cash surplus and loaned to that fish firm for that plant, and we are most acutely concerned about it because we want to follow our money and see it is protected in so far as we can do so.

MR. BROWNE: That is finished? You have settled it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is not settled. The matter is still open. They still have the problem waiting a solution. Now with the two solutions proposed I have disagreed, the first would be to bring fishermen in from Portugal—The honourable and learned member for St. John's East could well imagine what the result would be if we stood by and allowed a few hundred Portuguese fishermen to come in—Although I will say this: in this world today one of the few nations left that seem to have a genuine aptitude for the fishery is the Portuguese. They are fine fishermen, and the Portuguese Government has developed some very magnificent schemes of vocational training for young Portuguese, taken as young lads and like in the navy in the old days, in the British Navy, are given a thorough training from the ground up so that when they graduate as young men, so to speak, they become first-class fishermen. That is the type of men coming to our banks and that you see tramping the streets of St. John's, trained men—I don't say a word against them, but I do not think the time has come to begin bringing fishermen from Portugal to settle in

Newfoundland. The other scheme was to bring them from the South West Coast, where they would be Protestant and where we might solve this problem of having fishermen to catch fish but create for us a problem to build schools and churches. There might even have to be one Anglican and one United Church and Salvation Army, three churches to be built and schools as well.

Now in the District of St. Mary's their problem is again roads and electrification and again telephones. They have an abysmal telephone system, worn out twenty years ago and more so today. A terrible system. There is a problem of electrification. They are clamoring for it as in so many places of Newfoundland. Roads also, more roads, better roads, plowed roads in the winter giving them a chance to use buses and to use their own cars. It is the eternal cry of the Newfoundland people today.

Then we come to Placentia East. In Placentia East you have first and foremost the problem of roads. You can never give the people enough roads and get them straight enough or wide enough nor make the surface smooth enough and you cannot plow the roads enough in the winter. They have the problem of roads, electrification and telephones again, some kind of a decent telephone system. They have the problem of their hospital in Placentia. It is not nearly big enough. It is quite too small and needs considerable enlargements. I do not know if provision is made this year—We are hoping this year to solve that problem. That is one of the hundreds I mentioned here yesterday to be solved this very year. Then again there is a problem of water and sewerage in my honourable friend's district of Placentia East, which has to be faced just

as problems have to be faced and have to be solved in the Placentia West District. The problem is serious but not nearly as serious as we heard from the honourable gentleman who represented it seven or eight years. We solved the problem in part by roads we have built in eight years, but there are still lots of roads to be built. The great problem is electrification as we heard from him in his speech here today. That matter is now well in hand. A special investigation is being made by the company up there, and meetings are to be held and the honourable gentleman who represents that district and the district of Burin up there are attending, I think something will come out of it. The telephone system up there and in Burin is a scandal to the company that operates it. I say now, and hope they can hear me, I hope they hear what I say, it is a disgrace to them, it is a disgrace to the company to begin with that operates it, it is a disgrace to the District of Burin and Placentia West that have to endure such a scandalous service and it is a disgrace to Newfoundland as a Province of Canada. Something must be done to improve the telephone service.

Mr. Speaker, in St. Lawrence we have two very important mines in Burin, you have a large fish plant, the largest in Newfoundland, in Grand Bank you have another large modern fish plant and in Fortune you have one I will speak about in a moment. Now there are five industrial enterprises operating at this moment, four of them operating, one that is not at the moment. These plants are served by a telephone system that would not be adequate for a bullseye shop. It is scandalous to be trying to do business, it is outrageous to be trying to do business with a telephone

system of that character. If the company that operates it is not prepared to improve it steps ought to be taken to take their franchise away from them and an Act perhaps brought into the House cancelling it—give them a certain amount of notice and if they don't bring in the improvements bring in an Act and cancel the rights they have. It is outrageous to get a franchise to do a thing and not do it, absolutely scandalous. Something has to be done about it.

Then again in the District of Placentia West you have in a more vexatious degree than a good many other districts the problem of centralization, with the exception perhaps of Mersheen and one other, all the islands in Placentia Bay ought to be assisted, if they wish to do it, ought to be assisted to remove the people on them to places where they could have roads and schools and churches, and an opportunity of getting back and forth and a better opportunity to raise their families and have all the modern amenities that they cannot ever hope to have as long as they continue to live on these small islands scattered about that bay.

In the District of Burin there is the question of electrification and the question of this telephone service to which I have just referred. In addition to these they have the road problem. They have the problem of housing in the town of Grand Bank, Fortune, Burin and St. Lawrence.—In these four industrial towns they have in each case a problem of housing, the provision of housing for industrial workers, the problem of the extension of their water and sewerage systems and the problem of providing of fire equipment where it does not exist and improved fire fighting facilities where they do presently exist.

Furthermore they have the problem of hospital extension. I had the pleasure of being shown through the hospital at Grand Bank, the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Education and I, three of us last year went through that hospital, and we could see with our own eyes, we did not need to be doctors nor building experts, we could see the very serious need for hospital expansion there, and I have no doubt it is in our programme for attention before too many years are passed.

Now having passed the Burin Peninsula I come to the Great South West Coast—Here I am at a disadvantage—I am referring now to the great district represented by His Honour, the Speaker, Fortune-Hermitage and the other great district represented by the Minister of Fisheries, Burgeo and La-Poile, that great stretch of coast which we usually call the South West Coast. I am at this disadvantage that a Royal Commission sat a few months ago for the best part of a year, I think, certainly over half a year, and have compiled their report which is now, I believe, in the hands of the printers, for submission to the Government and to this House and I believe they made a very thorough study of it—The honourable member for Burin, the former magistrate, was a member for that Royal Commission and the Minister of Fisheries was the Chairman of it, so that two of the members of this House. When the report comes in I have no doubt we will have an excellent and valuable discussion of the problems of that great part, almost a third of the coastline of Newfoundland, well not almost, but a very large stretch of coast. It seems to me that the problems may—I have not read the report and I do not know any more about what is in that report than the members across

the floor. I have not seen it nor have the members of the Royal Commission told me what is in it—But I would imagine, from my own imagination, that it is a problem of centralization. If you took the population from Port aux Basques or at least exclude Port aux Basques because that is a great railway terminal centre, and take every settlement this side of Port aux Basques up to say Terrenceville, at the head of Fortune Bay, the whole population of that great stretch of coast you could drop down between Briggs and say Spaniard's Bay or if you like between Clarke's Beach and Carbonear—I am deliberately choosing short distances of between fifteen miles in length, you could drop the entire population from the head of Fortune Bay or from Terrenceville say to Port aux Basques, not including Port aux Basques, into that small section. In other words our distinctive Newfoundland problem is a small population thinly spread over thousands of miles of coastline. That is a problem which is so distinctively Newfoundland, which has been bedeviling our history so much, which has made the governing of Newfoundland so terribly difficult and so terribly expensive—That Newfoundland problem is dramatized in the most spectacular fashion in that long stretch of coast so very, very thinly populated in a number of struggling and in some cases strangling settlements.

Now the people themselves are first class people up there, of English descent, high class people, good people. They are good people, they are intelligent people and they are frugal and hard-working and they are people who have knocked about the world. They have there today the backbone of what is left of the Nova Scotia Banking Fishery. No Nova Scotia man would dream of going banking, fish-

ing or take any crews other than Newfoundlanders from that coast if they can get them. If they cannot get them they might be forced to take somebody else. They are first class people but the coast is not a first class coast, it is just as well to face it now brutally. The coast is rocky, the land in from the salt water is mountainous and rocky. I flew over it.

MR. HOLLETT: That is what made them fine people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is what made them fine people. Maybe they could endure that and their sons and daughters were willing to stay there seventy years ago, not today. You cannot get people today to be content to continue from youth to old age living in tiny little hamlets clinging on to the foot of the cliffs. You cannot get those people to live there. They won't do it. It is only nonsense to expect they will do it. All over this Island of Newfoundland they were willing to do it a hundred years ago. They are not willing to do it today; you will not get people to put up with that today. When you remember that fifty years ago there were tens of thousands of Newfoundland people who were born in certain settlements and never got more than ten miles away and that ten miles in the woods, shooting caribou or rabbit or something. Today they have travelled around the world, they have been in two world wars, lived in England and Scotland and have gone across to Ireland—thousands of Irish descendants taking a run across the Channel to Ireland, they have lived in France, Italy, North Africa and have gone to work in the United States and in Nova Scotia and in Gander and in here at Fort Pepperrell and down at Goose Airport. They have seen the world and they are not going to stay any longer in

these crannies or these crevices on that bold, rocky coast. They might do it if they could make a great big living out of it, if they could get rich quickly, then a young man would go even down to the North Pole if he could make good money and he has not got to stay all his life down there—but you are not going to get people to settle down any more in the normal course and rear families and settle down and raise families. They will not do that today, I hold. I may be contradicted completely by what the Royal Commission Report says but I hold, personally, there is only one solution ultimately, only one. We may have palliatives, we may have plasters to put on here and there, do something to sort of half satisfy them and stop their mutiny for the time being. But ultimately the solution is to encourage and assist those of them who wish to move from places that have no future in the nature of things to places that have a future. Now where these places are I do not know. When you see the gallant people of Belleoram it is heartbreaking to think of Newfoundlanders. Such fine high class people as the people of Belleoram, it is heartbreaking to see the unsuccessful struggle they have put up in the last eight or ten years for survival. Why one of the first things this Government was asked to do eight years ago when we came into office was to help them to get a water system installed. We did lend money to the Town Council there. They had pluck enough to form a town council and they wanted a water system and we helped to do it. Then the very industry going in there to justify all that failed to materialize and there was a big herring plant to go in there and bought a building and had it all ready and the machinery ready and shipped away from St. John's and the

ship carrying the machinery was wrecked and the machinery lost up there near St. Lawrence on the west side of Placentia Bay. That was the end of that industry. From that day, if I am not mistaken, Belleoram has been sinking and dying and they are today almost without hope. Which are the places on the south west coast to be built up for fishing settlements is more than I know. We may ask, what about Gaultois? There is a fine modern fishing plant in Gaultois. Can we build that up and encourage the families to move into Gaultois? What about Burgeo? There is a fine fish plant there. The Government financed both plants. Are they not both of them places to which many families could be moved from these less promising coves and settlements along the coast. The answer I am afraid is no. At least so far it is no. The plant at Gaultois has gone through extremely difficult indeed extremely precarious times. Only a few short days ago the Government were obliged to extend financial assistance to them. The House will be told the details in due course. This is just not the moment to do it.

But the one hope for the South West Coast is Bay D'Espoir. When I say, as I said here yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that I will never support St. John's for a national harbour believe me it was not prejudice against St. John's that made me say that. I was able to say it all the more readily because I know of a great programme of harbour improvement that has been designed by the Foundation Company of Canada, who made a very thorough survey there and were kind enough to bring their plans so I could examine them closely, so that even I, not an engineer, could see it would be a superb arrangement for the Harbour of

St. John's. I can therefore all the more readily say I am absolutely opposed to making St. John's a national harbour. But my real reason for withholding my support of St. John's for one national harbour is the fact that Bay D'Espoir if ever Providence ordained any place in this Island of Newfoundland for development Bay D'Espoir is that place. Just look at it—It is an ice free port. You can go in and out of that harbour any day of the year. Now I am not overlooking the fact that you can get a thin scum of ice, just surface ice that will freeze an inch or two inches. But any boat can go through that, hardly notice it is going through it. So that first of all it is a great ice-free port. It is what is known as an all-weather seaport.

Secondly we have had a hydrographic survey made of it and a topographic survey made of it—You can build a town there. We have actually a complete engineering survey made of the land surrounding the harbour as well as the foreshore and the water in the harbour. We have spent a great many thousands of dollars to have that survey made, surveys made. You can build a town there bigger than St. John's on beautiful level land, in fact two levels, the first goes back from the salt water two or three or four miles, level as the floor here, then beyond that again at a higher ground level, at a greater elevation there are more miles again, any amount of fresh water. There is enough fresh water to supply any city, the City of New York, so it would supply anything ever going to be in Bay D'Espoir. Therefore you have an all-weather seaport, a magnificent harbour, a magnificent site for a town and an endless supply of fresh water. On top of that five hundred thousand

horse power of potential electricity. Now put that together, put it together. Any other country in the world would try to put it together. Would not any other part of North America try, if they had an all-weather seaport, large and commodious and with deep water and a magnificent land site adjoining it, contiguous to it and a plentiful supply of fresh water and good soil for farming nearby and five hundred thousand horse power to be developed. We know precisely the fraction of a cent what it will cost. We spent a quarter of a million dollars to have a survey made of the hydro-power, to find out. Would not anyone else try to put all that together into an industry. We are trying to do it, and I believe I am not in a position to say all I know or all that we all know in the Cabinet, but very big things are moving and very big concerns at the bottom—We believe we are going to get a paper mill there. Now if we do, Mr. Speaker, let me trace for you in rapid succession the things that shall happen:

(1) A great power development will go forward that will cost in the initial stage one hundred millions perhaps, one hundred million dollars, up to a hundred millions. That is number one.

(2) A great paper mill, A large paper mill.

(3) A national harbour that will take twenty-five million dollars to build — Great piers running right around the foreshore, great sheds, great cranes that move back and fourth on a track, completely modern installations, a modern harbour. A railway running due north, or approximately north to connect with the Trans-Island railway mainline somewhere in the vicinity of Grand Falls

or Bishop's Falls. A highway. We would have to build a highway to connect with a great new industrial centre in Bay D'Espoir. There would be a good road, and a paved road running due north and connecting with the Trans-Canada Highway, roughly parallel with the railway and connecting somewhere in the vicinity of Bishop's Falls.

Inevitably in that case, inevitably Bay D'Espoir would become a great port of entry for goods from the Mainland of Canada, inevitably — it would be the port of entry of goods that would be shipped north by rail and supply the whole of the centre of Newfoundland. It would supply all of Notre Dame Bay all of White Bay, it would supply everything north, say, of Cape Freels. In fact it might even supply the South Side of Bonavista Bay. Of course it would supply the great Gander Airport. Furthermore out through that same seaport would be shipped great shipments of merchandise as well.

Now I have discussed it with Mr. Boylen, and Mr. Boylen's concept is of a ten million dollar paper mill. Remember Mr. Boylen will very shortly have an important industry in Newfoundland when his great copper mine begins to operate on the 1st of September approximately in Tilt Cove, two thousand tons a day to rise to three thousand tons. There will be Little Bay and Gull Pond and undoubtedly others. We already have Buchans. There will be enough copper to justify a smelter and just as surely as you have a smelter you will have other activities arising as a result of it.

In short, Mr. Speaker, given once, just given once enough to justify the beginning of a hydro-development the

logical thing would be to run a transmission line down through the Island and take the power to Grand Falls where they need more, to Buchans—they need it also, they have very little and to Tilt Cove, Baie Verte, the Whole Baie Verte Peninsula will be supplied from Bay D'Espoir into a grid which goes east to west, half million horse power of very low-cost hydro-electricity that you can get there. It has got to be developed—It will be developed.

MR. HOLLETT: That means finish to St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why so? I would like to hear why?

MR. HOLLETT: I am asking you would it? All the goods you say would be coming in via Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would say this great development in Bay D'Espoir would be the biggest thing to happen for St. John's since Corner Brook and Grand Falls, in as much as the building of Grand Falls and Corner Brook were great steps forward for St. John's. Now look at St. John's in a moment and I will show the House why — The member for White Bay North, not being an economist, used a description of St. John's which was highly offensive. He said that St. John's was a parasitic, gossipy little city. That was translated in the course of a very few days into something altogether different—that the St. John's people were parasites—Now how can you make one mean the other is a matter of semantics (a thirty cent word). He explained it so thoroughly that there should have been no possibility of any misunderstanding. What he said was this: No new dollars are produced by St. John's. What he said was this: No new dollars are produced by St. John's. What he meant to say was that all dollars were those

which somebody else produced and which were handled in St. John's, but St. John's produced no new dollars except (1) what fish is produced here and shipped out—that brings in new dollars into Newfoundland, (2) St. John's brings in thousands of new dollars into Newfoundland through the American Base—that is new money —(3) The Federal Government civil servants salaries—that is new money, as far as Newfoundland is concerned that is new money St. John's brings in. Then it seemed he could not think of anything else—The rest of the dollars in St. John's, St. John's does not produce, Grand Bank produces them, Bonavista produces them, Wesleyville produces them, Grand Falls produces them, Buchans produces them, St. Anthony produces them, Corner Brook produces, Bell Island produces them, in the basic industries of Newfoundland produces them, the only money we have except what the Canadian Government and the American Government puts in here.

MR. BROWNE: That is dealing with only the primary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have a few secondary industries—They do not bring any money in except the cement mill. That ships cement and brings in new dollars—The Gypsum Plant brings in some new dollars. Both sell perhaps over half their products in Newfoundland, and they do not produce new dollars. On what they export they bring in some new dollars—The Hardboards Plant, the Hardwoods Plants, United Cotton Mill, they ship now the Maritimes, the paint factory down in the East End that ships some paint to the Maritimes. That brings in some new dollars. I might have mentioned the tanneries, ninety per cent of its output is sold outside New-

foundland and its income is new dollars—So Newfoundland is living on these kinds of dollars, four kinds (1) the new dollars that our fish bring back, our newsprint paper and pulp and minerals, our timber, our cement and the rest—Now these dollars do not come to the people who produced them—Grand Falls does not get all the dollars that Grand Falls produces. The man who works in a biscuit factory in St. John's gets some of these dollars because some of the biscuits he makes are sold in Grand Falls, the man who works in any one of the factories around St. John's or any one of the shops on Water Street, the dollars he gets Saturday night as his pay envelope these dollars were earned in Grand Falls, in Buchans, in Wesleyville, in St. Anthony, in Placentia, in Ferryland, these dollars were earned by the fishermen of Newfoundland. The only new dollars that St. John's produces, as the honourable member says, the only new dollars St. John's produces are what comes in from the fish produced—St. John's is a fishing port, and they produce some fish and the fish is shipped away and the money comes back—That is new dollars you find in St. John's are dollars earned in other parts of the Island. Now pure straight economics that is. I won't repeat the ugly word but is there any doubt what it is in economics—that is not to say—

MR. HOLLETT: You are going to transfer all that now from St. John's to Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman—I understood the honourable gentleman majored in economics at Oxford University.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes. Did you?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No I did not. Therefore I ought not to know as much about economics.

MR. HOLLETT: You know as much about economics now as that parasite.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That may be the case—But what I am saying is that if there were ten new Bay D'Espoirs and ten more Corner Brooks and ten more Grand Falls than St. John's could have a population of two hundred thousand, they could have ten more factories than they have now and the factories larger to sell more biscuits and more jam and more candy and more ready-made clothes, boots and shoes. They would have far more customers to sell to, they would be getting more of these new dollars produced in Bay D'Espoir—So that I say the best thing that could happen to St. John's is for Wesleyville to be twice as big and twice as prosperous—That would be good for St. John's—But a lot of people in St. John's do not know it, don't recognize. They sneer at the smell of fish. Their delicate nostrils cannot stand the smell of cod—A lot of people around St. John's can't stand the smell of cod.

MR. HOLLETT: Some of the cod is not fit to sell here, and cod is thirty-five cents a pound.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That may be so.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Honourable gentlemen are not talking to each other—Talking across the floor is out of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perfectly true. If I had been in the shoes of the honourable member for White Bay North, unless I was prepared for one-half hour to explain thoroughly what I meant, I would not have said what he said even if I thought it I would not have said it. But I think it is highly unfair the way his statement

has been taken and twisted, distorted into being an attack upon the good people of St. John's.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps he will be elaborating upon the word "Gossip"?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No doubt about that—I myself announced that St. John's is the gossip factory, a rumor factory—There is no doubt about that, St. John's is a gossip little village. There is no doubt there are other gossip cities—Well that is what he called it—Ottawa is gossip too, Washington—But he should not be attacked and it almost made it hardly safe for a man to walk the street of St. John's.

MR. HOLLETT: He can take it.

MR. BROWNE: He passed around a few compliments besides those.

MR. SMALLWOOD: St. George's: In the District of St. George's they have the problem of electricity, electrification and telephones. I would say St. George's is the first place since I have been in office to start the ball rolling in their demands for electrification. Their demand for electricity is simply appalling. They are up in arms over it, almost ready to declare war. Some of the messages I have received have been offensive, some insulting and all have been very ardent, to say the least, but they really are determined out in St. George's District to have electricity and telephones—I am with them a hundred per cent. They have the problem of some centralization and some by-roads.

Now they are very well served, or shortly will be, by the Trans-Canada Highway running through from one end to the other of their district—a beautiful paved highway—But they

need connecting roads to open up more country. They need an extension to the hospital at Stephenville Crossing—Is that in the cards for this year?

HON. DR. J. McGRATH (Minister of Health): No, Sir, it is definitely needed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is definitely needed. One crying need for the District of St. George's is to pave the road between Stephenville Crossing and Stephenville. The House may be interested to know the traffic over that road between Stephenville Crossing and Stephenville is probably the heaviest in Newfoundland today, that is on a dirt road, a road not paved, practically the heaviest traffic there is in Newfoundland.

The need of St. George's District is for a harbour. Now remember, Mr. Speaker, that all the way from Port aux Basques to Bay of Islands—just picture that in your mind—between the two there is not a harbour. Now I might go a step further and say from there to the Straits of Belle Isle there is only Port Saunders and Bonne Bay. I would not call Flowers' Cove a harbour exactly. There are, say, three harbours on the whole west coast from Cape Bauld to Cape Ray. Now if you want to call Bay St. George's a harbour you are welcome to do it—Codroy is the place earmarked for a harbour—It is a Federal matter and I ought not to mention it perhaps here at all today. I ought to be confining myself—God in Heaven knows we have enough problems without having to worry myself about the Federal ones—But the matter is under discussion by the Government of Canada. The South West Coast commission, I believe, dealt with it and will probably bring in recommendations on it.

Then another pressing problem is that Sandy Cove beach, Sandy Point Beach there in St. George's is washing away. Give it another two or three years and there will be no Sandy Cove Beach left—It is a pressing problem—We have spent a few dollars on it, I think fifty or sixty thousand, thirty or forty thousand dollars in the last eight years—That is only a flea bite. It has got to have perhaps a quarter of a million to prevent that place just being washed completely away.

Up at Robinsons they badly need a modern, frost proof, commodious vegetable warehouse to supply that area. Actually St. George's is a little thinly populated but it has the advantage that it has the future on its side. That West Coast from Port aux Basque right down to the Straits of Belle Isle is a section of Newfoundland the last in the whole island to get its start in life, at the turn of this very century. While many of us who are in this Chamber now were alive it was unlawful to live on the West Coast—It was possessed by a foreign nation or practically so. So that it is very late in getting its start. But it is the garden of Newfoundland. There are a few spots around Newfoundland that are absolutely beautiful, beautiful beyond words. The head of Bay D'Espoir is very beautiful. Dildo Sound, some of Green Bay, Notre Dame Bay and some of the coves and the harbours up on the Southern Shore are just beautiful beyond words, and Conception Bay.

MR. BROWNE: You had better go all around again now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I won't. But the West Coast is a beautiful place. I say there are these spots in and around Newfoundland, but the whole of the west coast, all of it from Cape Ray virtually to Flowers' Cove

is one magnificent part of the whole west coast, and it is a great coming part of Newfoundland. Let us make no mistake about that, it is a great coming part of Newfoundland—St. George's is one part of it—

Port au Port has a problem again of roads, electrification, telephones. I think most of the clamour for electrification comes from Port au Port rather than what is now the District of St. George's. I know there is a lot over in St. George's, and I am not overlooking that clamour and some of these very powerful, let us say, telegrams come from Port au Port.

MR. HOLLETT: What about the Bill of Cape St. George's? Is that alright now? Have they got roads over there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is need of some centralization—I leave the most important one to last—Some centralization is needed out there. There ought to be a really adequate survey made of the oil deposits and put that matter once and for all to the test and settle it.

MR. HOLLETT: I thought you did that? What about Fox?

MR. SMALLWOOD: John Fox—I am afraid I don't know what would be the eventual outcome—John Fox has run into a series of hard luck, incidentally, since he came down here in the first place—He bought the "Boston Post"—I think he paid three or four million dollars for it—I had lunch with him one day at the Harvard Club in New York, of which he was a member—I was his guest at lunch—It was during the presidential election, not this last one but the one before—and he could hardly talk to us so busy was he writing front page editorials in behalf of Mr. Eisenhower,

and all of a sudden the great money maker, great oil man, pioneer, all of a sudden was a newspaper and politician and could hardly eat for wanting to get back to the "Boston Post." He ran the paper two or three years and ran so deeply into debt there is hardly any sign nor sight of him today. He has gone under. He has lost millions of dollars. He tried to get a licence for a big television station. He lost his share in the Western Union. He had controlling shares in Western Union and had to sell them to realize some cash and in the end it got so bad he could not even pay a few small bills he owed here in Newfoundland, for all his millions—Now do not blame the Government for that—for John Fox—Do not blame us.

So, like the Opposition, I would like to see a really determined effort made to prove once and for all whether there was oil. Now Fox had intended going to this district with a ten-thousand foot drill and deep well drills that would go down ten thousand feet. He had even gone so far as to pack up that big drill for that purpose when he ran into those financial troubles. Now I am not saying John Fox will not recover. I am not saying this man that "Fortune Magazine" devoted an article to and "Time" has written up a financial wizard, this man, John Fox, won't stage a come-back. Maybe he will.

We want to do something with the asbestos deposits at Bluff Head, which has had a very checkered career, very unsuccessful. It cost the Government some three or four hundred thousand dollars we lent to it. Negotiations are presently going on, I believe, between Mr. Siebert, the owner, on the one hand and one of the asbestos companies on the other hand, and I believe BRINCO shows some positive in-

terest. We still hope we will get our money back one day but more important than our getting back the three or four hundred thousand dollars of Government money we lent them, more important than that, we hope to get an asbestos mine operating, and give a couple or three hundred men a chance to earn a living and rear families.

You have a problem out in that district as follows: Large parts of the land and the timber is owned by absentee landlords who acquired the property some seventy or eighty years ago and ninety years ago, and have sat on it leaving it completely idle, and have done nothing with it. Now the population is growing rapidly in Port au Port District and the people need that land, need that timber. We I think, are going to solve that problem. I think in this present session we propose to bring in legislation to give us the authority, if the House will pass it we will take the authority to get that land back so that people can have it and the timber on it. Now we would not ask the House to do that if the company that owned it, the London and Newfoundland Telegraph Company.

MR. HOLLETT: I thought you already had that authority.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. If we did we would use it. This is something else again, and we are hoping to do something about it. If they themselves were doing something with it we would not bother but they are doing nothing, in fact all they are doing is sitting back writing a letter now and then from London wanting to know could they get some money. The gall—They got the face of robbers' horse, sitting in London and writing letters after ninety years, wondering could they

get a few dollars. How much? What do they want? Two dollars an acre—they turn up their noses—Not a square mile, mind you, but an acre.

Finally there is a great problem in Port au Port District and that is the development of a harbour. They must have a harbour. That again is a Federal matter. We are going to see what can be done between us all in that matter.

Now we come to the last two districts, the last two I take, the two Humber Districts together, because it is all one area. Although politically obliged to separate them they are actually in fact all one great area, the great Bay of Islands, the great Liberal Humber area.

MR. HOLLETT: It was.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That district never yet voted anything but Liberal, ever since it was created by the great Liberal Premier, Squires. It has never ceased to be Liberal. They are great people, energetic people, people of wide vision and people of daring vision, people unconventional, untrammelled, people who are not all tied down by the conventions which you find in old towns like St. John's.

MR. HOLLETT: They came from all over.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They came from all over. Having, as my friend from Bonavista said, having come from the Land of Egypt they have gone into the Land of Canaan in Bay of Islands, and they have become new people. Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, that eighty per cent of the men of Bay of Islands, in the City of Corner Brook, were either once fishermen or loggers themselves living out in little outports or are the sons or grandsons of fishermen. They

came from harbours that had nothing. They came from harbours that did not even have a road to walk on, even a road with stumps and rocks. They have no roads at all.

MR. HOLLETT: That is where most of us came from.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right—But having come from that background into Bay of Islands, an area of modern industrialism, they became a new people, energetic, progressive. There is no limit to their ambitions, no limit at all, as we who work in Cabinet with the Minister of Labour and now with the new member know so well. There is no limit to their appetites. To them this Government has justification for its existence only if we spend and spend and spend in Corner Brook.

Now I am not blaming them for that. I take my hat off to them for that. We could never give them all they ask for, never in their life until Newfoundland is ten times richer than she is today. But we take our hats off to them because they are in the vanguard of Newfoundland people. They are now where all Newfoundland people will be ten or twenty years from now—they with their insistence and demands for the best that money can provide, in schools, in hospitals and in water and sewerage and homes and streets and churches, the best that money can provide in everything. In that they are only in the vanguard, only leading Newfoundland by a few years. But historically, anyone with a sense of history, any one with any knowledge of Newfoundland is absolutely dumbfounded to find that in ten or twenty years you could get such an illustration as that from the people. I say the people of Corner Brook, when I myself lived there,

when I tried to hound and tried to prod and tried to agitate to get some kind of municipal organization, some kind of anything rather than just muck and mud and work and wages. In twenty years they have come to be as progressive minded as any town in the length and breadth of this vast Canadian Nation. Not even out in the west even in Alberta even Calgary have nothing on Corner Brook in the extent of its ambitions and the degree of its appetite. They are changing Newfoundland. They are laying down a new record, a new long-distant high jump, broad jump, every kind of record for improvement. They are not going to get half of what they demand, but the end of it will be, without a doubt, a vast improvement over what they have.

If we could only say to the member for Labrador North—"Sorry, Old Man, we got to forget you. Corner Brook must have it. You cannot have it for Labrador North. Forget it for another eight or ten years. It has gone on a couple of hundred years. You have waited so long you don't mind waiting another few years. We want it for Corner Brook so all of you members must just postpone your demands." Can't you see, Mr. Speaker, we cannot. We will have a mutiny. That is what the people of Corner Brook just can't seem to get into their heads, that the demands are in millions, they are unlimited, they are like the sands of the sea, the desert. There is no limit, no end to the demands of the people of Newfoundland, North, East, South and West in every bay and in every bay and in every cove and in every harbour and in every hamlet. If we did not have these demands we could spend a few million, more millions than we are spending, in the great City of Corner Brook and the great

District of Humber East and Humber West. Nevertheless, actually you have in the area of Corner Brook a thing so typical. Here in St. John's in this fairly modern city—not as modern as Corner Brook—but fairly modern, but go six or seven miles away and you will find people burning kerosene as you can in Corner Brook.

MR. HOLLETT: That is if you can get out of Corner Brook.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You can get out. Just go a few miles and you will find no electricity, no water and sewerage, no adequate school facilities.

I was going to say something about the School Tax but because of meetings which were begun yesterday and continuing today and perhaps will go on some days that will deal with the matter perhaps I am not in a position.

I can only say in connection with Corner Brook that we will go on, we will not be able to do as much as we would like to do, but we will do a lot. We will spend millions of dollars there, millions. We intend to spend millions of dollars in Corner Brook. We will go on doing it. We won't spend millions every year, but every few years it will run to millions and every few years after that run to more.

MR. HOLLETT: On roads and schools?

MR. SMALLWOOD: On everything you can think about, roads, schools, hospitals. It all has to be done. It is a modern city and Corner Brook is not going to be satisfied unless they get it and they may not be satisfied when they do get it. They got to get it anyway.

The final district, and after that I propose to move the recess for ten minutes, Mr. Speaker, and wind up

after recess in a general discussion of Newfoundland as a whole.

St. Barbe District—It was Canon Richard, I think it was, used to call it the forgotten coast. I was talking to Canon Richards. He is now over in Port de Grave. As the House is so well aware for about forty years he was the priest at Flowers Cove. You remember he was the man that started the business of skin boots. He had the people up and down the shore for years making skin boots, sealskin boots. He through different clergymen of the Church of England and others, not only clergymen, would write letters and get to buy a pair or a dozen or a half dozen. In that way he worked up over a period quite a trade in making skin boots. He used to write to the "Evening Telegram." I remember so vividly in 1922 these long letters from Flowers Cove describing the life of the people, describing the conditions that existed down there on that coast. He called that coast the forgotten people.

I was talking to him not long ago, a few months ago, and we made a bargain that if we both lived long enough and God knows which of us will live longer. He is an old man and sometimes I think I am too. We made it up that we will go together and drive from St. John's to Flowers Cove, and we won't stop but we will go on across to St. Barbe. Now I do not know how long that will take, I am satisfied it will be another two or three years perhaps. We are getting well down the coast now. It cost an awful lot of money. The place is terribly expensive to build roads in. But you only have to go to any settlement you like on the north side of Bonavista Bay to Lumsden where the people almost cried with joy when the road was

pushed through there, you only have to go to any one of the hundreds of places opened up by road to realize what it means to the people of that St. Barbe Coast to put roads down there so you can drive down, and then when you go down to come back so much prouder of Newfoundland than you were before, to see that superlatively beautiful coast, beautiful beyond words, breath-taking in its beauty. I have gone down there a number of times, and have flown down and up the coast quite low and have gone up and down by boat, but I have yet to drive. I want to go in a more leisurely fashion to see. I do not say that every last inch of it is beautiful but it is magnificent coast. We are opening it up. We will finish it, I hope, in the next two or three years. It will cost, I think, a couple or three millions yet to finish the road right on through to Flowers Cove and cut across to Cooks Harbour in the Strait and then across to White Bay at St. Anthony. But we are going to do it.

They need a telephone system down there. They need some harbour development. There must be a harbour somewhere on that coast. That is a Federal matter. There has to be some centralization. You can go to places in St. Barbe with two, three or four or five families and ten miles from another place. Well, Mr. Speaker, you cannot expect to have very much in a place as small as that. These people in these small places have got to be encouraged and assisted to move out of where they are into larger places.

It is a district of great contrast. It has Bonne Bay and Norris Point. Bonne Bay is so modern, so progressive, so beautiful and the people are so well informed and so well educated—Woody Point and Bonne Bay. There

is a contrast there between these places and some isolated places which is quite startling. I think it is going to be absolutely necessary that the people move out of some of these small places into some of the larger places of that district.

I think hospital extension is imperative. There has to be extension for the hospital facilities in that great district.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have gone clear around the Island. I started at Cape Chidley and came to Cape Race and over to Port aux Basques and up to the Straits of Belle Isle. You will see, if anybody has bothered to count, just the headings of the problems I have named in all these districts would come to hundreds and indeed into many thousands. Whether it be possible to solve all of them is a very difficult question to answer. To solve these problems will take a great many millions of dollars. You can put a figure on it—you can say fifty million, a hundred million or five hundred million—but it will all take a great many millions of dollars. Roads alone will take a hundred million dollars. I mean new money, new buildings not just a continuation of the maintenance in a greater or lesser degree of the roads we have by the construction of entirely new roads will take a hundred million dollars.

How much will it take, how many millions, to provide the electricity that is needed, how much will it take to provide the thoroughly modern telephonic and other types of communications without which we are still a backwoods province? How much will it take to foot the bill for the amount of centralization that is required? It is only when you examine these problems district by district—and there is

not a member in this House today, I suppose who does not feel that the problems of his district are far more pressing than those of the other districts. Every member feels that if he is worth his salt at all—if he does not feel that he is not worthy to represent the district which sent him here; every member must feel that the problems of his district should be the first to be attended to. Yet you have only to state these problems of all the districts for each individual member to realize that he cannot ever hope to get all the problems of his district solved. There just is not that much money. There just is not going to be that much money in the pockets of the Government of Newfoundland to enable us to foot the bills for the solution of all these problems. But—But—We have got to try. We have got to spend to the last dollar we can get. We have got to exert the last ounce of energy and enthusiasm together with all the skill that we can command—and above all—above all, Mr. Speaker, above everything else, let us sternly resist it, any impotunity, any sneer, any attack from St. John's, from Corner Brook, from any of the places that are a little more fortunate than many others, ninety per cent of the places of this Province, let us not be diverted, let us remember the little people who sent us here, let us see that to him that have it will not necessarily be given but rather to him that has not. Now that does not mean that St. John's is to get nothing. That is stupid and silly. That is not to say that Gander and Grand Falls and Bell Island and Corner Brook are to get nothing. That would be just stupid. But let us remember that first choice always must be for the little people in the little places. That is not contradictory. There is nothing contra-

dictory about that—the little people in the places who make up two-thirds of the whole population of Newfoundland, or well over half of it. Our first consideration must be to them because if not what are you doing? What are you doing if you don't do that? What is the alternative? Have you ever stopped to consider? Here is the alternative. Because a man is lucky enough to have come to Corner Brook and got a job in the mill or lucky enough for his father or grandfather to be lucky enough to have gone to Grand Falls and got a job in the mill or to Bell Island and got a job in the mines then his luck must be deliberately increased by us. In addition to having better and more clothes in addition to what he earns by having a chance to have a job that the man in the little place has not, in addition to that good fortune we are to pile on better schools for him are we? And build better roads for him, are we? I say no we are not. We are not. We are to give every living soul in Newfoundland, whether he lives in Corner Brook or Grand Falls or Bell Island or anywhere else, we are to give him the per capita amount that is his due as a Newfoundlander.

MR. BROWNE: You have not done it in the last eight years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We think we have.

MR. BROWNE: I think you have not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think we have given all Newfoundlanders so far as public monies are concerned per capita the same amount. Now we have given some more than that. Where you build a new road altogether you are giving more than the per capita amount, but we give to

Grand Falls for example and to Corner Brook in education the same as we give to the smallest little settlement per capita, and we give it on a denominational basis per capita or per child of school attendance age.

MR. BROWNE: Not in roads.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In education we are not justified in giving Corner Brook—I take Corner Brook as an example because it is a new town and a growing town, growing fast and their needs are very urgent and their needs are expressed to us very freely—So I take that as an example—We must give to Corner Brook at least what we give to any one else. But are we justified in giving more? Are we justified in taking from the public chest public monies and passing them over to Corner Brook, to give Corner Brook per capita more than we give to some little cove in Placentia Bay or Fortune Bay or anywhere else, per capita? Are we justified in giving more? We must give all Newfoundlanders the normal amount. We must do that. But we are not justified in adding to the good fortune of the people who are already more fortunate than others by virtue of the fact that they have good jobs and a chance to earn more money. Now the irony of that is this—and I am not unaware of it. There is a sociological law which says increasing prosperity breeds increasing discontent. It is a well-known sociological view—We can sum it up by saying “much wants more.” Increasing prosperity breeds increasing discontent. It is only we who have a good job earning good money with a big industry, when you feel security that you begin to demand the better scale than you had before and better than other people had and feel yourself worthy of it. But it is not fair to expect the people of Bumble Bee Bight to take less than their

share so that somebody else may get more. That is not fair. We cannot very well do that can we? Would we be honest and fair and square men if we did that?

MR. BROWNE: Who is suggesting that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I prefer not to answer that question. There is an unspoken suggestion of precisely that. The man who argues—for example—Where do you get most of your taxes? Is it not from there? Well, spend more there then, and manage that way. Because the fellow in the little settlement has less wages or job or no job therefore he is paying little taxes—To Hell with him! People working and making big money in big industry paying big taxes give them a better school. That argument is very frequently used. I am not accusing the Opposition and I am not even thinking of the Opposition because they are not using it. How could they? They are intelligent men—I am not talking about intelligent men.

Mr. Speaker, I move a recess for ten minutes.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, these problems that I have been outlining are some of the local problems in the different districts. Now these problems of Newfoundland fall under two broad headings. There is first the problems as they are found in the individual districts and in parts of the individual districts, in the coves and bays and so on. Then secondly there are the problems of Newfoundland as a whole, problems that are general in Newfoundland and apply not just to one part of the Province but to all

parts or at least to most parts of the Province, problems of a general category. We have a good many hundreds of such problems in Newfoundland today. I will cite just a few of them, just a few of the serious, important, province-wide problems, problems of a general category.

First there is the revision of the financial terms of Confederation. I put this one first because upon the solution of that problem so much else depends. We talk of spending millions for this and millions for that and millions for the other thing, and yet while I was doing that the Honourable and learned member for St. John's South interrupted and said "where are you going to get all these millions." I told him not to worry about that—meaning to say we will get the money alright. I believe we will get the money. But there are three sources of money with which to do all these things (1) what we get from the people in taxes, from the people of the Province (2) what we get by the sale of our bonds, in other words by adding to our public debt and (3) is what we hope and expect to get as a result of the work and the recommendations of the Royal Commission which was recently appointed to review the financial terms of Union. We have done a great part of our work—Our own local, Newfoundland Royal Commission for three years has worked and worked very hard in the preparation of Newfoundland's case. Now they in turn have retained such people as Karl Goldenberg and Professor Keirstead and a number of other very eminent economists and experts of one kind and another to do specialized types of work of research for them. I am not a lawyer but I have examined very carefully the report of the Royal Commission and it seems to me to be a very wonderful piece of work indeed.

I think that we will go before the Royal Commission thoroughly and well prepared to state and to argue Newfoundland's case for a very considerable upward revision in the financial terms. Now if we succeed—and I do not see why we won't—I just frankly don't—I frankly cannot see why we will not be successful—then we will get very large—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Premier a question on that—when he speaks of the upward revision of the terms he is not gathering, he has not read that into Term 29—The transitional grant was a disappearing grant and will disappear in another three years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman states his facts alright, but I do not see what inference he asks me to draw from it.

MR. BROWNE: The grant we have now is a disappearing grant. It was six millions to start and is disappearing by eight hundred thousand a year and at the end of twelve years will have disappeared. Was it ever intended the six millions or any particular figure should be the basis from which the elevation would be?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not at all. The terms says that—one term of the terms says that for the first twelve years of union there will be a transitional grant of so much a year, so much for the first three years and so much less than that each year. Therefore after the end of twelve years it ends—One term says that—But Term 29, the very next one, says that within eight years—not twelve years but eight—there will be this financial review to find out what effect confederation has had upon finances of the Province and to recommend the form and scale of additional financial assistance if any

is required. Well there is no question about it—"if any"—they had to say that—To enable the Government of the Province to continue (not to maintain but to continue) the public services at the level and standards reached without imposing taxation, having regard to the capacity to pay, more burdensome than that obtaining in the three neighbouring provinces.

Now that is the term on which we base our hopes. The work has been done and now we have to present that work to the Royal Commission. We have very great confidence—When I say "we" I mean the members of the Royal Commission and the members of the Government—the members of our own Newfoundland Royal Commission—

MR. BROWNE: That is not a Royal Commission.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, a Royal Commission. There are two Royal Commissions. One has just completed and will hand me their final report in a matter of days, I think two or three days from now, whereupon the Royal Commission as such ceases to be, in the meanwhile the Federal Royal Commission has been appointed and will shortly go to work. Now I am very, very confident of the outcome of that Royal Commission. As a result of that outcome I think we will be in a position to spend very large sums of money that we are not now in a position to spend. That is a problem—That is a man-sized problem. That is a problem upon the outcome of which so many other things depend here in Newfoundland.

Here is another problem, Mr. Speaker, which affects the very future of this Province; the teacher shortage—The teacher shortage and not only the shortage of teachers of any kind but

then in addition to that another problem, the problem of raising the standards and levels of teaching in the teachers we have got. First we must get many, many more teachers than we have got. That is a problem, that is a huge problem. That is not a problem that can be solved easily. It is not a problem so easily and quickly solved as merely to increase the rate of pay for teachers. Then in addition to that there is the problem of raising appreciably the standards and levels of the teachers we do have.

Another problem that is crying out for solution today is the future of NALCO, NALCO is a corporation which was created by this House, by this Legislature at the invitation of the Government, and it was ceded the right to explore a large area of Newfoundland and Labrador and to develop anything they might find in that concession worth developing, and to cede to sub-concessionaires all or part of their rights. Now that corporation is presently not functioning too well. It lacks leadership. The question of its future is a very great problem that we must solve and solve quickly.

Another problem of very great importance in Newfoundland today is the problem of making the new industries profitable and successful. Now that is not a problem that affects every one of the new industries. Some of them are operating quite successfully and quite profitably and do not call for any worry or very much concern on our part. That is the case with some of them. With some others of them we are worried about their prospects, and we are presently having their affairs, their affairs, their prospects carefully analyzed by a very able firm, the firm of Arthur D. Little Incorporated of Boston.

Another very great problem in Newfoundland is the problem of housing.

There is never a day when I don't have several people come to me, men and women and sometimes a man and wife and children all come to see me in a body—living in one room or living in three rooms or in a house that is leaky or the place they have they got to get out of. Yet very often, in a great many cases, the father of the family has a job with very good pay and can afford a house but cannot get one—There just is not one to get. This is a terrific problem. I have no doubt every member in this House who lives in the City here is confronted by the same kind of interview from many, many people. I would say we need in Newfoundland today probably ten thousand new houses. Incidentally I don't know of any economic activity that can be carried on that has such an instantaneous good effect upon the economy as the building of homes. It is not only, you see, the carpenters who get jobs and the plasterers and electricians and bricklayers and labourers and plumbers, not only these men who get the jobs—and they get jobs, lots of them, but the firms that sell and handle the material and equipment going into these homes and the mills, cement mills and gypsum plants and the rest of them that provide material, and truckmen and trains and boats—The ramifications of house building reaches out perhaps further within the economy of any given province than does those of any given economic activity. If you could get started in Newfoundland today the construction of ten thousand new houses it would produce an economic boom the like of which we never had. That is an enormous amount, but we need at least ten thousand houses in Newfoundland today.

Then there is this problem which is perhaps the biggest single problem we have in Newfoundland, the problem

of centralization. I never tire of talking about it. We have perhaps twelve hundred places in Newfoundland today. We should have about ten per cent of that number. If we had one hundred and twenty it would be plenty—but we have not—we have twelve hundred and our population of four hundred and twenty-five thousand people is split into twelve hundred places. Now it is worse than that because if you take out of the four hundred and twenty-five thousand people the people of St. John's, Bell Island, Grand Falls, Gander, Deer Lake, Corner Brook, Stephenville, Port aux Basques, if you were to take these people out of the four hundred and twenty-five thousand and take another fifty places, the best and biggest, what have you left? What you have left is about a thousand places with a population running anywhere from two to three families up to fifteen or twenty families. You have a thousand places like that—You have a thousand places not one of which has a population of more than say a hundred and fifty or a hundred and seventy-five men, women and children. Now that is an impossible position—It is impossible—You cannot do anything with Newfoundland so long as that continues that way. You cannot do it. It is just impossible—You just cannot do anything with Newfoundland—It is too expensive—We are too scattered—Our efforts have to be spread out, an awful lot of money goes a little way by the time it is spread so thin. We have not got enough to show for our money we spend, and a lot that is spent is just money down the drain—just good money down the drain—just good money after bad—It is just lost—It is gone into a bottomless pit—There is no end to it—You never see an end to it. You have no hope that these thousand settlements in ten years or twenty

years will have instead of an average population of a hundred and fifty should have five or six or eight hundred—If you had that hope you could grin and bear it, and could go to the wicked, the enormous expense of keeping up public services to these thousand little places, because you feel it is an investment in the future. These places are not always going to be small, you could say—But we know they are going to be ten and twenty years from now still small. What are we going to do for the next ten years? Are we going to just continue this uneven, hopeless fight that has no prospect of success in it, or just spending endlessly on these many hundreds of small places. Now you either have to do that, precisely that or else, or else, work up some great programme of relocation, or as we have been calling it "Centralization." But I warn the House it is going to cost money, an awful lot of money. I do not see anything less than a thousand dollars a family is going to do very much. We have been spending up to four hundred dollars a family and the result all of the people have left some of the islands not too many, not too many, and it is only scratching the surface—Four hundred dollars is just not enough and perhaps even a thousand dollars is not quite enough—and that runs into money if you move twenty-five thousand people at a thousand dollars a family, or twenty-five thousand families at a thousand dollars a family, that is twenty-five million dollars. So that I warn the House that the cost of centralization is enormous, but it is a capital sum, once it is done it is done. But we go on endlessly finding money for the same people to serve them in the same little settlements, with never an end to it. At the end of twenty years we start another twenty because there is no hope of an ultim-

ate solution. There is a problem, Mr. Speaker, to which we have got to apply our minds and our energies and to which we must find a solution because failure to solve that problem, mark my word, failure to solve that, means that every member of this House five years from now will go out of the House, go out to elections discontented inside him, every member of the House will feel that we are not really getting anywhere, only scratching the surface—that is the feeling we will all have the feeling of futility, of not getting anywhere, who have not left Newfoundland really better than we found it, or at least better than we found it because we put sticking plaster on here and there, but had not really tackled the basic problem which is the problem of isolation. We got to solve it! We're going to!

Now another problem in Newfoundland today—If you are fifty years of age or say fifty-five years of age you cannot get a job, nobody will give you a job today, at fifty-five years of age. Now when wages were fifteen cents and twelve cents an hour a man of fifty-five or fifty-eight or sixty in the outports could get a job if there was one to get. I mean, at that rate of pay they were not so particular about a man's age. But today at eighty cents or seventy cents or a dollar or a dollar and twenty cents and in some cases a dollar seventy an hour, when the wage rate goes up the man so young that they can waste it, overflowing with energy—You see they do not want the slower moving man in his fifties. So that the result is in Newfoundland today, unlike twenty or twenty-five years ago, a man when he gets up in his fifties is getting ready for the scrap heap, nobody wants him any more unless he is intellectual—Now he is a bookkeeper he goes right on working at fifty as well as at forty and as well

at sixty as at fifty—that applies to sedentary work, sitting at a desk, but when he is on a construction job or a mine or in a factory they do not want men in their fifties any more. What are we going to do? Put them out, shoot them? Take them out and smother them? What are we going to do? Now a Government has to answer that question, do you see—That is not a rhetorical question—We face that every day of our lives. I face it every day of my life in my office—and I have not any doubt that other members face the same problem of men coming in from Bonavista North and indeed from all districts of Newfoundland even districts represented by gentlemen on the opposite side come to me and look for jobs—"Can you get me a job?" Well now, Mr. Speaker, when a man comes in to another man and asks if he can get him a job in effect he is saying can you get me food for my wife and children because I can't—Can you get me food for myself because I can't. Can you get me a chance to earn food and clothing to keep my family together—Can you get me that chance—That is what he is asking can you do unless he already has a job when he asks for a job—He is treating you as though you were "God." He almost approaches you as if you were the Life Giver—You are the work giver—you are the Life Giver because without work you cannot live.—

Newfoundland today has thousands of men for whom there never will be a job—Just think of that—There is no job for them—It is not in the cards—There are thousands of them that never again as long as they live may get a job—Oh a week somewhere patching someone's house or painting—but there is no work for them—thousands in Newfoundland today. Now what are we going to do about that? We

got to do something! If you cannot find work for them you got to find a pension—You cannot in a Christian country just let them die—You cannot do it—it is a problem here—It is as alive as any problem is alive in Newfoundland today—We got to face it—every day of their lives they are facing it—The gentlemen opposite us are facing it every day as we are, they get the tap on their doors as we do. We have to find a solution.

The Honourable Minister of Welfare is pressing home to us that we must build a Geriatric building, a place where you can provide a home for the old gentleman who has no wife, no sons, no daughters, no family or the old lady—If you do not find them a home nobody else does. In a Christian country you cannot let them wander the streets. Do you realise the extent of that problem? Do you know that right now we are paying the board of fourteen hundred like that here in Newfoundland, old people with no home—as Newfoundland gets into this modern development, this new civilization we are living in, the problem seems to get worse. What used to happen to people like that twenty or forty years ago? In Newfoundland in every harbour there is so many like that, in every settlement and every cove there were one or two or three old people with no family left and they were alone in the world—They come to the Government, nobody else—The Church is not able to take care of them, apparently the families, the homes, the lodges, the societies, the fraternities they may give them a little help, a little advice, a little Christmas gift.

MR. BROWNE: The Catholic Church just built a home.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes—That is just scratching the surface—How many can go into the home—a hundred and

eighty—out of thousands—I am not condemning it—Obviously it is only scratching the surface—If we had ten like that we would still be scratching the surface, ten magnificent homes like that we would still be scratching the surface—Geriatric care, the care of old people without friends or families—

I will tell you another problem, Mr. Speaker, that is enough to make a Government worry, if they are self-respecting and conscientious—That problem—There are fifty thousand men in Newfoundland today with no trade, no profession, no special skill that is saleable, no skill that anybody wants, fifty thousand men—They come in and say—"Mr. Smallwood, can you get me a job, Sir?" "What kind of job?" "Anything, Sir." "Well, have you got a trade?" "No, Sir." "Are you a carpenter?" "No, Sir." "Can you drive a truck or anything like that?" "No." "Well, can you paint or anything like that?" No, Sir.—"Well, what can you do?"—"Nothing just work." He has strength in his arm that is all—no skills—no trade—no profession—fifty thousand like that in Newfoundland today. Now when there are so many jobs going on, you see, we got to have labourers so long as labour is part of the job, which is the smallest part of it—Put up a ten million dollar building today and the men who get the jobs will be the electricians, the plumbers and bricklayers and plasterers and carpenters and finished carpenters, as for labourers, just a handful of them.

MR. BROWNE: Don't you think that figure of fifty thousand is an exaggeration?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the labour force in Newfoundland?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I suppose it would be one hundred and fifty thousand men.

MR. HOLETT: One-third cannot get jobs?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't say that—They are unskilled. They have no trade—Therefore I say it is a positive duty of the Government to do something about that.

Now what can be done? There is only one thing I know, vocational schools. The tragedy is that the young fellow who when he is sixteen or seventeen comes out of school or at fifteen say with Grade VIII or IX—Now that is the crucial moment in his whole life and in the lives of his wife and children which will be affected by what happens in the next year or two. Think of the number that pour out of the schools every year in St. John's alone, with Grade VIII and IX and Grade X and Grade XI—Now what happens to them next year? If they strike a job as a labourer and get ninety cents or a dollar an hour it is probably their ruination forever. Because they stick at that until they are too old, twenty-one, twenty-two or twenty-three and are probably married and too old to learn a trade. But if they came out of school and go into a trade, go to vocational school and learn a trade, all the skills that can be learned, diesel engineering, brick laying, plastering, carpentering, electricians, Heavens only know what the things are today there are to learn. If they can do that then they can get a job, maybe not straight off as a diesel engineer but as diesel engineers' helpers and plasterers' helpers or bricklayers' helpers and gradually work into it. Otherwise if they go to work as labourers they will be labourers ten or twenty years later and it will affect

them and their families and all Newfoundland as long as they live. It is a terrific problem which has to be faced. We are trying to face it but there is not enough money to do all we would like in that field—but it is a tremendous problem.

The drinking problem is ever before us. There is never a day passes but that problem is before us. People are drinking too much, there is no doubt about that. We do not have to be temperance fanatics nor prohibitionists we have just to have eyes open and be ordinarily observant to see people are drinking too much. There is too much drinking going on. Now as far as I understand—I am told and read that for the overwhelming majority of people there is very little if any danger of their becoming alcoholics. The average person may drink too much but still don't become an alcoholic. But a certain small percentage of people are chemically, in the make-up of their bodies, in their temperament cannot drink without becoming alcoholics. They cannot drink at all without drinking a lot. I do not think we should base our argument on this small number but rather our policy should be shaped to serve the general interest of the mass of the people. It is the mass of the people I am talking about. Too much drinking is going on amongst them—too much drinking. Now I do not want to talk like a reformer nor like a fanatic because I am no fanatic in the matter. But I do think seriously there is too much drinking going on. The danger is very great and the least the societies, the churches, the Government, the school, the parents can do is to warn every young man and every young woman that while drinking may be alright, social drinking, conviviality, may be alright nevertheless there is peril in it, there is danger in it—"Do not go

into this thing blindly. There is danger. You may be one of the persons who can take a drink throughout your entire life and never be affected by it, but you may be one of the small number who once takes a drink and ends up a drunkard." They are at least entitled to know that.

What to do about this liquor question quite frankly I don't know—I do not know! I cannot find anyone to tell me. I find people to tell me to do away with it completely. I do not take that seriously. I do not think it should be taken seriously. You cannot do away with it. They drink shoe-shine and shellac and melt down rubber collars. They will get alcohol—sure they will.

MR. HOLLETT: Only the alcoholics do that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not only the alcoholics. The minute you say you are not to have it, you are not allowed, people will go through their collars to get it who would not ever think of it — they will melt their collars to get it.

Do you know that we have in Newfoundland while we are talking now something between five thousand and six thousand children who are handicapped, that is to say they are blind or they are nearly blind or they are deaf or they are nearly deaf or dumb or they are so badly crippled or their mentality is so retarded that they are not normal children with a normal chance in life, between five and six thousand of them. Now it is perfectly true that some of them can be well taken care of by their own parents who are the best people to take care of them if and when they can—but if they don't or can't who will? Again the answer, I am afraid is the Government.

The problem of the farmers — my honourable friend from Harbour Main, like myself, because he is into it up to his neck and because he is interested in it for other reasons and others of us here who are very much interested in farming in the problem of enabling a few thousand men with families in the farming to make a living out of it — It is a big problem—a big problem! It is a problem which some members may not take seriously, is the conservation of what salmon we have left in Newfoundland. Now I have a son who is a bit of a fanatic on that. I believe he lives and works primarily so that he can have a half day or so that he can go salmon fishing—I think that is his chief aim and ambition in life, to go salmon fishing or trout fishing—If ever I am in danger of forgetting the danger of lack of salmon and trout conservation I have someone at home to drive it home to me. I would say we are up against this danger now—I have been talking with Lee Wolfe and others—I would say we are now in danger that in ten years from now just ten years there won't be any salmon in any rivers in Newfoundland—ten years. What will the government do about that? Will we be cowardly about it? Will we be afraid of public opinion or will we take the bull by the horns and do what has to be done. I will ask the question in another form on another occasion—But we have to face that problem—Will we sit by and be cowards in the future years, so cowardly we see what is going on and will not lift a finger to stop it because we are afraid of public opinion?

Conservation of partridges, conservation of rabbits—These are four great natural resources that God gave us. Are we going to be so stupid as to allow them to disappear from the face of the earth, so far as Newfoundland is

concerned? That is a problem we have to solve, to which we have to find the answer. I hope we will find a manly one.

A problem that should give us sleepless nights, disease has begun to appear in our timber, in our forests. I think in my honourable friend's district the woody aphids have attacked on the west coast of Newfoundland. Does the House realize how serious that is. Stop for a moment and dwell on that and see what it might mean to Newfoundland and the Paper industry if that problem is not tackled and solved.

A thing which interests my honourable friend, the Minister of Education, the pollution of lakes and ponds and rivers by what we call summer settlement people building summer cottages and homes in the country, for the summertime, and polluting the lakes and ponds and streams.

The question of absentee or what I sometimes call "lost" landlords—Absentee and lost landlords, landlords who are not only absent from Newfoundland and live in England or somewhere in the world, but at least we know where they are, but landlords who are lost and we do not know where they are and yet own large portions of land here in Newfoundland which is badly needed and out to be reclaimed and bought back into use by the public — A problem—

The problems of schools, of education in Newfoundland—Mr. Speaker we might as well face that if we don't provide good education in Newfoundland then we have failed as a province, electrification, development of municipal Government, these are problems. The problem of fishery affecting twenty-one of our thirty-five districts, twenty-one of them — The

problem of agricultural development affecting sixteen of our thirty-five constituencies.

I think I have said enough, Mr. Speaker, to indicate, if we did not realize it before, something at least of the number and nature and complexity of our problems in Newfoundland. It is my own personal ambition to be associated with a solution of them—My ambition does not fly so high as to make me think I will be associated with the solution of them all. I am afraid there will be some problems left for solution after I am gone and someone else will take on after I leave off.

MR. HIGGINS: Forty years from now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No I won't say forty years from now—Maybe I would take the "O" out of that. But the point is that they got to be faced and in the course of time they have got to be solved.

Now my conclusion, and I am afraid because of the time I will have to drop a number of points I intended making—They are all important points and I am disappointed I have to drop them for this reason; I was hoping in one speech I could at least indicate, name, all the problems of Newfoundland. This is the first time it has ever been done—It has never been done before—

MR. HOLLETT: We have another day on Monday.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. I want to finish now—I want to say, in general our problem in Newfoundland and our aim should be to wipe out illiteracy completely and not have one illiterate man nor woman left, and to raise the standard and the level of popular education; to wipe out tuber-

culosis and to wipe out completely other communicable diseases, and to raise the level of the health of all of our people; to raise the level of housing; to build roads and schools and hospitals and electric systems and water and sewerage and hotels and playgrounds and parks and libraries, yes, and museums and art galleries and to have more doctors and more dentists and more nurses and more opticians; to build the public services, to make Newfoundland more attractive, to make Newfoundland more interesting especially to our young people so that they will stay here and have the excitement and have the satisfaction of growing with their homeland and of making their homeland grow—For above all things Newfoundland needs the idealism and the impatience and the dissatisfaction, the divine discontent and the drive, the irresistible drive of her young men and her young women. I suggest to you if you can't and don't make Newfoundland a place of some excitement of some interest of some attractiveness for young men and young women they will get the excitement, they will find the attractiveness elsewhere and we will lose them and in losing them we will lose more than our mines and our forest or our waterpower, if they could be lost. We will be losing the main ingredient of true prosperity in Newfoundland. So, when I indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, something of these Newfoundland problems that must be faced and must be overcome I throw out the challenge to the young men of Newfoundland that they must throw themselves into this, young men who are here in this House and the young men who are not here, the challenge is to them to build a Newfoundland that will be a star in the Imperial Crown, that will be a Province in the Canadian family that can hold its head erect and look

all Canada and look all the world straight in the face.

(Applause).

Motion that the Report of the Committee Appointed to Draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne be received and adopted, carried.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday next, at 3:00 of the clock.

MONDAY, April 29th, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Supply): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition on behalf of the citizens of Norman's Cove and Long Cove in Trinity Bay South.

The petitioners pray that they may be given the advantages of electricity by extension of the power from some eight or ten miles drive from their vicinity. I might point out also that some ninety per cent of their citizens are eager and willing to take advantage of the services when and if they be extended, and I pray they may be extended sometime during this year.

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petitioners and ask that the petition be tabled and referred to the Department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for reference to the Department to which it relates.

**Presenting Reports of Standing
and Select Committees**

None.

Notices 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 to Amend the Legislative Disabilities Act."

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

Notice of Questions

Notice of Questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Browne.

Answers to Questions

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, with regard to Question No. 84 I would refer the honourable member for St. John's West to the answer to Question No. 15.

QUESTION No. 85:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I might ask that the question be allowed to stand until tomorrow.

QUESTION No. 86:

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, that answer is still in the course of preparation.

Orders of the Day

HON. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in view of the absence of the Premier I wonder if I might ask the Honourable the Attorney General a question relative to the item in the "Daily News" this morning referring to a series of secret meetings between the Newfoundland Government, North American Steel Companies and Newfoundland Labra-

tor Corporation—I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney General would have some statement to make on that matter at the present time?

MR. CURTIS: No, Mr. Speaker. The only statement I have to make at the present time is that the annual meeting of NALCO takes place tomorrow and for that purpose Mr. Doyle is here and Mr. McIntosh is, I believe, due today. I might say that Mr. Doyle has with him certain professional men in order to discuss with the Government the whole Javelin proposition.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder could I ask the Honourable the Attorney General if he would inform the House of the purpose of the visit of the Premier and a large group of other officials to Bay D'Espoir, which has been announced over the radio as taking place this afternoon—Could he tell us if it has any connection with the national harbour project or industries, or for what purpose they are going up there?

MR. CURTIS: I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, the Premier himself will make a statement tomorrow on that matter—my understanding is that it will be a general visit to discuss the question of water power.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister of Highways if he would tell the House whether a statement attributed to the Honourable member for Bell Island, which appeared in a recent issue of the "Evening Telegram" which quoted the Premier as having said there would be no paving in Newfoundland this year.

MR. POWER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say this—In preparation for the paving programme we had in mind we would have to have talks with the

oil companies and have them erect tanks for strategic places in Newfoundland and we would also have to have arrangements with the Canadian National Railway to distribute these to the nearest point on the railway where the job is being performed. This arrangement cannot be made in time to pave this year because the only paving that can be done, I understand, is for about six weeks in the summer season. So that there may be a little paving done on old systems using the mix imported in the drums. Incidentally we must pay six dollars for each of the drums, and the drum is useless after taking the mix out, so that is not the most economical means to pave. If it were left to my decision I would say, leave the paving to next year and it would be done much more economically and much more efficiently.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask a further question—The Canadian National Railway has no lines on Bell Island and the arguments used there would not apply to Bell Island—Would there be any paving on Bell Island?

MR. POWER: If there is any paving on Bell Island it will be done under the old system of the mix in drums—It is very expensive, and I suggest right now, if there is paving done there it will be a small amount.

MR. BROWNE: Very little?

MR. POWER: Yes—It would not be wise to spend probably fifty per cent more for paving this year when by just waiting one year and set it up and do it properly, as they do it on the Mainland.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I take it there will not be any paving done in Newfoundland, this year unless we get this system in, and I don't think you will.

MR. POWER: I do not think there is time enough left.

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

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

On motion a Bill, "An Act to Provide Assistance for Teachers By Way of Loans for Certain Purposes" read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

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

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill the purpose of which is to amend the Public Utilities Act, which was an Act that was introduced, as some of my honourable friends will be aware, in 1949 and also brought forward to the consolidated statutes and is there as Chapter 249, Section 69, sub-section 8. Section 69, sub-section 8 of the Public Utilities Act provides that if any public utility company (that would be an electric company; Newfoundland Light and Power; Avalon Telephone Company; United Towns Electric, any of these companies) should increase their capital and that increase amounted to more than fifty per cent of their existing capital that the shares so offered for sale must be offered in the first instance to the existing shareholders in proportion to their holdings. If they wish to increase their capital they must do it in this manner. Now I can quite un-

derstand, Mr. Speaker, why the memorandum of articles of a company might well want to protect their existing shareholders by giving them the first right to buy their own shares or any additional shares that are offered. But I am unable to understand why it is that the Public Utilities Act should require this. It seems to me that it is a matter for each individual company and that each individual company should protect itself or its shareholders if it wishes to in its memorandum of articles of association.

We copied this Act in 1949 when we brought it in from, I believe, the Nova Scotia Act. I find the Nova Scotia Act today is as our Act is—In other words that any shares offering over fifty per cent must, under the Public Utilities Act, be offered to existing shareholders.

We have been asked, Mr. Speaker, to amend this section as it appears. I have a letter, Mr. Speaker, from Mr. Morris the General Manager of both United Towns Electric Company and Avalon Telephone Company, and Mr. Morris pointed out his companies have made arrangements to get some money on the Mainland for investment in Newfoundland, in one or the other of these two companies. But in order to get this money they have to issue certain share warrants to offer to the investors so that the investors can participate in a larger way than by merely getting interest on their money. I understand they propose to sell an issue of five and a half per cent bonds, giving at least five hundred dollars worth a share warrant, entitling the purchaser to buy at eight dollars a share. It is quite impossible, Mr. Speaker, for the company to do that under this section of the Public Utilities Act. So that the object of this amendment is to enable the Board of

Public Utilities to waive this section should it in their opinion be advisable so to do. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this Bill does not repeal that section. It just enables the Public Utilities Commission in a proper case to allow it to be ineffective.

I do not think I need say more except I would be asking when we have passed the second reading of this Bill if I could have the unanimous consent of the House to have it committed this afternoon and put through all stages because I understand if this legislation is not put through today there may be considerable delay in raising this money, in fact it may interfere with this prospective expenditure in Newfoundland. I am sure we are all anxious to have as much money as we can expended here during the present season.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the principle of this Bill proposed by the Honourable the Attorney General because I believe in so passing this legislation we will enhance the improvements in the various public utilities under the control of these companies. Generally perhaps it is not wise perhaps to allow the issuing of such kinds of stock whereby you get shares awarded to you—We have heard of some of these things, I believe, out in Western Canada, we hear of some shareholders making piles of money off stocks—I was not referring to anything in particular—My colleague mentions the pipe line—In any case we don't anticipate anything such as that here in Newfoundland in connection with this particular company or any particular utility. We believe that this money is absolutely urgent for necessary improvements for necessary facilities for our people in connection with telephones and so on. So

we certainly support the principle of this Bill, and I do so now, Sir.

MR. BROWNE Mr. Speaker, there is only one question which occurs to my mind. Perhaps the Attorney General may be able to answer it when he closes the debate. That is the question why the company concerned has left it so late before bringing in this application to the House of Assembly for this measure. There is not very much time to study it. It seems to me that should have been known weeks ago when the House first sat so that we could have had more time to consider it. However I do not know of any objections nor why there could be any objection to this measure. In any case the matter is still under control of the Public Utilities Board according to the way the section is framed.

MR. CURTIS: I will say, Mr. Speaker, in reply to my honourable friend, any intimation that the matter was urgent only came to me last week. In fact the legislation has been in my department for a couple of weeks, not as long as it usually should be before it goes through. But we had no intimation that the matter was urgent. But it appears that under the Ontario Securities Law any bonds offering must be made and accompanied by a balance sheet that is less than four months old. I understand that they have produced a balance sheet in this case but the balance sheet will be four months old tomorrow, and if they don't get this through today they will have to make a new balance sheet and that will involve a very considerable delay and may hold up the issue—But that matter, Mr. Speaker, was not brought to the attention of the Government until late last week.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Bill. With the unanimous con-

sent of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the unanimous consent in view of what I have said and move that this Bill be now read a second time and ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House now together with Items No. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7.

On motion Bill read a second time.

By leave of the House Bill ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House now.

On motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

On motion the House went into Committee of the Whole on various Bills.

Mr. Clarke Chairman of Committee.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act."

Motion that the committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting Notaries Public."

MR. CHAIRMAN: We were discussing section 7.

On motion section 7 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Before we carry Section 8, does that include people appointed Notaries Public for the Dominion of Newfoundland?

MR. CURTIS: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you!

On motion Clause 8 carried.

Clause 9 read:

9—(1) Every notary public shall provide himself with a seal which shall

be of metal and on which shall be engraved his name and the words "Notary Public" and "Newfoundland."

(2) A notary public shall affix his seal to every document which he signs in that capacity, and shall write or print on the document the words "My appointment has not been revoked" near his seal and signature.

(3) A notary public who fails to comply with subsection (1) or (2) is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding ten dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: I see no reason for that. I suggest that might be deleted.

MR. CURTIS: Let us wipe out (2) and amend (3) and it will then comply with subsection (1) Amend subsection (2) by striking out all the words following the word "capacity." (2) a notary public shall affix his seal to every document which he signs in that capacity.

On motion clause 9 as amended carried.

Clause 10 read:

10—Notaries public may demand and receive for their services the following fees:

Taking acknowledgment or proof of deeds or instruments for registry50
Noting protest relating to ship, vessel or cargo	\$5.00
Drawing a protest, per folio50
Each necessary copy of a protest20
Notarial certificate	1.00
Presentment and noting of Bill of exchange or promissory note for non-acceptance or non-payment	2.00

Protest of Bill of exchange or note when made, including presentment, noting and notice

5.00

MR. HIGGINS: Has that been increased?

MR. CURTIS: There have been no fees—nobody knows. I think we can accept these fees.

Clause 10 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman "Each necessary copy of a protest .20". Does that seem sufficient. Making a copy sometimes entails a lot of work.

MR. CURTIS: Let the Bill go through and I will hold up third reading to see if that has been considered.

On motion Clause 11 read:—Carried.

Motion, that the committee report having passed this Bill with some amendment carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the St. John's Fire Department Act."

Motion that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Bulk Sales Act, 1955."

Motion that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the St. John's Housing Corporation Act."

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I have a little objection there to subsection 6 of section 30: I feel that the City of St. John's or any other city charges a man for putting in water and sewerage and that sort of thing gets paid for it and turns out later

that the said city made some defect in workmanship—I feel that the city like any other individual must be liable for bad workmanship. Now I have seen cases in the neighbourhood in which I live where the pipes leading from the main into the dwellings have broken no less than on three different occasions. The work was done in each case by the City of St. John's. I do not know who paid it. I take it in this particular instance probably the city did pay. But this proposes to absolve the city from all liability for any defective workmanship, I think that particular subsection should be stricken out altogether.

MR. HIGGINS: Strike it out and the city won't take it.

MR. CURTIS: I agree. But the city won't take it.

MR. HIGGINS: It is very rarely, publicly at least, I find myself at odds with the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition—But as I understand this particular legislation the Housing Corporation proposes to pass over to the city the installation in that area which were constructed some years ago. The City of St. John's has already been (and I think my honourable friend from St. John's North will bear me out) has already had the unhappy experience of taking over installations without having some protection and it cost the city considerable sums of money to repair such installations for various reasons they were not adequately constructed. Sir, it would be unfair to expect the City of St. John's to assume responsibility for installations in which it had no part at all in the original work. I think I can say, and my honourable friend from St. John's North will, I think, support me in this, unless (and as a famous gentleman said) unless and until some such assurance is given that the city

won't buy anybody's baby on these terms.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I would support the honourable member for St. John's East—There is not only faulty workmanship and poor material in many cases but poor engineering in some parts of the Housing Corporation and badly laid out underground. These things we have to take over—In the original debate I ask in connection with faulty workmanship or bad engineering whose fault it will be? The Housing Authority refuses to take any blame, and the City of St. John's considers it an "Act of God." I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the City of St. John's will have it repaired whoever pays for it.

MR. CURTIS: I must say I was a bit dubious about this clause. Honourable members will remember when second reading came up I drew attention of the House to it. On the other hand on thinking over the matter since the situation is a bit complicated, or it is not really complicated but very, very simple. Here we are asking the City Council to take over this installation lock, stock and barrel. The Housing Corporation and in fact everybody wants the City Council to control this, which is now part of the city, but they actually don't own it the tunnel and they refuse to take it. The council refuses to accept the ownership although it is given to them as a gift. It is true it is a kind of gift you got to watch, fearing you will get bitten, but we are giving it as a gift, this installation which cost the Housing Corporation a very considerable amount of money. Now the question arises if anything happens that there should be a claim to whom should an injured party go to look for compensation. Well the

city council says "we are not going to accept liability. We did not build it. We are only taking it provided you protect us." On the other hand the Housing Corporation says: "We will give it but having lost control how are we going to know who is responsible or not." So you are stuck between the position of the two people neither of whom will accept liability, and I doubt if there would be any liability anyway, I think the service is there now many, many years, and I doubt if anybody could prove successfully any action against either the Housing Corporation or the Council or anybody. The Council was only liable as far as Housing Corporation. In fact at the time they built they owned quite a considerable portion of the Housing Corporation. The Government had to take over the corporation. We have bought out the City Council, and why should we take all the responsibility for it. The Government long ago paid off the City Council.

So, Mr. Chairman, really I see no alternative but to agree to this suggestion. I hate to see my honourable friends opposite fight over this matter. However if they do like to fight we would be glad to watch them. However I really see no alternative but to adopt that section. Otherwise the situation is a bit difficult. The Housing Corporation still owns it and the City Council are still running it, and I do not think the situation is going to be worsened in any way by passing this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, it is all very well to say that. The Housing Corporation want to get out of it as they are throwing themselves at the City Council and the City Council says we won't take all that unless you

give it to us without any liability whatsoever. So in this clause you leave the citizens carrying the bag, so to speak, the voters of St. John's have to take responsibility for any bad workmanship on behalf of the people who constructed these sewers. I think it is highly unfair. I think if it can be proven there was bad workmanship the Housing Corporation is liable, and if the Housing Corporation is passed over to the City Council the City Council must take on that liability. That seems to me to be straight justice, and I do not see how this House could pass such a section as that. It amazes me it is put in there, leaving the citizens holding the bag. You cannot do a thing like that, Mr. Speaker, and get away with it, not in this day and generation. I can quite understand my councillor friends, one on this side and one on the other should favour it—anything to save a dollar they are happy about it. I think we should take a longer view and look at it from the point of view of the citizen. I know of one person that on three different occasions had the sewer pipe between the house and the main blow up in his face—and they had to pay the damages as far as I know.

MR. CURTIS: You are not sure of that?

MR. HOLLETT: I am not quite sure, but would think they would have to pay it.

MR. CURTIS: I think it only covers the original installations.

MR. BROWNE: Look at Clause (1) "which hereafter may be constructed"—Under Clause (1) there of Section 30. It says not only all the existing installations but all which hereinafter may be constructed. It says neither the

City nor the Corporation shall in any way become liable.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I might say the City of St. John's will never do a bad job after the Council over any work. From now on it will be good, I guarantee that. There is no doubt it cost the City a lot of money for this new servicing through the valley. It is very poorly designed and the sewerage breaking up costing the City of St. John's thousands of dollars.

MR. CURTIS: I do not think the honourable and learned member for St. John's South is right—In fact we seldom agree—If you look up the fourth line of subsection 6 "neither the City of St. John's nor the Corporation shall become liable anyway by reason of any defect by and on behalf of the Corporation, "Surely if the City does something it will not be done by and on behalf of the Corporation now.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, referring to the original statement by the Leader of the Opposition this leaves the thing in the air. Suppose after this Bill becomes law some main bursts on one of the streets. Well, I know that the Corporation won't bother about it—The City, as the honourable member for St. John's North has said, will have to pay for it. I do not see how this section will exonerate them from responsibility. If a main breaks they have to repair it.

MR. HIGGINS: But installations to houses.

MR. BROWNE: These are not installations to houses. This is the curbs and gutters and drains, and if the service broke down it seems to me the City Council would have to do it no matter what the Act says.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Yes, we are holding the bag!

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I am not quite satisfied at all that this should pass. I think it is highly unfair. There are a large number of people in there paying through the nose for the privilege of living in back of the City of St. John's, trying to keep clear of that parasitical group outside, see—To do that we pay through the noses. I maintain if the whole area is to be passed over to the City of St. John's. Why not? Do they not belong to the City of St. John's? But if the people from whom they take it over, who decided it to them what is now the Housing Corporation—It is through the Government they are going to deed it to them as a gift—If bad workmanship is proven on behalf of the people who constructed this surely the Council has taken over that responsibility too. I do not think this House should allow that to stand. Of course it has to be proven there was bad workmanship, and that is very difficult for any householder to prove. Surely if a householder proves there was bad workmanship on behalf in this case, of the City Council, is the City Council not responsible? Absolutely! The City Council in taking over this area must assume the responsibility for any bad workmanship. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to make a motion that that Clause 6 be deleted from Section 30 of the Bill, or Section 2 of the Bill.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend's whole argument seems to be based on the assumption that the City of St. John's is anxious to take over. The City of St. John's is not at all anxious. But in fairness of the Housing Corporation people the City of St. John's recognizes the principle that for the City to properly be administered it is now more practical that it should be vested in the admin-

istration of the Water and Sewerage Department.

MR. HOLLETT: Why more practical?

MR. HIGGINS: But certain it is, Mr. Chairman, it cannot be argued with any reason you are going to ask the City of St. John's to take over responsibility for a position that may have existed ten or twelve years ago. That is contrary to reason and common sense. As my honourable friend from St. John's North more or less intimated in the final analysis the City will be saddled with it anyway. That is no reason to take the section out.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: In that case we are intended to receive everything we have ever seen go down, and there are miles of underground work in the Housing Corporation. We have no idea of what kind or whether there is piping enough—But we are satisfied to take it over and keep the thing in repairs as it is now. I think it will stay as it is now. I think it is time the City took over the whole thing otherwise with the Housing Corporation on one side and the City on the other we will never get any done. I don't think for a minute the City will play fast and loose with any work we will do after this. If we do a job and put in pipes and the road breaks again, Sir, we will fix it and fix the pipe again. I guarantee you that. We have a good engineer there, and he is doing a good job. Our staff is very good. In other words, they are doing it all their lives. I do not think there will be very much trouble. But most of that went in under contract and with different engineers, and very poorly designed.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, can the honourable gentleman show me what benefit it will be to the house-

holder in the Housing Area for the City of St. John's Council to take us over? Where is the benefit for us?

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Services, Sir.

MR. HOLLETT: This is one of the services you are being asked to do.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: It will be done, Sir, if it is done by us. But this was done by some strange fellow a long time ago, for the Housing Corporation, whoever he was.

MR. HOLLETT: Who has been giving us the services so far?

MR. NIGHTINGALE: We have been giving you some services but we are taking over this underground service. We have to keep it good once we take it over. We just say now, "Sorry that is not ours, that is the Housing Corporation." That is what we said before. After this, since it is ours we will do it.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask the honourable gentleman, who is a council man, and a very good one — The Council built a street, they put in the main and they put in inlets into dwellings and so on—The Council does that—Alright, anything goes wrong with that who fixes it?

MR. NIGHTINGALE: The Council will fix it.

MR. HOLLETT: Alright, the Council should fix it. Why not this, we are not asking you to take it over.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: We are the ones who have been asked.

MR. HOLLETT: The fact is that there is no one else to take over.

MR. HEFFERTON: Although I do not like the situation very much I might point out this is not a unique situation—Some year and a half ago

attending consultations of two parties where this thing, onus of responsibility, was being argued—I refer to the situation in Gander where during the past four or five years you had the Department of Transport putting in services; you have a local board of trustees, the question came because the "Department of Transport" were passing over the services — The question came up as to who was responsible for the work after the services had been passed over. Department of Transport officials were adamant in reiterating that they could not and would not be held responsible for the services once they were turned over to the local trustees. The local board of trustees argued, and I think rightly, they could not be expected to assume responsibility for past defects in services installed by Department of Transport. So the situation was exactly the same as here. Neither party was satisfied nor willing to accept the responsibility for the things which had already been done. I feel here in this particular section between the Housing Corporation and the Municipal Council St. John's and the situation which is going to arise during the next few months between the Department of Transport of Canada and the local board of trustees at Gander we will have to do exactly the same thing—neither wants to accept the responsibility—

MR. HOLLETT: What are you going to do with it?

MR. HEFFERTON: Let it fall upon the individual.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, that is "Liberal" policy right from "A" to "Z"—Throw it over to the tax payers. The people went in there and took these houses in good faith, put there by the Housing Corporation on the understanding that if something went wrong

with their works that they would repair it and they would fix it. Now you are going to pass a law which will take away the citizens right to that right which he had, take away every privilege which he had, the rights under the present setup where he had the right if anything goes wrong due to bad workmanship to get the work repaired. Now you say, we will pass it all over to the City Council and in doing so we shall absolve the City Council from that and make John Jones and Bill Smith pay for it.

Now I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if you think that is justice, if you think this House should pass a thing like that? Well, I have a wrong concept of what justice means. To me it is absolute brutal. If the Housing Corporation had a responsibility they had to fulfil, the people who take over the premises tomorrow will have the same responsibility, otherwise there is no right, there is no justice in this Newfoundland of ours under this "Liberal" administration. Now do you want that to be said. I assume you do not want it said. I know it is not right, every man in the House knows it is not right. It is all very well for the councillors to get up and say we are not going to take it unless we are absolved—fine—but it is not right for the taxpayer—they are taxed enough—they pay on ten or twelve thousand dollar houses under the terms on which they bought them and they will pay twenty-five or twenty-six thousand dollars before they own the houses. Then on top of that they have to pay for all the bad workmanship, which should have been done right—Are you going to pass a law like that? I maintain, Sir, this should not pass. It may be simple and it may be small to some men here but I think it is a great principle and one we cannot depart from.

MR. HIGGINS: That is the whole point of debate here—My honourable friend says it is not fair to pass over to the taxpayers any responsibility for expenses they might be put to. It is equally unfair to ask the Council to pass over to the municipal tax payers responsibility for something they had nothing to do with. As far as I am personally concerned I would certainly not be part of asking the City of St. John's to take responsibility for work when they had nothing to do with it.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I think at the present time our water is passing through the pipes in the Housing Corporation, and there is no Housing Corporation at the present time or it is on the way out.

MR. BROWNE: They have a big apartment going up there now.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: In most subdivisions public works is under the supervision of the City Engineer and must be passed by the Water and Sewerage Department. We never passed that.

MR. HOLLETT: Go and examine it before you buy it.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: It is a pretty big job to get down and dig up.

MR. HOLLETT: Alright come back to this House tomorrow or next day for another loan.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: We might be able to do that.

MR. CURTIS: When we were asked to bring in this amendment we were told the Council is undertaking the construction of a new tunnel, and that new tunnel was going to remedy every and all conceivable errors made in the original installations. My honourable friend from St. John's East will bear out in that.

MR. HIGGINS: Four hundred thousand dollars worth.

MR. CURTIS: That new tunnel is supposed to be able to look after the entire installation there—I understand the only objection so far has been in connection with the removal of sewerage, I understand it is a question of mains breaking. That matter is ordinarily looked after by the Council. Anyway they got to give you water. If they do not give you water you do not pay taxes—so the council really has to fix it whether it wants to or not.

I think we might safely let the clause stay in. But I have been looking at it again since the Member for St. John's South was speaking and I am inclined to think he may be right and perhaps (6) is a little too wide. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask that the Committee not pass this section finally until we have had another look at it. Because the section does say—or hereafter constructed—I think my honourable friend is right when he says that means if the City Council, or if the Housing Corporation tomorrow, as it is doing, develops an area there, and if as a result of that development nobody is going to be liable or the City is not—Is that fair? I would be quite prepared to have Section (6) apply to everything to date but do not think it should apply to anything from now on. I do not think it should have freedom from everything the Housing Corporation should do from now on. It is not a section I have ever been particularly fond of. I think it might be held over and perhaps we might discuss it outside the House and come to some fair solution. We as a Government are not pushing this Bill as a Government sponsored Bill. We were just asked to put it through. Actually the Government is not particularly interested in it as a

Bill. We want to clean up the Housing Corporation work and they want to pass over the streets and sidewalks and everything to the City. I might say it is a very nice thing to try and absolve the Council but remember the Council was partner of the St. John's Housing Corporation. Every bit of work in there was done under direction of the Council, and the Council engineer was on every Committee and passed all the plans.

MR. HIGGINS: That is the former engineer.

MR. CURTIS: So I am not going to allow these two councillors to get up and sell the rest of us a thing like that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that Fagan's Farm Area, I take it that is an economic rental project between the Government and the Housing Corporation. I also heard that the St. John's Housing Corporation are going to build another apartment building.

MR. CURTIS: Not at the moment, not that I know of. It might be under consideration.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I would suggest this be held over until we get definite facts on the amount of work which was done by the City Engineer of St. John's or the man before him and see where we are in this particular thing. I might say I brought up the same thing as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition when it came before the Council, because I asked the solicitors when both parties are absolved from blame who is responsible—It is usually called "An Act of God." But God does not fix these things—and the City engineer will have to fix it. I think it should be left over to get the facts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a motion that the section is deleted.

MR. HOLLETT: In view of the fact that the Honourable the Attorney General asks it to stand I will withdraw the motion for the time being at any rate.

On motion section ordered stand—

Motion that the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again, carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill—"An Act to Amend the Partnership Act."

Motion that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Fisheries Act."

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I do not see very much wrong with the amendment to be made except that I would like to take this opportunity to say a word on a subject which is dear to the heart of every Newfoundlander including every St. John's man and woman. If it had not been for the fishery, gentlemen, there would be no Newfoundland. We would not be here today. It was on the fishery was built the history of Newfoundland. The history of Newfoundland is as beautiful and as wonderful as the history of any other country under God's sun. It was all brought about by reason of the fact that we had plenty of fish in our waters and we had plenty of good harbours along our shores and that there were plenty of good English, Irish, Scotch, French and otherwise who were only too happy to escape to freedom and come out here and plant themselves in the bays and on the

points and on the bill of Cape St. Georges, if you like—and my friend is not here—and shall I say—eke out a substantial—and I say “substantial” advisely—livelihood. Because I have seen men and women, when I was a boy, the like of which I cannot today. There were men who were full of brain and brawn because of the life they lead. They were healthy and strong. They were independent. They had no relief nor dole nor anything of that kind. They built their own boats. They sailed their own ships and they marketed the cod or other fish they caught. They did not have any Fishery Federation. I do not know that they had a Fishery Department. They did not have all these various scientific setups which you have in your present Fisheries Department. These were the men who made Newfoundland. I think therefore when the subject of fisheries comes up that we, Sir, you and I and every Newfoundlander should stand to his feet in honour of those people who carved out of this rugged soil a history unequalled anywhere else in the world. Because I am proud of Newfoundland. I am proud of our fishermen what ever part of the Island they come from and, Sir, I stand firm for any Act or any Bill which comes in here to, not to help but shall I say to augment the efforts which must be put forth to catch, to make and to market the cod. Our fishermen do not want too much help. They just want a little less hinderance. They want encouragement. They want the stability to build their boats and to build ships to take their fish to market. Of course if there is anything any Government can do this Liberal Government ought to do it, and this Liberal Government has been in for

eight years and it has been called “The Best Eight Years Yet.”

Now I ask you, Sir, how much better off are our fishermen today than they were eight years ago? Are there any more fishermen today? Are they more numerous? Are there more fishing settlements? I do not need to answer these questions. I take it the number of fishermen has shrunken by about two-thirds and our people have gone, some of them to work in the mines. No fishermen would work in a mine if he could get to work at the fishery. That does not speak well for this Liberal Government, not by great shakes.

MR. FORSEY: It does not speak well for the mines if what you say is true of the conditions in the mines—if what you say is true.

MR. HOLLETT: Well I have been in more mines than my honourable friend. I visited a good many mines and I know the conditions in mines both on Bell Island and in Buchans in other places.

I am not going to take very long. We could take a recess—right now I feel like a cup of tea.

On motion the Committee recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Chairman returned to the Chair.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to delay the Committee much longer on this. But I thought on this the introduction of the new fisheries Bill setting out a new fisheries department in this Year of Our Lord that I wanted to say a word or two with reference to the fisheries. I have said a word or two and do not plan to say very much more except to say to the new Minister of Fisheries that we wish him well. We wish the

fisheries well because we don't believe it can be well with Newfoundland if the fisheries do not prosper in a better way than they have been prospering during the best eight years yet. I do sincerely hope that the next four years, the life of the present Government, will see some real steps taken to rehabilitate our fishermen, to re-establish the fisheries and put it on a sound basis, to eliminate such things as recently happened when a man who received some five or six millions of dollars from this Government to put into a fish plant came back and told the Government just where they were getting off, told them practically they were no good not even giving him more money and that sort of thing. Certainly it is not the way, I think, to conduct the fisheries. But I have great respect and great regard for the new Minister of Fisheries. I am not saying I did not have a great respect and a great regard for his predecessor. But for that man who is now the new Minister—I have known him many, many years and his father before him. They were both fishermen. They grew up in a fishing settlement and they know what it takes to make the fisheries pay.

As far as the fishermen are concerned, I know today how hard it is to market our fish. I say here and now that the present Government and the present Department of Fisheries under the new Minister should take advantage of that term in the Terms of Union which would indicate that the Federal Department of Trade and Commerce will aid and assist and abet the Government in establishing new markets for all our products. That in my opinion has not been during the past eight years. It has not been done in any way, shape nor form. That is one of the reasons why a lot more fish has not been marketed.

We have a body of men coming in here from Portugal to fish, as fine a body of men as one would wish to see, stalwart, well-dressed, clean, and it is a pleasure to meet with them and talk with them. They have left their homeland in Portugal to come here to Newfoundland and catch fish and make a living whereas our people right on the fishing grounds here are finding it very difficult to do that. I know it has a lot to do with the value of the dollar and cost of living and that sort of thing. But surely there will always be a market for fish. I am quite sure that under this new fishery Bill and with our new fisheries Minister and the aid which we shall receive from his brother Ministers and from this side of the House that something will be done over and above what has been done in the past to rehabilitate our fisheries.

I have nothing further to say except, I agree with the principle of this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Clauses 1 through 10 carried.

Clause 11:

MR. HOLLETT: On that section I have a note there. I don't know what it meant.

MR. CURTIS: I remember that section was raised in one of the previous Bills and I explained to the House it is in all the Acts. It is a harmless clause.

Clause 11 through 14 carried.

On motion of Mr. Curtis the Committee rose to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to it referred and

directed me to report Bill No. 29, "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act," without amendment. Bill No. 10, an "Act to Amend the St. John's Fire Department Act," without amendment. Bill No. 11, "An Act to Amend the Bulk Sales Act," without amendment; Bill No. 15, "An Act to Amend the Partnership Act," without amendment, Bill No. 19, "An Act Respecting Notaries Public," without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Might we take the Bills without amendment.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole reports they have considered the matters to it referred and passed certain Bills without amendment.

On motion report received, Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, we might ask the unanimous consent of the House to read Bill No. 29, a third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion, that all these Bills with the exception of No. 29 be read a third time on tomorrow, carried:

By unanimous consent of the House it is agreed that Bill No. 29 be read a third time now, by leave of the House.

A Bill, An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act" read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and has instructed me to Report Bill No. 10, "An Act to Amend the St. John's Housing Corporation"—report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received—Committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move we go into Committee of the Whole on Items. No. 10, 12, 14, 15 and 16.

On motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair:

Mr. Clarke Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Department of Mines and Resources."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, a point of order—Where is the Minister for this Department? I would like to ask him a question.

MR. CURTIS: I am not sure that is necessary. This is a departmental Bill and departmental Bills do not come under the Minister, they come under the Premier.

MR. BROWNE: Well, is there a report of the Division of Co-operatives? I have not seen it.

MR. CURTIS: I will make enquiries about that. I might say the Minister has not been here all day. Unfortunately six of his children have got measles and he is breeding them himself—So I have moved away from him—if you like I will ask him to bring over the report in person.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, "The encouragement and assistance in the organization of co-operative enterprises amongst persons or groups who desire to provide themselves with or to market commodities or services or both" I am rather wondering whether that ought to be the function of the Department of Co-operatives. In my knowledge of the co-operatives I am led to believe that co-operatives are something got to grow from the

roots up. It is not assisted up by somebody else and certainly is not assisted upward by the Government. If it is it usually proves a failure. I think if you go back into the history of co-operatives in this country you will find that the history has not been too good. My contention is that the cause of that is that co-operatives have been receiving too much help from the Government. The co-operative system in the establishing idea of it is where a group of people get together and decide they are going to perform or do some certain action, they are going to do some certain work on their own, unaided and by mutual assistance. Now here you have "the encouragement" encouragement is alright—"and assistance in the organizing of co-operative enterprises." It may not be a bad idea "amongst persons or groups who desire to provide themselves or to market commodities or services or both." Yes, I suppose when analyzed properly it is not too bad. But I do think the big trouble with our co-operatives in this country is the fact there has been too much Government interference, too much Government assistance. That is not true co-operative work at all. I am wondering what the Minister would say about that if he were here or what the Attorney General might have to say on it now. But I do think if we in Newfoundland are to have successful co-operatives we ought to endeavour to assist them in such a way that we are not supporting them. I am wondering if the Minister would care to make some remarks on it.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to discuss co-operatives. It is not one of the departments I am greatly interested in—I think the honourable member's colleague—

MR. BROWNE: I am going to say something on this. It is quite under-

standable the Honourable Leader of the Opposition did make the remarks he did because we are not hearing very much about co-operatives today. Yet in the past a great deal was said about them, and I am wondering what progress has been made. I would like to see greater progress being made than is evident at the present time.

The co-operative movement originated in England back in 1847 or somewhere around that time. The first co-operative endeavour that I know of in this country came here when men who had been members of the English Co-operative Union came out to work at Grand Falls and the Grand Falls Co-operative Store was set up by men who have had that experience. Subsequently Dr. Grenfell tried to establish co-operative enterprises but the chief widespread co-operative movement was introduced here followed the failure of a gentleman brought out here by the Commission of Government from Scotland, Mr. Beverage. He sank about a hundred thousand dollars of Government money in co-operative enterprises trying to establish them, as my honourable friend in the Opposition says, from the top, at Ferryland, at Grate's Cove and at Pouch Cove. If the Honourable the Premier were here I think he would recall the events that lead up to the establishment of that co-operative store and the unfortunate history it has had since that time.

But following these failures the Commissioner for Resources, who was in charge of the co-operative work went to see Dr. Coady at Antigonish and as a result Dr. Coady sent down here a gentleman, Gerald Richardson, with whom I became very friendly and whom I assisted as well as I could in visiting different parts throughout the country and in promoting the co-

operative movement. A number of other workers came here from Antigonish who were well versed in the educational work being promoted by the extension department of the University of St. Francis Xavier at Antigonish. During the years that their workers from Antigonish were here a great many study groups were formed as a foundation of the spread of co-operative movement. In addition to the study groups there were big clubs established and in the next phase stores. They got into difficulties and many co-operative stores were established too soon. They should have remained for a longer period in the big clubs stage.

It is largely an educational movement which grows best in times more difficult than the prosperous one which we have seen since 1941.

MR. CURTIS: The best eight years.

MR. BROWNE: 1941 to 1949, yes, the best eight years. The coming of the Americans brought unprecedented prosperity to Stephenville and that West Coast area where the co-operative movement seemed to take root best, because the people there were of the same type as the people in Cape Breton where the movement had been started. I know Dr. Coady and Dr. Thomkins and I knew Professor A. B. McDonald and I know the personal interest and enthusiasm and inspiration with these three men put into the lives of the fishermen and miners and agricultural workers in Nova Scotia. They built up a wonderful movement in that Province which has spread since to New Brunswick and, of course, spread here.

In Quebec about fifty-seven years ago a French Canadian by the name of Desjardins established the cause

popular, which we know as the credit union, which encouraged people to save their dimes and dollars in little banks. They built up a tremendous bank movement. The Popular Banking Movement in the Province of Quebec amongst the French-speaking people. That is very substantial today, and has been able to assist to a very large degree in the construction of co-operative houses.

Now the co-operative housing has been done by people working for themselves. We have in this country, with the assistance of Federal and Provincial Governments, enabled many hundreds of people, I believe, to own their own houses or in time to own their homes largely through their own efforts. I have been in some of these and I have been astonished by the work that has been done there by the men and women. I was in one house on Kilbride Road a short time ago and was amazed to see the work the wife had done in painting that house. It seemed as good as any painter could have done.

MR. HOLLETT: Your grandmother did that.

MR. BROWNE: I do not know what my grandmother did, I can only tell what this lady did in this particular home. Sir, the co-operative movement has not prospered as well as it deserved and as well as the indications were at the beginning. I would like to see my honourable friend's Federation of Fishermen study the co-operative movement because I believe it would bring great advantages to the fisheries.

MR. LANE: They have done it and are doing it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: I am glad to hear that. I do not know how far because

some of the branches I have been talking to have not done anything about it. I know that there is no activity there of that nature. I know there are many co-operatives societies amongst the fishermen down North and over on the North West Coast and I hope that they prosper. But it is a matter that must have some guidance. Here we have decided to put it into the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives in the first place and now it is taken out by this Bill today and is to be put under the direction of the present Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. CURTIS: That is why it originally went to Mines and Resources then to Fisheries and now back again.

MR. BROWNE: It was under the Commissioner of Natural Resources. Anyway it has been moved around. Anyone who looks at the Bill can see there has been a great deal of movement back and forth. But the present Minister should know more about co-operatives than he knows about fisheries.

I think the explanation has been pretty good. The new Minister of Fisheries is the proper man for that job and I think that the Minister of Mines and Resources has the experience necessary to know what is required in the promotion of co-operatives. I hope he will give it all the attention he can because it is a beneficial movement and has done wonderful good and has given wonderful benefits all over the world and to the people of Newfoundland, the people who took part.

MR. LANE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words because fisheries have been brought in this afternoon. I do not want to delay the House, but the Honourable member

for St. John's South mentioned the Federation of Fishermen, which I have the honour to represent. I can tell him and the House here we have done all that. We have not done it through the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives. What we are doing we are doing on what we consider, and from my years of experience, to be the right thing, the right co-operative way. The honourable member for St. John's South might recall that while he was a magistrate I went as a magistrate to the District of St. Barbe, to Bonne Bay, and I spent forty-three days in the first year organizing the fishermen to market their lobster as co-operatives. A man McIsaac came along but I went there before Joe McIsaac. I must recognize the fact that I learned something from the honourable member for St. John's South, and I did appreciate it, and I went over there to try and do something for them. That co-operative movement in the marketing of lobster is the only thing that has stood the test of time, from Bonne Bay North to Flower's Cove. Others, some of the South West Coast, Placentia Bay, all went by the board, but these men are still holding to marketing their lobsters. They are doing for themselves what other people are paying someone else to do for them. Last year they were able to clear 32c. for their lobster—But unfortunately for them and against my prayer and wishes instead of keeping the big clubs they went into business and started grumbling, one man's daughter got a job and the other didn't, and they split apart, just because it was not founded from the ground but was built from the top perhaps. But I understand some one went in and told them what they should do, and they were all up in the air and had to build down instead of up. Now in the Federation of Fish-

ermen this year I was going through our financial agreement and arrangements with the locals and I found that last year we did for the locals forty-six thousand dollars worth of business and we did not charge them anything. Partly through Government assistance and help we are able to do that and give some assistance. Orders came in for a dozen suits of rubber clothes. We get them for \$13.75. They have to pay as much as \$16.75. I tell them to take them to the store loft and don't open a store. We can get gasoline by twenty drum lots and on engines we get twenty per cent discount and on parts fifteen. But they must have that bit of money. That they will have the money to start off in the Spring. We secured more salt last year from St. Anthony and Lewisporte at the same price as businessmen. We get up against businessmen occasionally and tell them what we are trying to do.

That is what we are doing. I am not personally in agreement with building a shop or store and going into business. I am in perfect agreement with the honourable member. In fact in my own little home town of Salvage we have a big club of twelve members, which sends a man up once a year with all their money. They take the supplies down in a schooner and store it in a store loft. They have now started a little shop. I don't agree. I do not think it is going to last, paying someone else to keep the place going, electric lights and everything else. What we are trying to do is to encourage the big clubs to get together and pool their fish. We pooled seven thousand five hundred quintals of codfish in Pools Island and got a dollar a quintal more, and they pooled their cod oil and sold it by the tun and are paid by the gallon. That is what we are encouraging. Also with lobsters and the same thing applies.

Placentia West is one of the areas where they pool all their lobsters, look after it themselves and they get the profit themselves. That to me is co-operative movement, and that is what we are fostering and encouraging. It will take time. It is a matter of education. I believe anything built from the foundation up is going to prosper. I assure the members of the House that I am interested in the co-operative movement and we are doing everything possible to help our fishermen when they do get a toehold on life to save just as much money as they can.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the idea I had in mind when I drew attention to this, Mr. Chairman, because I think we got to get the men at the grass roots interested to put in their few dollars and work for themselves. I am very glad to hear the remarks made not only by my learned friend but by the honourable member who is the present secretary of the Federation of Fishermen. I think co-operation amongst our fishermen will in time be a great help to them, and it will help to put legs under our fishery. I am very glad to hear the remarks the honourable member has made regarding the work he is doing in regard to the fisheries.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that my honourable friend brought up this subject because it has produced a very interesting debate, and I know we are all glad to hear what the honourable member for White Bay North said about co-operatives. I may say I was fortunately one of those to meet Monsignor Coady a few years ago. One could not fail to be greatly impressed by his story. But I never felt that a co-operative movement in Newfoundland followed the same steps as he envisaged, a movement from the roots up and not from

the roof down. I do know we have had some successful co-operative housing and I have myself seen some of these houses on Elizabeth Avenue and in that neighbourhood that are a credit to the builders. I am speaking now only from the outside. Yes, I have been inside one or two. In that way the co-operative movement has been a great success. But we all live and learn and no doubt as time goes on we will get the co-operative movement flourishing and started properly.

MR. HOLLETT: There is one other remark which I cannot lose this opportunity to mention, i.e. the encouragement and assistance to people to market commodities. Now we all know the unfortunate incident of the O'Brien Fisheries. That was an attempt made by the Minister of Co-operatives, I take it, or in his department, to assist in the marketing of lobsters. They made a faux pas of it, there is no question about that. Now it seems to me there ought to be some preventative to such a thing happening again. I do not like the idea that the department should send field men out to the field to tell fishermen to sell to John Jones if you want to make good money. That is not the idea of the co-operative movement at all. I do not know what that is. It is a bungle, a monopoly set up by the department. The result was that it cost this Government forty-three thousand dollars and it cost a lot of bad faith. I am getting letters day after day from people down in the Notre Dame Bay Area. I am getting letters from Woods Island Area where they were told to sell to this particular firm by the co-operative movement, and they have lost money, and some of them have not been paid over there in Wood Island Area.

HON. J. T. CHEESEMAN (Minister

of Fisheries): They have been paid for their lobsters

MR. HOLLETT: Some have not, over in the Wood Island Area.

MR. CHEESEMAN: All lobsters have been paid for, that is everyone who presented an account.

MR. HOLLETT: I can tell the Honourable Minister there are individuals who have not been paid. There may be some reason for that—I don't know—But I do hope every one of them is compensated, and I do hope the Government has learned a lesson. That is why I raised this point—There is too much Government interference in the trade and commerce of the country. It is not good. It is not good at all. People in a co-operative should be allowed to work within that co-operative. Surely they should not be instructed by any Department of Government as to what they should or should not do, otherwise it is no longer a co-operative.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in explanation to what my honourable friend said, when this question of lobsters first came up and the sale to O'Brien Fisheries was under decision I sent to the Department of Co-operatives and asked them to send down the man responsible for going through the area. He gave a perfectly logical explanation of everything he had done. His explanation was that these sales were to be made for cash and that O'Brien Fisheries had undertaken to pay three or four cents a pound more than was currently being paid.

MR. HOLLETT: That is right.

MR. CURTIS: The only slip made was that the fishermen sold not for cash but gave credit. That is where the thing slipped up. If his scheme

had gone through, as he intended, these fishermen would have received three or four cents a pound more for their lobster than they actually did get. He can hardly be blamed for the fact that the fishermen did.

MR. BROWNE: What happened?

MR. CURTIS: They got cash first. In fact I have been told they did not get cheques. They got paid in cash first and that into too they received for the lobsters they sold just as much as they would have received if they had sold them at a lower price, in other words the amount they were short was really the extra that was being paid by reason of this higher price.

MR. BROWNE: That cannot be right.

MR. CURTIS: That is what I was told at the time. I am only saying what I was told.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Forty-one thousand dollars.

MR. CURTIS: I realize I am wrong, but that is what I am talking about, at this time, I am only speaking about those in Twillingate District. In Twillingate the difference they got was only about the equivalent to the increased price. Perhaps in other areas the situation may have been different. But the thing started in good faith. Those people undertook to pay a higher price. These agents went around in good faith and told the people to sell to the man who would pay the higher price but he told them to sell for cash but did not tell them to take cheques or to sell on terms. If the transaction had been a cash transaction the men would have been benefited.

MR. BROWNE: Naturally if they had gotten paid.

MR. CURTIS: Some did get paid.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of entering this debate at all, for reasons that would be obvious—Co-operatives was in the Department that I now administer prior to my coming in and is now being transferred, at my request, to the Minister of Mines and Resources. He has administered it hitherto and I am quite sure he will do a much better job with it than I could possibly do. But the fact is I asked to have the Division of Co-operatives separated—not divorced but legally separated—because of the fact that the Minister of Mines and Resources could do a better job than I could. But it is not to be taken by that suggestion that I do not believe in the principles of co-operation. I think no one can dispute the fact that the principles of co-operation is sound. I was rather amused by my honourable friend, the Leader of the House—if these people had received any money—It reminds me of people who buy stocks—if they had sold when they were up they would have made money.

MR. BROWNE: Unfortunately the money was not forthcoming and the people were out and the Government came to their assistance.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Yes and so far as I know every outstanding account for lobsters has been taken care of, has been paid. I know that we had individual accounts rendered for as little as eighty-odd cents. So if there is any account outstanding I hope the Leader of the Opposition, if he knows of any such account, will let me know. I would like to know and would be glad to have it investigated.

Before I sit down I would like to say again, I agree wholeheartedly with the principle of the co-operative move-

ment. But it has failed in Newfoundland and it has failed because it has been tackled from the wrong end. Co-operative business means education. Our people should be educated into the proper use of the system. Just by telling people that by joining any organization, call it what you will, you will get more for what you process or produce and buy cheaper what you want to buy is not the way to build a firm co-operative system. I do hope that we can in this country build up a firm and sound credit union as has been done in other countries and a firm co-operative business. It is possible, and if legislators and others will bend their minds to it and give it their support I am quite sure it can be done. But it is a long haul, a long job, a job for which men especially qualified are needed and certainly not men of my trade.

On motion Bill ordered reported passed without amendment.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report having passed this Bill and made progress on other Bills, and asks leave to sit again.

On motion the Committee rose to report progress.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to it referred and passed Bill No. 16, "An Act to Amend the Department of Mines and Resources Act," and directed me to report same without amendment.

On motion report received Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and

has ordered me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

On motion report received, Committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

On motion of Mr. Curtis, all further Orders of the Day do stand deferred and the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Tuesday at 3:00 of the clock.

TUESDAY, April 30, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. WHELAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Bacon Cove. The prayer of this petition is for repairs to a road leading from Conception Harbour into Bacon Cove, a distance of about three miles. Bacon Cove is populated by about twenty-five to thirty families and it is one of the few remaining fishing areas in that area of Conception Bay. They live close to some excellent trap fishing grounds and even now quite a number of the young men there prefer to remain fishing instead of pursuing other occupations. They have prospered to the extent that an increasing number of them have acquired motor vehicles, trucks and cars, and this road is their only means of access to sources of supply, doctors, hospitalization and produce. For several weeks this Spring this road was in such a bad state it had to be closed entirely and it was only within the past three or four days, with the help of some local free labour and assistance from the highroads department that it was made passable to traffic.

I strongly support the prayer of this petition, Mr. Speaker, and ask it be received by this Honourable House and referred to the department to which it relates.

Presenting Report of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices of Motion

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Government of Newfoundland to Enter into An Agreement With the British Newfoundland Exploration Limited."

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 M. J. Boylen (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1955:

I also give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Consolidate and Amend the Law Relating to the Raising of Local Taxes for Schools."

Notice of Questions

MR. W. J. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder could I ask the Premier who the British Newfoundland Exploration Company is? Is that a new company?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a wholly owned subsidiary of BRINCO Incorporated BRINEX it is usually called. And I would not advise my honourable and learned friend on his immediate left to try and coin anything on the one but just leave it as it is, leave it severely alone.

MR. HIGGINS: I thought I was off that and it was shifted.

Answers to Questions

(See Appendix).

QUESTION No. 87: (See Appendix).

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Public Works): (See Appendix).

MR. BROWNE: Does that mean the Trans-Canada Highway goes through the Kenmount Road and straight to Witless Bay Line?

MR. POWER: Yes, I think it is safe to say the decision has been made to bring the Trans-Canada Highway in the Kenmount Road.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the House could take notice to lay on the table of the House a map showing that course.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would not suggest that until all land is reserved for taking first.

MR. BROWNE: I have none in there.

QUESTION No. 88:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I saw this question just before I left my office. I was in my office for a matter of three or four minutes. The Order Paper was on my desk and I saw the question, and asked my staff to have my letter to the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister's reply to me copied and sent down this afternoon. As soon as it arrives I will be glad to table it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I give notice of a question on tomorrow—To the Honourable Minister of Health—

Orders of the Day

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the St. John's Fire Depart-

ment," on motion read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act To Amend the Bulk Sales Act, 1955." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Fisheries." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act To Amend the Partnership Act." On motion read a third time ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act To Amend the Department of Mines and Resources Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill—"An Act to Amend the Legislative Disabilities Act." On motion Bill 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 Assessment Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

On motion the House went into Committee of the Whole on various Bills.

Mr. Clarke, Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Corrections Act."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, "Every school established under this section is declared a training school." I am not sure whether the school at Whitbourne comes under that—could the Minister tell us? While I am on the subject I would ask the Minister if he has heard of any improper conduct that took place in connection with that school out there and whether any steps have been taken to punish those concerned?

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable member may I say that the matter is now under investigation.

MR. BROWNE: What sort of investigation are you having?

MR. ABBOTT: By the Attorney General's Department.

MR. BROWNE: By some legal officer?

MR. SMALLWOOD: By the police.

MR. BROWNE: The "RCMP."

MR. ABBOTT: Right!

Motion that the committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill—"An Act Further to Amend the Welfare of Children Act."

MR. BROWNE: What is the difference between Section 2 and the previous section?

MR. HOLLETT: None whatever.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "Minister" becomes "Director," is that not right?

MR. HOLLETT: I looked up the Act, Mr. Chairman, and I see absolutely no difference.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is not the word "Director" in. It was the "Minister." Dr. Pottle thought he should be the one.

MR. HOLLETT: "Director" is in the original.

MR. SHEPPARD: It was changed from "Director" to "Minister" and is now going back to "Director" again.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, Dr. Pottle changed it.

MR. BROWNE: Why is it going back to the old one?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is more proper.

MR. BROWNE: Clause 3 is a very important section, I take it, from the sound of it. Could the Minister tell us the reason for it?

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Chairman, it has been regarded that seven hundred and fifty dollars is a very small amount and furthermore a great many people were availing of that minimum amount of seven hundred and fifty dollars which is absolutely insignificant, as far as the support of the child until he or she reaches the age of seventeen. We just raised it to twelve hundred to increase it. Any more than that would be maybe a shock to some people. I think most honourable members will agree that seven hundred and fifty dollars is a very small amount to pay for the support of a child.

MR. HOLLETT: For ten years?

MR. ABBOTT: It is seventeen years under the Act.

MR. BROWNE: I notice the next section depends on this one too.

MR. ABBOTT: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: That means if he deposits the twelve hundred dollars that finishes it, does it?

MR. ABBOTT: Well, twelve hundred dollars is the minimum amount and not the maximum. In the event it should go to court, of course, he shall have to abide by the decision of the court. He enters into an agreement, as you know, and the minimum amount now of the agreement will be twelve hundred dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Very good. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this is a wise provision here in Clause 6—There is no top limit now and a magistrate could make it twenty thousand dollars. It appears to me—of course the Minister could correct me if I am wrong—it is the intention that there is no top limit now.

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Chairman, I may say this particular legislation provides for a minimum amount of seven hundred and fifty dollars which can be paid within three years. In other words he could wait until the end of the third year to pay one cent under the existing legislation whereas now, of course, he has to pay his first instalment of course, and it has always been so with the legislation, the magistrate could impose the support or make the support fifty dollars a month for a period of seventeen years or one hundred dollars a month. There is no maximum to the amount.

MR. BROWNE: Could I ask the Minister, what is the usual amount now?

MR. ABBOTT: The usual amount now is around ten dollars a month for a period of seventeen years, because the Act provides it must be a period of seventeen years.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask if bond must be given?

MR. ABBOTT: Yes, and the minimum amount of the bond is twelve hundred dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I don't know—This Bill has been adopted by the House at second reading. We are now in Committee of the Whole and it may not be strictly in order to discuss in any way or in any degree the principle of the Bill, but as I read through this now today it does not leave me too happy. I remember back in 1924 when Mr. Monroe was head of the administration and there was a very sad case here in the city of a girl who was a matter of fact a cripple and the father was a man who was reasonably prosperous. The law at that time, if I remember rightly, fixed a hundred dollars as the amount by paying which a putative father escaped forever at least in this world all responsibility for what happened.

I was a newspaperman at the time and I covered the case very thoroughly and followed up and launched a sort of one man crusade of my own in which I interviewed all the judges of the day, magistrates, clergymen and all kinds of people, several dozen people, and quoted their opinion as in favour of my proposition that this law was a "Cod" and in fact was cruel and brutal, with the result that the late Sir John Crosbie, who occupied a seat in this House then as Minister of Finance, undertook, volunteered, himself having followed personally this crusade in the newspapers for a week or ten days, to introduce legislation—And it was introduced—And as I remember it, it made the putative father fully responsible for the maintenance of the child during the minority of

the child, and I believe that was spelled out as being seventeen years. And as I recall there was no amount of money mentioned, if my memory is correct. And I believe my memory is correct because it was the first such crusade I ever embarked upon. That legislation set no figure, no amount of money, but said simply that the putative father would be responsible and wholly responsible for the maintenance of the child until that child reached its seventeenth birthday, or during its minority. If I am right, and I think I am right, then it is a retrograde step we are taking in fixing this amount even though the amount here is for four hundred and fifty dollars more than it has lately been. I wonder is my honourable friend, the minister who has looked into that, familiar with the law as it has been over the last, say, twenty or twenty-five years?

MR. BROWNE: He ought to be?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I wonder could he give us some information on that. I know it is a little unusual—but it suddenly struck a responsive cord in my memory as I read this section.

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Honourable the Premier I recall that in the early thirties some magistrates would order the support of a child at \$2.50 a month for a period of seventeen years. Now in all my experiences of course I felt that the state should not have to contribute to the support of any child, illegitimate child, if the putative father were to be found. For that reason personally I have always made the amount, taking into consideration the circumstances of the putative father. There is no point in ordering support of a child of a fisherman for ten dollars per

month if his yearly income is more or less two or three hundred dollars a year. Now with a man who has a very good position and receiving good wages personally I felt that that man should pay the amount ordered for the support of the child in accordance with his ability to pay.

Today with the existing legislation we have, there is nothing to prevent a magistrate from imposing twenty dollars per month for the support of a child or ten dollars or even five for a period of seventeen years, but in a great many cases today we find agreement being entered into by the putative father with the approval of the Director of Child Welfare. Although we find in a great many cases the agreements break down—and the existing legislation states that the agreement shall be not less than seven hundred and fifty dollars for a period of three years to be paid in a period of three years. Now the department has felt that a great many people have taken advantage of that minimum amount and they have entered into agreements for seven hundred and fifty dollars, whereas they failed to see that they could have entered into an agreement to three thousand, five thousand or even six thousand. I agree the amount is meagre. Today the amount of ten dollars per month or fifteen dollars per month in support of a child is meagre. Nevertheless the Act also provides not only that the putative father has obligations in this respect but also his mother.

MR. BROWNE: Does the minister think that this provision here under sub-section (4) is going to be very severe on a man who has not a regular income. How could he pay twelve hundred dollars and four hundred dollars down? That is what I am thinking about, that first four hundred dollars.

MR. ABBOTT: This section here applies to an agreement, where an agreement is entered into. Now if it goes to the court of course an affiliation order could be made and the magistrate orders it—This is really an agreement, where an agreement is entered into by the putative father and the mother. Section 103—if you would look up the section.

MR. BROWNE: I have Section 103 in the Act. I do not know whether it has been amended in 1954. Well the section itself is not directly concerned in this amendment of the Act of 1954. There is nothing there about an agreement, the agreement is referred to in the amendment in another clause. An agreement made between the parents of a child whose parents are not legally married, etc.

What I think is that anyone who sat as a magistrate would agree with me when I say that getting that first four hundred dollars is going to be the problem.

MR. ABBOTT: The magistrate's order does not have to state three years. He can order it for ten years or fifteen or seventeen years.

MR. BROWNE: Not under that Statute. Under this section it has to be paid in full in three equal installments, the first installment to be paid within ten days.

HON. DR. J. McGRATH (Minister of Health): It is surely permissive. He may order but does not compel him to make that type of order exclusively.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if we put in—The magistrate may with the approval of the Director of Welfare order that—Then we could get a second look by another party, the party really responsible for such children. I

agree with what the Premier said, there are cases where certain individual should not be permitted to get away so easily by three installments of four hundred dollars each. I have seen cases myself and many cases in the old days, under the old law, where it was almost a crime to invoke the law that then existed and we could not do anything else about it. There should be some way where the magistrate could agree to a higher sum than stipulated.

MR. CURTIS: Under section 2 he can do that.

MR. BROWNE: I am not quite satisfied—It says he may order the liability shall be paid.

MR. HOLLETT: That does not take care of it.

MR. BROWNE: I do not think it is strictly permissive. I think what it means is this, the magistrate on the conclusion of the case can do certain things, can order a man to pay the expenses incidental to the birth if the child dies, order a man to pay the funeral expenses, order the man to pay the expenses of the mother if the mother dies, order the defendant to pay the costs of the proceedings up to fifty dollars, then in determining the weekly, monthly or yearly sum he takes into consideration the position and means of the father and so forth.

MR. CURTIS: There is no limit of time in (2)—He can make it for seventeen years.

MR. HOLLETT: He can go over twelve hundred dollars?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, but it cannot go over seventeen years. It is a good while since I studied it but it seems to me he is given instructions to determine the weekly, monthly or yearly

sum payable. But you see under (4) he can order that the whole be paid now over two years.

MR. BROWNE: We know these things happen to young men who are not well fixed financially and often their parents are not well fixed financially and they cannot raise that amount, and after all, it is in favour of a person who is somewhat more well to do who would be able to get his four hundred dollars. So I think some recommendation should be given to that point.

MR. ABBOTT: One reason, the magistrate would be familiar with the section. Certainly existing legislation prior to this section they could make an order for a period of seventeen years at a certain amount per month.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, but you can have the whole thing settled within two years under this and not more than three years under the previous section. The point I am making is that this new section here would suit a well-to-do person, a man who is established with a big income, all he would have to do would be to pay four hundred and four hundred for two years. But take a young man, a school boy, a young fisherman, only eighteen years of age, he cannot do that. Therefore should there not be some consideration given to that difference?

MR. ABBOTT: Well the consideration is given in so far as he too can pay over a period of seventeen years, if he is ordered by the magistrate.

MR. BROWNE: Supposing he were ordered to pay ten dollars a year for seventeen years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The purpose is not, obviously, to punish the man. That is not the purpose of the law

at all. These things happen. But the thing that must be done above everything else is to protect the child. The child thus born has a right, as much right as though that child were born in wedlock or ought to have. Surely it has the same right to life and protection and being fostered and having a chance in life as any other child. And the legislation ought surely to be directed to that purpose. There is no thought of punishing the man. It seems to me the law ought to be sufficiently flexible to deal with it and with the young fellow who has not got any money as well as with the fellow who has lots of money or with the fellow who has not got much money now but will have enough five or ten years from now or ten years after the thing has happened.

MR. BROWNE: No, it is not a question of consideration of the punishment. It is a question of considering the fairness of this as it applies to the poor man as compared with how it applies to the wealthy man. It is easy for a wealthy man but for a person who has not a large income or a bank account then this is of no benefit to him at all. Once the time passes what happens then if he does not pay that four hundred dollars in ten days, then he must pay so much a month for seventeen years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That twelve hundred dollars is only a minimum. Surely no magistrate is going to fix the minimum for a man he thinks can afford much more than that.

MR. BROWNE: There are a good many magistrates in the House—Does anyone know of where seven hundred and fifty dollars were exceeded?

MR. ABBOTT: Yes, I personally do.

MR. BROWNE: Were there many cases?

MR. ABBOTT: After an enquiry into the circumstances of the father, when it was discovered he was well able to afford to pay two thousand eight hundred dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Very good!

MR. SHEPPARD: Mr. Chairman, under the Welfare of Children Act the magistrate still has a right to order the putative father to make payments monthly until the child reaches the age of seventeen years or shall die. Now that is in the old Act. This section here gives him a further alternative of fixing a minimum sum of twelve hundred dollars to be paid in installments. In other words, if I may speak from experience. I have found in lots of cases that I would like to be able to make an order like this, but under the Act as it was I was not permitted to do so because (1) the form is prescribed, the affiliation form is prescribed in the Act and sets out a certain way the order has to be made and could not be varied. Now by putting in this it will give the magistrate, any particular magistrate, the alternative; he can make an order for seventeen years at a fixed sum per month or he can order the man to pay a fixed sum, say twelve hundred dollars or fifteen hundred dollars, or a magistrate may make an order under this section here, Sub-section (4) ordering the man to pay in installments.

MR. BROWNE: No, that was in the old Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You mean sub-section (4) is new?

MR. SHEPPARD: No, it is not new but it gives the magistrate another alternative.

MR. BROWNE: No, it is limited. It is not really an alternative. Here is the old sub-section (4)—The magistrate may order that the liability of the putative father, under this Act, shall be paid by payments of expenses incidental to the birth of a specified sum not less than seven hundred and fifty dollars to be paid in full over a period of not more than three years—Now, as the Minister says, this does not pin it down to any particular time for the payments of the installments. That is the only difference between that section, apart from the money—But under that old section the magistrate had power to order that he could escape any further liability by paying seven hundred and fifty over a period of not more than three years.

MR. SHEPPARD: At least my interpretation of the old section was that the order had to be made for seven hundred and fifty dollars to be paid within three years but not by way of installments—In other words liability would be satisfied by the payment of seven hundred and fifty any time within three years after the order was made. Now this section gives the magistrate authority that he will pay the sum of twelve hundred dollars, the first installment within ten days from the date and then so on within the next three years, he can set down different dates. Whereas under the old—

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member's point is that the magistrate should have some way as to whether ten days is sufficient. He should be allowed to say thirty days instead of ten days. In other words it is fixed by the Act to ten days. I think my honourable friend from St. John's West thinks that ten days should be a little more elastic, to make it thirty days or even sixty days.

MR. ABBOTT: I think in the light of experiences we have discovered that servicemen stationed in Newfoundland for two years where an order was made similar to this over a period of three years, before the three years were up they are gone and no installment is paid—Now this certainly serves us well.

MR. BROWNE: May I interrupt there? Now that part is protected by the bond. When you refer to servicemen, I remember a case, a very bad one which happened in the ministers' own district. The man was a serviceman belonging to a regiment sent to Hong Kong. I said that man had to pay the money before leaving, and the Colonel of the regiment gave his personal word he would—He went away and we never heard of him since.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There have been at least a thousand cases like that in Newfoundland, American and Canadian servicemen.

MR. BROWNE: I don't know of that. That is protected now by the cash or bond of twelve hundred dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: There is only four hundred dollars protection.

MR. BROWNE: No, the bond still stands for the twelve hundred dollars as good security.

MR. HOLLETT: The Colonel's word as a bond was not any good.

MR. CURTIS: Would the position be better if it said thirty days instead of ten?

MR. BROWNE: I think it would be better if the man were given some time to try and get the money. I do not think it is easy for a man to get four hundred dollars in ten days, sometimes. But I would like to answer the honourable member for Harbour

Grace—I do not know what interpretation the magistrates put on that wording in the old sub-section but it says paid in full over a period of not more than three years—I would take it, looking at that, over a period the seven hundred and fifty dollars has to be paid over—And that would be too narrow an interpretation to say he had to pay it at the end or at any particular time—It is over a period—Now we come to the new sub-section. It gives two years, four hundred in ten days, and four hundred in twelve months and four hundred at the expiration of the two years. It seems there should be some latitude given there.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Maybe the honourable member is suggesting a smaller down payment. Usually these troubles come together—They never have any money when that happens—Maybe if we made it a smaller down payment—Then after a while he will know what he is up against. I might say our American friends are not only lax in affiliations. A good many left the country owing the council and leaving the Newfoundlanders holding the bag. This usually happens in youth, you see, and they do not have the money—certainly they earn it eventually.

MR. HOLLETT: In the case of a servicemen who gets two of his buddies to go bondsmen, and, as my learned friend said, they are probably sent to Hong Kong within a week or two—Is there any protection then?

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Chairman, the only thing, any man giving a bond, of course the bond has to be approved, as you know, by a magistrate—And if he does not approve of the bond—and in the light of experience.

MR. HOLLETT: You cannot refuse these two bondsmen, can you?

MR. ABBOTT: Sure, oh yes!

MR. HOLLETT: Two good, reliable men from his regiment?

MR. ABBOTT: If the magistrate feels they are reliable they are approved I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, we find a great many of these servicemen are here for two years and the last year they are here they will make their payment but remaining installments pending when they go out of the country we don't see them any more. Now if you press their commanding officer he will tell you that they were brought with them anyway when they left Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the question I am asking, what protection have you?

MR. ABBOTT: As the Honourable the Premier said, we have hundreds of illegitimate children today supported by the state whose fathers are servicemen, and we cannot do anything about it—This section here will help us.

MR. CURTIS: Will the honourable minister agree with thirty days?

MR. ABBOTT: Yes.

On motion clause (a) amended to read thirty days instead of ten days.

On motion clause 6, as amended, carried.

Motion, that the committee report having passed this Bill with some amendment, carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill—
"An Act Further to Amend the Education Act. "

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I know that I will be told that this is

because Labour is so important it should be honoured, and the parents of the children have been having a holiday that day, but I would like to know how many holidays are now being recognized by the school. It seems to me in this country there are no shortages of holidays. Everyone who comes here remarks on the number of holidays.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, the important point to remember is that this does not change the number of days in school. The Act says the schools must be open 187 days of the year. What this does is to say a holiday may now be held on the day set aside as Labour Day.

MR. BROWNE: That is just about the time the schools are opened, the first Monday in September.

DR. ROWE: In actual practise in the larger centres, in industrial centres and in St. John's there has been a good deal of confusion because some of the schools open perhaps the first day of September and others open the second and third. Usually it is on the first Monday in September. That is the traditional day for the opening of schools. But there are cases where, if the first Monday happens to be the fifth or sixth then the schools are likely to be opened some other day in the week. But what actually happens is that in a great many of the schools they are closed on Labour Day but others are not, but all the Government offices and all industries and stores are closed. It is what one might call the last family holiday for the summer, and the Government has been approached on many occasions and by organized labour to have this set aside as a school holiday. To do that some legislation was necessary. It could not very well be voluntary, otherwise the

confusion would continue to exist. So we discussed it in the Department of Education and with the councils of education, which automatically includes the denominational heads.

MR. BROWNE: Have they been consulted about this?

DR. ROWE: Oh yes!

MR. BROWNE: I asked a moment ago how many days are ordered by the Government to be observed as school holidays, are there any?

DR. ROWE: I will tell the honourable gentleman in just a moment.

MR. HOLLETT: Perhaps he could tell us how many school days there are.

DR. ROWE: One hundred and eighty-seven.

MR. HOLLETT: I remember when there was two hundred and twenty.

DR. ROWE: Well, the honourable gentleman's memory goes back further than mine. I think it was two hundred when I started. The point I would make is that it is still one hundred and eighty-seven days. Labour Day to be observed as a holiday does not change the actual number of days. You see the days on which the schools are open depend not on the Government but on the boards of education. For example Roman Catholic Boards have closed on days the others are open and vice-versa. There are days, for example, when Protestant schools have a holiday to celebrate a championship.

MR. BROWNE: That does not happen very often.

DR. ROWE: It happened quite often this year. This does not change the number of days, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: The Minister did not tell me what are the days.

MR. CURTIS: It is in the Act. Here they are.

MR. BROWNE: Are there any private schools or schools considered as private schools?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: If so have they been consulted?

DR. ROWE: This applies to schools which come under the Education Act.

MR. BROWNE: It does not apply to the university.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To educational institutions which come under the Act. This Bill amends the Act covering certain schools and the amendment covers only the schools covered in the main Act, which rules out private schools.

MR. BROWNE: Well, this order coming from the Government that schools shall not be opened on Labour Day. It is not worded like that in regard to any other holiday. Why is not the same language used?

DR. ROWE: The honourable gentleman is correct. There is no other part of the Act which says that schools must be closed on such a day.

MR. BROWNE: Well, why not use the wording you have in the other there, instead of that you are going to have some days compulsory holidays in the school. Perhaps there might be other days more valuable than Labour Day to be declared as holidays and more important.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I never thought I would sit here in this House and hear the honourable and learned member for St. John's

South utter such complete heresy as he has uttered this afternoon in connection with what must surely be his basic views. Now I happen to know, and it is a matter of some rather widespread knowledge, he is a great admirer of Belloc and Chesterton. They must be turning over in their graves this afternoon to hear him complain there are too many holidays. Why these men were the great exponents of the idea that the world has gone wrong, in departing from the era when there were two hundred holidays a year, holy days or holidays, call them what you like, two hundred a year when they danced around the Maypole, the principal occupation in life enjoying one's half. And here he comes in this afternoon, an admirer of Belloc, a follower of Belloc and Chesterton, and says there are too many holidays. I cannot understand the honourable gentleman. He is not consistent.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the Premier is shifting the position—What I am saying is that this is the first time that the Government has declared any particular holiday to be observed, and I am asking why it is adopted in this fashion. Why is it different?

MR. HOLLETT: I do not think the honourable member said he was objecting to a holiday on Labour Day nor that he was objecting to any other holidays but he is objecting to the wording—Read it—Labour Day shall be observed as a day of vacation in every school and any school session held on that day shall not be counted for any of the purposes of this Act. In other words if a teacher down in Englee or up in Burin holds school on that day—mind you everybody works there—everybody is out fishing fishing every day of the year, and it may be an opportunity for the teacher

in that particular place to hold school that day and not hold it later or on an earlier day. But if she happens to hold school on that day in one of these fishing settlements down in Bonavista North perhaps, where everyone is out fishing and nobody bothers about Labour Day because they labour every day, fishermen have to labour every day clear of stormy weather when they cannot get out, but because she happens to hold school she does not get paid—Now that is what my honourable friend is objecting to, not objecting but rather raising the point.

DR. ROWE: That is entirely true, Mr. Chairman. We do not say school shall not be held on Good Friday nor Christmas Day although I never heard of any school opening on Good Friday nor Christmas Day, nevertheless in this amendment we suggest Labour Day shall be made a holiday.

MR. HOLLETT: All over the island? We have no objections on this side but to the "shall."

DR. ROWE: It is a departure from the past.

On motion clause carried.

Clause 3:

MR. BROWNE: Could the minister tell us what that it is intended to cover?

DR. ROWE: That is intended to cover Pentecostal Schools not named in the schedule. I think it was three years ago in this House the Pentecostal Services were recognized for school purposes. This provision is put in here in order to take care of that fact. The Pentecostal Assembly is not recognized as a denomination.

On motion clause 3 carried.

Clause 4:

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the minister could tell us why that is so?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to—The Government feels and the Department of Education feels, the council of Education feels that it is not right for a teacher to be a member of the Board of Education; that a teacher should not be a member of the Board of Education which employs him. This situation could arise where the vice-principal or indeed any teacher in a school could be made a member of the Board of Education and therefore would be the employer of his immediate senior in the school. Any teacher in a school could be, by virtue of being a member of the Board, the employer of the principal. It would create an intolerable situation in the opinion of all who have ever gone into the matter. As a matter of fact—I will be quite frank—I think honourable gentlemen know that last year it was recommended to us that a teacher, not a principal, but a teacher be made a member of the Board of Education which employed him. And when I refused as Minister to recommend it to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council I did it of course on the advice of the Council of Education. I would have done it anyway but I did it on the advice of the council, which, as I pointed out earlier, includes all the denominations. The Board came back and asked, by what right do you refuse. I said: by right of the Law. They said: there is nothing in the Act that a teacher may not be a member. I refused, as I had the right as minister to refuse, the recommendation given me. Nevertheless after consulting on the matter we felt that the minister should not be placed in that position. We felt it was undesirable anyway for a teacher to be a member of the Board em-

ploying him. It could create all kinds of serious situations especially in more remote places in the Province where so often the Board of Education is only one man in practise. It could cause all kinds of complications and is fraught with danger of one kind and another. We thought we had better take the bull by the horns and bring in this amendment to prevent any teacher from being made a member of the Board of Education.

MR. HOLLETT: I understand that far, but referring to the section: A person who is employed as a teacher by a Board of Education, a common board, a committee or other governing body constituted by or under this Act shall not while he is so employed be appointed a member of that Board of Education, common board, committee or other governing body."

DR. ROWE: The reference there, if I may, Mr. Chairman, is that elsewhere in the Act it is possible to set up common board, committees or some other bodies to administer schools and that is why it is included there.

MR. HOLLETT: A committee can employ?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He cannot be a member. I am sure the honourable Leader of the Opposition is aware of the fact that in the eight years we have been here we have never yet brought any education legislation before this House that has not been already referred to and received the approval of the Council of Education, which is the body in which the recognized religious denominations are recognized in Law for educational purposes and are thoroughly and officially and formally represented. The fact that this Bill is in here is in itself evidence that it has been approved by the denominations. We do not

bring any legislation in here until first it has been approved by the denominations.

MR. HOLLETT: I hope the Honourable the Premier is not inferring that any legislation brought in here at the suggestion of the Council of Education has to be approved by this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, far from it.

DR. ROWE: May I say the Council of Education is made up of several superintendents of education plus the deputy minister plus the minister. And in actual practise if the minister and deputy minister for example, were opposed to it it would never, I am sure, leave the Council room.

MR. HOLLETT: It has to be approved by the Cabinet, I take it.

DR. ROWE: Oh yes! I might say apropos to what the Premier said, that, applies to every piece of legislation we have here. There has been no Opposition from any source to any thing we bring in here.

On motion clause 4 carried—Clauses 5, 6, 7, 8 carried.

Motion, that the committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried.

On motion the Committee recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Chairman returned to the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Education (Teacher's Training) Act."

Motion, that the committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Companies (Licensing) Act."

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps we had better just pass this over until the minister is here. If there is any point the honourable members wish to question I think we ought to let it stand.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, may I ask who is the superintendent of insurance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Channing, the Deputy Minister of Provincial Affairs because of the fact when he was Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance, Mr. Marshall was superintendent of insurance and Mr. Channing was his assistant and assisted him very closely in all insurance work. When he himself was appointed deputy minister and we wanted to pile more work on him in that department we passed all insurance matters over to him. He is the superintendent of insurance.

MR. HOLLETT: Is he appointed under some Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know but I imagine so. At least we thought we had authority and I fancy we did.

MR. CURTIS: It is a statutory appointment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is the superintendent and his appointment is under authority of an Act of this House and he is appointed by Order in Council.

MR. HOLLETT: If that is the case it is alright.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Incidentally, he is doing a very good job.

MR. BROWNE: When is he going to give another report?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I suppose he makes an annual report.

MR. BROWNE: We only had one in the last three years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know if the Act calls for an annual report. He is a very good man.

MR. FORSEY: On one thing this Act does not seem to go far enough. While it permits a person guilty of rebates or attempted rebate to receive a fine it does not stop that person from carrying on and resume selling. I think some clause should be put in whereby this person's license should be revoked.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It says in section 2 (sub-section 6) on top of page two that the superintendent without assigning any reason may cancel or revoke or refuse to renew or refuse to issue. He has that power anyway.

Motion, that the committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting the Policies of Accident and Sickness Insurance."

On motion clause 1 read:

1. This Act may be cited as The Accident and Sickness Insurance Act, 1957.

MR. HOLLETT: I had a policy, double indemnity at one time. I have it no longer. I cashed it and spent it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would not dare carry double indemnity insurance.

MR. HOLLETT: "Double indemnity insurance" means insurance undertaken by an insurer as part of a life insurance contract whereby the terms of the policy provide for the duration of such insurance for more than one year and for payment only in the event of the death of the insured by accident of an additional amount of insurance money not ex-

ceeding the amount payable in the event of death by other causes. It does not say, but the amount, as I remember now, is double indemnity which meant getting back exactly double what a person was insured for. But this does not mean that at all.

MR. FORSEY: This is not intended to bind the insurance companies.

MR. HOLLETT: You are an insurance man, good, what is the answer?

MR. FORSEY: It means according to circumstances—If death occurs by purely accidental means it is double the amount of the policy—you get double the basic amount of your policy.

MR. HOLLETT: This section does not say so.

MR. FORSEY: It is not the intention of this Act to limit the insurance companies surely. I never did like the law where a superintendent of insurance can revoke a license without giving a reason. I think that is dangerous.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to see this clause make it absolutely certain that a person would get double the amount that he was insured for.

MR. FORSEY: His policy makes that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That makes it double—This is an additional amount equal to but not exceeding the amount he would get from a normal clause—it is an amount equal to but not exceeding. That is double indemnity.

MR. HOLLETT: He could get two hundred dollars more and still carry out that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes it does not say "less than." It is "not more than" here.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I do not think the insured is going to get anything. It is the beneficiary is going to get it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It means what it says, and it does not say "not less than double" but "not more than double." Suppose they decide to give one quarter?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is rather difficult to know who has the floor if honourable members won't stand when making remarks. I would like them to do that, please!

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I understood by double indemnity he would get twice as much in case of accident.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The question at this stage is not what the clause means but the way it is worded.

MR. CURTIS: There might be a thousand dollar policy with an extra indemnity of five hundred dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The law says insurance companies are permitted to insure for double indemnity and such policies may pay up to but not in excess of double. But can they also issue policies paying one-quarter more or half more or three-quarters more? It only fixes a maximum. They have authority to issue up to double indemnity but not in excess.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman. following out the suggestion of standing I do so now—I think there is a little confusion. I think the honourable Leader of the Opposition is talking about double indemnity in life insurance. This Bill is on sickness and accident insurance which is en-

tirely a different thing. This has nothing to do with policies of life insurance. These are policies of accident and sickness insurance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is to cover cases of death.

MR. CURTIS: This is a life insurance clause—It says double indemnity.

MR. FORSEY: If that be so, Mr. Chairman,—I address myself to you, Sir, it should be an Act Respecting Policies of Accident and Sickness and Life Insurance. Surely the life insurance companies are not bound by this Act to observe that clause.

MR. HOLLETT: It does not matter to me very much. I do not intend to take any more double indemnity. Still I think there is something wrong there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In 2 (a) It specifically excludes death except death by accident. This Act I may say is a straight copy of an Act prepared by the Association of Insurance Superintendents of all the Governments across Canada. They have an organization. They drafted this model legislation and all the provinces just automatically enact it into law. That is what we are attempting to do here now. This is not our drafting. This is drafted by the Association of Insurance Superintendents, of ten provinces meeting jointly and assisted by solicitors and insurance legislation experts and headed by the Superintendents of Insurance of the Government of Canada.

MR. HOLLETT: Did we have that explanation before. I thought it was a Government Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a Government Bill, yes.

MR. FORSEY: My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, is confusing accident and sickness insurance with life insurance. We are not dealing with double indemnity in life insurance here at all, where you get ordinary life insurance or double in case of accidental death.

MR. HOLLETT: The legislation does not set out to make a floor. It sets out to make a ceiling. In other words it is lawful to pay up to double but not lawful to pay more than double.

MR. HOLLETT: The policy itself will take care of it.

MR. CURTIS: A life insurance policy allows double indemnity on certain terms but if it goes beyond that it is not looked upon as life insurance but becomes accident and sickness policy. In the life insurance Act you can have double indemnity. It need not be double. It may be additional indemnity. It may be a hundred dollars in case of measles, as my honourable friend has, or one hundred or two hundred for breaking a leg. It just has additional indemnity but it shall not exceed the double indemnity.

MR. HOLLETT: It is understandable an ordinary person gets insured and is told he has a double indemnity policy—is it clearly outlined in the policy exactly what he would get?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course it is—in small print—

MR. HOLLETT: Very small print.

MR. FORSEY: Not too small, Sir, I object to that as a salesman—It is a great selling feature.

MR. HOLLETT: You are not a salesman in here. No company selling life insurance in Newfoundland today

sells that, sells double indemnity, not twice the amount of the policy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The law says no company pays more than double. Not exceeding, that means no more than.

MR. HOLLETT: I quite understand—It does not mean they have to pay double.

MR. CURTIS: It is only an interpretation clause.

MR. BROWNE: That is one of the points I raised about civil service insurance—and I raise it again—This looks as if it were a fraternal society—In this definition where a society is incorporated for the purpose of making with its members only and not for profit contracts of life, accident or sickness insurance under which benefits may be paid only to its members or their beneficiaries in accordance with its constitution and laws and the provisions of this Act. So that is alright, yes.

On motion clause 2 carried.

Clause 3:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this is one of the points I raised while on second reading: The Civil Service has a co-operative society, accident and sickness, and they are not exempted here. They have to fulfill all the formalities which have never been necessary up to the present time. I ask that that stand until we get the exact position from the minister.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly! There is no desire to make any difference for them or anything like that.

Motion, that clause 3 stand, carried.

On motion clauses 4 through 10 carried. Clause 11:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, is there any particular reason why twenty-five years is mentioned. I suppose they have to take some date and put it at that. That would be about the time a man would be through college and his career commences.

On motion clauses 11 through 14 carried. Clause 15:

MR. BROWNE: There is a section where I raised a question—How could it be inserted here at all. I do not think that anybody in this country ever heard of anybody under the age of fifteen getting married and having a family.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I heard of a case the other day of a boy of fifteen and a girl fourteen getting married here in Newfoundland. I was quite surprised when I heard of it.

MR. BROWNE: I never did—Well I am learning something here. What does this section 15 replace? Does it mean that up to this time nobody had the right to take out life insurance until they attained the age of twenty-one? Does anybody know?

MR. FORSEY: It is to bring it within uniformity with other Provinces of Canada. All the other provinces had the same regulations whereby a person fifteen years of age may procure insurance on his life. Say a fellow of sixteen went out to work, he does not have to have the consent of his mother and father.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What was the case before this?

MR. FORSEY: Before this we have had no regulations respecting it whatsoever. Once we became a province of Canada we went under the Federal Regulations.

MR. BROWNE: No, that has nothing to do with it. It is a matter of contract. A person under 21 years of age cannot sign a contract. He should be protected against the wiles of insurance agents.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let us say the persuasiveness.

MR. McGRATH: I would like to tell the honourable member that only the other day we had an application for free benefit services for a maternity case under the Children's Health Act.

MR. BROWNE: Under sixteen.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the word "capacity" has been defined in the Act. What is the meaning of "capacity"?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is strictly a legal term.

MR. CURTIS: Legally allowed to do it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Attorney General if the law officers have given consideration to this Bill?

MR. CURTIS: I think so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No legislation ever comes to the Cabinet except directly from the Attorney General's office and does not come from there until it is most carefully either drafted or if someone else drafted.

MR. BROWNE: It is investigated very carefully?

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if someone having knowledge of insurance matters would tell me the meaning of that word "Capacity"?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Trying to start something now—Ask for a commission demanding an explanation in advance.

MR. FORSEY: I am quite sure a person of fifteen is quite capable of deciding his own affairs. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would think back to when he was a boy of fifteen he would know whether he was capable of doing it or not.

MR. HOLLETT: I do not think that has any meaning whatsoever.

MR. CURTIS: "Capacity" has no meaning.

MR. HOLLETT: In this instance.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, why is it being brought in. It seems to me to open up a field for exploitation of children and a father might easily find himself saddled with life insurance that he would have to pay or the money be lost.

MR. CURTIS: The father would not have to pay it. It does not have to be paid by anyone.

MR. BROWNE: He may be considered embarrassed by this sort of thing if his son goes and takes out life insurance and the father does not approve of it he would have to see it is paid or the money would be lost and cannot be recovered.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That happens every day.

MR. BROWNE: I do not think under the insurance at the present time they can do it under twenty-one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It happens with adults.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, when I was in my district I went into home after home and found not a voter in the home, a man and wife, a couple of children, not old enough to vote.

MR. BROWNE: Reduce the voting age to settle that.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, we might allow everyone married to vote. It seems strange to see a man and wife and children and not a vote in the home. It seems to me unfair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Especially if they are Liberal.

MR. CURTIS: Quite seriously, a man under twenty-one years of age has a wife and child, why not have a life insurance. The wife has just as much need for protection as if he were twenty-one. Therefore he should have the right to effect a contract to insure himself and to insure his wife and children if he wants to. I am inclined to think this is a proper clause.

MR. FORSEY: I might add there no danger of that—The Honourable Member for St. John's South must think insurance men are stupid to try and railroad a boy of fifteen into a policy. After all he probably had his family as clients before. In the business of life insurance there is a very high standard. It could not survive without it.

MR. BROWNE: I know they are well behaved. But there are some unscrupulous people in every profession, and it may be possible an unscrupulous person would get loose amongst a group of boys and have them all written up. However, I know there must be some reason why the Province of Quebec, which is one of the largest Provinces of Canada have not accepted it.

MR. FORSEY: That I may answer is because they carry the old French Laws in Quebec. They never drifted from it too much. But getting back to the point again, I do not think there is any need of any fear. Before the Life Insurance Company accepts a life insurance application from an

agent an independent report is made as to the character of the person, ability to pay. And if there is no financial means to pay the policy will not be issued by the company, although the agent collected the first payment.

MR. HOLLETT: I still have not received an answer to the question. What is meant by a minor after attaining the age of fifteen having the capacity?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He has the capacity to effect a contract, to deal with a contract to deal with his insurance, and if married to effect a contract for his wife—That is what it means—he has the capacity.

MR. W. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, as far as this Act deals with legal capacity of a minor it seems to go further than any other Act on the Statute Book at the present time.

MR. HOLLETT: Hear! Hear!

MR. W. SMALLWOOD: A minor after attaining the age of fifteen has the capacity of a person of full age. Now I do suggest, Mr. Chairman, capacity in this sense means legal capacity and sub-section (a) says to effect a contract on his own life or well being and to deal with the contract. Now come back again to Section 10 sub-section (1) and (2) It says—The insurer may deduct the unpaid premium from the amount which it may become liable under the contract or may sue the amount which it may become liable under the contract or may sue the insured therefor. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do suggest that Section 15 gives a minor the capacity to sue and to be sued for life insurance premiums. I think, Mr. Chairman, that as far as I know no act on the Statutes Book has gone that far dealing with the legal capacity of minors.

MR. HOLLETT: I am very glad the honourable member for Green Bay has stated that. That is the very point I was trying to arrive at. It just says he has the capacity. If it had said the legal capacity—it dare not say that because it would be a contradiction to all laws ever heard of. It just says he has the capacity. It does not say has the legal capacity at all. Any boy of fifteen may sign a contract or girl either.

MR. FORSEY: Clause 10 eliminated any doubt the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is speaking about. I think the Honourable member for Green Bay will bear me out, when a policy is delivered—that is what will apply. Certainly no life insurance company nor accident insurance company doing business in Newfoundland would permit the delivery of policies unless there is a full payment whether quarterly, monthly or yearly. An agent is not permitted by the company to do that. So how could a policy be delivered or legal action be taken.

MR. BROWNE: I think we really should have more information on it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let it stand—If we find out it is common right across Canada what have we to worry about. If they have had it in effect for the last five years what would be wrong with our adopting it too?

Motion, that clause 15 stand, carried.

On motion clause 16 carried. Clauses 17 through 21 carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is quite evident we are not going to get through before six o'clock. I assume the Opposition would want to carry on through the night. We are willing to accommodate ourselves to them.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in regard to that section there. May I

say that I think we should have some precedent for that because, up to two thousand dollars may be paid over to a relative—Sometimes it seems to me or very often there is disagreement in families. And I think without having someone with experience or some province having had experience with this provision we should not pass it into effect.

MR. CURTIS: If the contract so provides—in line three—

MR. BROWNE: I had it underlined, and I missed that. It means without taking out administration.

On motion clauses 22 through 27 carried. Clause 28:

MR. BROWNE: That is an important provision, is it not? Is it necessary to have that there—all these sections apply when this Act comes into force—

MR. FORSEY: May I ask at this time if this Act binds solely to sickness and accident? This has no bearing on life insurance except where it combines the accident and sickness part of life insurance policies? It has no bearing on purely life insurance policies, has it?

MR. HOLLETT: It is a death insurance policy.

MR. FORSEY: I mean this only applies to the accident and disability part of life insurance, and the contract does not apply to the principal contract itself.

MR. HOLLETT: Has this Act been approved by the Attorney General's staff?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, and not only that—it won't come into force until we say so.

On motion clauses 28 through 30 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: If I may, I want to go into the minister's right of examining the insurer. In other words the insurer has the right to demand and to undertake an autopsy without the consent or otherwise of the relatives.

MR. CURTIS: Is not that reasonable? One of the relatives might have killed him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then the Crown should have the right not an insurance company. Could we not also have this schedule stand. It is nearly six o'clock. If that is the case all across Canada, after all—

MR. HOLLETT: Never mind Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well it is a big country.

Motion, that the schedule be permitted to stand, carried.

Motion, that the committee rise report progress and ask leave to sit again, carried.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have considered Bills No. 17 and 19, "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act; No. 20, "An Act Further to Amend the Education (Teachers' Training) Act and No. 22 "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act," and directs me to report same without amendment.

On motion report received, bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have con-

sidered Bill No. 22 "An Act Further to Amend the Welfare of Children Act," and directs me to report the same with some amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and considered Bill No. 22, "An Act Respecting Policies of Accident and Sickness Insurance and direct me to report progress and beg leave to sit again.

On motion committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

On motion of Mr. Curtis all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred, and the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday, at three of the clock.

WEDNESDAY, May 1, 1957

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

Presenting Petitions

HON. DR. J. MCGRATH (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask your advice as to the disposal of a petition I have here. This is a petition signed by citizens of the Province, so described, which relates to the Dental Bill. Now the Dental Bill is now in the hands of a Committee, at Your Honour's direction. Should this petition be submitted to the House or referred to that Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member can submit it to the House, I would say, and refer it to the Committee.

MR. McGRATH: I should like to present it to the House with the comment; I have no knowledge of the individual signing it, but it is a petition asking the passage of this Bill be stayed.

On motion petition received for reference to the Select Committee at the present time considering this Bill.

Presenting Reports of Standing Select Committees

None.

Notices of Motion

None.

Notice of Questions

Notice of Questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Jones.

Answers to Questions

QUESTION No. 89 (See Appendix for question and answers).

MR. McGRATH: This is an average taken for a particular day, but it runs close to the average for last year—General Hospital 397 patients; St. John's Sanatorium 389 patients; Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases 944, etc.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Might I ask the Honourable Minister if that number 940, includes out-patients?

DR. McGRATH: No, resident patients only.

MR. HIGGINS: May I ask the Minister, in connection with the number of patients for the Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases, does the position still obtain that there is not enough accommodation for people certified for admission. One hears that at the present time magistrates and others have people on their hands certified by doctors for admission and

there is no room available and they sometimes have to be kept in the magistrate's jail and the penitentiary?

DR. McGRATH: Yes, that is the position. There are quite a number of people who sometimes have to wait quite a long time for admission to the Mental Hospital. There is definite need for an increase in the accommodations.

Orders of the Day

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to announce to the House some changes in the Ministry as follows: The Honourable the Member for Trinity South to be Minister of Public Welfare; The Honourable the Member for St. Barbe District to be Minister of Highways; The Honourable the member for Gander to be Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply; and I am taking again the portfolio of Minister of Economic Development, without salary. Mr. Speaker, these Ministers were all sworn by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor at 1:00 o'clock today, and the new appointments are effective immediately. The Ministers in question, of course, resigned the portfolio they held up to that time, just before lunch today.

Having that announcement made I now, Mr. Speaker, with the forbearance of the House move, seconded by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the honourable member for Carbonear, Bay De Verde do be or become the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, I so move.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in seconding the motion relative to the Deputy Speaker. I know of him, I know of his people and I know how much he is

respected by the people whom he has served so faithfully and well during the past number of years.

Motion, that Mr. George W. Clarke, the honourable member for Carbonar-Bay De Verde do take the Chair as Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker, carried:

Unanimously.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before we enter upon the Orders of the Day I would like to address a question to the Premier—Would he tell the House how the series of negotiations are going on at the present time between the following organizations: Javelin & Co.; NALCO; Pickands Mather; Harriman Ripley & Co., of New York?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, no negotiations are proceeding between the Government and the firm of Harriman Ripley Incorporated, New York City. The vice-president of that company was in St. John's yesterday in his capacity of director of NALCO to attend meetings of the shareholders and the directors of NALCO. That explains his presence here. It is the only connection so far as I know between his firm, Harriman Ripley and Newfoundland. In so far as NALCO, Javelin and Pickands Mathers are concerned it is true that negotiations have been conducted and are being conducted. These negotiations have not as yet come before the Government as a whole. They are more in the nature of discussions and lawyers here and there are in Cleveland, in Montreal and in St. John's are making a strenuous effort, I am told, to draft a number of agreements between these companies, and the Attorney General's office is in very close touch with them and certain legislation is being drafted. None of these things, legislation, agreements or

any of them have as yet come before the Government as a whole. When they complete the drafting of the agreement and have signed the agreement or are ready to sign it and the legislation that has been drafted or will have been drafted at that time is thought to be necessary to give effect to these agreements the whole of them will be brought before the Government as a whole and if the Government as a whole agrees with them they will be brought before this House.

Now the lawyers concerned appear to believe that they can have it, all these documents, ready for the presentation to the Government next week. They have been at it for some eight or ten weeks, I believe, already and claim to be nearing the end. I will not even attempt to forecast the probable reaction of the Government. This only I will say, that if these documents are all completed and agreements are made and draft legislation is prepared and are all agreed to by the Government and are brought before this House, the House itself would be given all the time reasonably needed. I don't mean to say if they want to spend the rest of the year here we would be agreeable to that, but all the time that ordinary commonsense would suggest as necessary to consider will be given, so far as we are concerned on this side of the House.

Now the whole thing is very, very big. It is very big. It gives some promise of being one of the biggest things ever to come before a Government and a Legislature of Newfoundland—I say it gives promise of that—I have not read any of the agreements. I have been informed from time to time for weeks and indeed for months past of the general character of the

negotiations, the general purpose of the agreements, the general project that is being worked up for development of some of our natural resources. If they are what I have been told then it will undoubtedly be one of the biggest things ever to come to Newfoundland. I do not know that I can add a word to that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question of the Premier? In view of the importance of these negotiations will the Premier tell us who is representing the Government of Newfoundland in this matter and who is representing NALCO and have they legal consultants?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Actually, Mr. Speaker, no negotiations are in fact proceeding between the Government on the one hand and anyone else on the other. In these matters discussions are taking place—No actual negotiations have taken place involving the Government; negotiations are taking place between Javelin Limited on the one hand and Pickands Mathers Incorporated of Cleveland on the other hand, the latter acting as Leader and spokesman for certain other very large industrial interests in North America. No actual negotiations have taken place between NALCO and these interests, discussions, certainly, no negotiations—When, if and when negotiations come to be inaugurated, to be conducted, then the Government clearly will equip itself with the best advice that it may feel that it is necessary at that time.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, a final question—Would the Premier give the House any assurance that no further concessions will emanate from NALCO Organization without approval of the House of Assembly?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I could not give any assurance even remotely re-

sembling that. If today some reputable mining company came here and asked NALCO for a concession of searching for minerals on its area of developing these minerals—That is all NALCO has and all it can give is a sub-concession from its own concession—If today any reputable concern came here seeking a sub-concession from NALCO we would very happily enter into negotiations with them and very happily make an agreement with them giving them the sub-concession as we have done for the last four years. When I say we I mean NALCO. NALCO has given concessions or sub-concessions to some of the finest companies in North America and will continue to do so as long as we own most of NALCO. Now if my honourable friend is thinking of something altogether different from what is covered by the words "concessions or sub-concession" if he means selling the shares that we have in NALCO or if he means—

MR. BROWNE: Control.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or the parting with control then I am happy to give him the assurance not only would we not but we could not do so without legislation passed by this House. Notwithstanding this power, if we have it, we would not use it. We would come back to the House in connection with any marked change in the status of NALCO and ask the House for its authority to do what we propose doing.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words, Mr. Speaker, we can take this assurance from the Honourable the Premier that the control of NALCO now in the Government will remain there until such time as the matter is brought before this House. What may happen after that is another matter.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course—The answer is “of course.” Now my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, will understand that if it were the policy of the Government to sell NALCO we would negotiate to the end. We would draw an agreement to that end and we would sign the agreement, but the whole thing would be then subject to this House passing it. In other words, that is the normal procedure, you negotiate your bargain, your project, make the bargain, sign the agreement, but all that is not worth the paper it is written on until it is ratified by this House and was brought before the House as an agreement which the Government seeks to have ratified. The House then ratifies it or not, and in debate the matter is thoroughly ventilated.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, that is the very point I was getting at. I want assurance that the Government would not negotiate nor sign such an agreement until the matter had been brought before the House and discussed and aired. I could go into more detail but I am not allowed at this time. I wanted assurance that the Government would not be committed, would not sign any such give-away if you like, to some other concern before the matter had been discussed. Because we know—and there again I cannot go on because Mr. Speaker would hold me up—The Premier has told me how they are prepared to go ahead and sign an agreement with somebody about the disposal of NALCO before they came here. That is the point I am very sorry to hear.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to labour this—but surely the Leader of the Opposition knows that there is no other way in which a Government can govern, the Government is a Government. The House of

Assembly is the House of Assembly. The Government is the executive governing body of the Province and it governs. Now certain of its actions are lawful only when this House confirms them—We can negotiate—if that should become the Government's policy—to negotiate—It is not, and I hope the Honourable Leader of the Opposition notes the tense—it is not the intention of the Government to sell NALCO nor to part with its control of NALCO. It may become the policy of the Government to do so, it will naturally negotiate on that matter, and if it finally decides as a result of it that the thing is suitable and appropriate and a bargain to do so it will sign the bargain, and that bargain will not be worth the paper it is written on—can I make that any clearer—that bargain will not be worth the paper it is written on until and unless this House ratifies it. What we bring to the House is a definite bargain made for the House and the documents will contain in its wording words to the effect that this is not worth the paper it is written on until first the House of Assembly of Newfoundland passes it. Now if that is not giving the House complete control then I do not know what control means.

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Premier when the annual report of NALCO will be available?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The practice has been now for the last four or five years, however long NALCO has lived, to submit to the House the annual report shortly after the annual meeting—and that will be done.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, arising out of the exchange between the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier or between myself and him, could he tell us why Canadian Javelin

and Pickands Mather are meeting here rather than say in Montreal?

MR. SMALLWOOD: To be frank I cannot. I think they have met in Cleveland for weeks. I think they had then subsequent meetings in Montreal for a further length of time and now they are meeting in St. John's. They are scheduled to go today but for the fact that fog prevented their plane from taking off, and it is tied up. They are going to resume negotiations in Montreal and possibly in Cleveland and then come back here again on Wednesday next to negotiate with each other and then to take up also negotiations with the Government.

MR. BROWNE: And NALCO.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And NALCO.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Premier or the Attorney General just where is registered BRINEX or British Newfoundland Exploration Company.

MR. CURTIS: BRINEX, Mr. Speaker, it is registered in Ottawa as a Dominion Company.

MR. BROWNE: When was it formed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: About a year ago.

MR. BROWNE: Last session but one.

MR. CURTIS: When you say last session—Do Dominion Companies have to register by Acts of Parliament? Has there not to be a register in Ottawa?

MR. BROWNE: It has to be incorporated by an Act of Parliament.

MR. CURTIS: I don't think so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: About two years ago the company was formed, a

purely subsidiary, wholly owned by BRINCO, to conduct explorations and make partnerships dealing with all kinds of other minerals. Their feeling about that is with so large an area they might not, even though they spend millions of dollars, be able in fact to explore all of their concessions. Therefore the company was formed as an exploration branch dealing with minerals and their concessions and to form deals and partnerships with other mining companies in North America to take bits and pieces of their concessions. In other words instead of explorations being carried out on BRINCO's concessions by BRINCO alone the idea was to bring in all kinds of mining companies each taking bits and pieces of BRINCO concessions and each in partnership with BRINEX. BRINEX was formed for that purpose.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask the Honourable the Premier who are the directors of BRINEX?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am afraid I do not know—It is wholly owned by BRINCO therefore its directors would be probably in the main just employees of BRINCO although some of the directors of BRINCO might very well be directors of BRINEX. But for the most part BRINEX is really a sort of active mineral exploration department of BRINCO but with this difference that they can make actual contracts with various mining companies. BRINCO deals with water power, with timber, with minerals. It might be willing to have partners with itself in water power, it might be willing to have partners with itself in timber and not willing to have partners with itself in minerals but willing to have partners with its wholly owned subsidiary. In other words, if my honourable friend made a contract

tomorrow with BRINEX for joint exploration of part of BRINCO's concessions he would not then be a partner of BRINCO. He would then be a partner of the wholly owned subsidiary of BRINCO. In other words he would have nothing to do with the development of the Hamilton River Watershed or the development of any timber on BRINCO's concessions but would have something to do with a particular mineral development. That is the whole purpose of this BRINEX. Is that clear?

MR. HOLLETT: Not quite clear yet. If you will forgive me, Sir—We have given a concession to BRINCO of a considerable area. BRINCO in my opinion is the company who could make an agreement with some other company. I am wondering why we are going to be asked to make an agreement with a wholly owned subsidiary of BRINCO. Why should not BRINCO make the deal with BRINEX, we having made the deal with BRINCO. I wonder would the Premier explain.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is not the time to explain. Wait until the second reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that would be the best time.

Before the House takes up the Orders of the Day I wonder if I might congratulate the honourable member for Carbonear Bay de Verte on his unanimous election as Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker. I wish him well in his new job, a job which I held for eight years, I can assure him that it has its moments when it is a most satisfying position. Now having been elected unanimously he can depend on the full support of all members of the House and on any help we all can give him.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted to express my humble thanks to the mover and second of this motion appointing me as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees and you, Sir, for your very kind remarks and all the honourable members of the House for endorsing it unanimously.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: This being Wednesday private members' motions receive preference. We have two here, (1) the second reading of a Bill—"An Act to Regulate the Election of Trustees of Lands and Chattels for the Queen's Road Presbyterian Church in St. John's." I believe that was moved by the honourable member for Placentia West.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill calling for very little explanation. The principle of it, Sir, is to empower the Board of Trustees of Queen's Road Presbyterian Church to take over property originally belonging to the Congregational Church here in St. John's. In short, Sir, it is to give the Board legal right to control of the property. Last year the Congregational Church entered into union with the United Church of Canada and at that time no provision was made for the passing over of the property of the Church. The property was originally controlled by the Board of Trustees who controlled the affairs of the Congregational Church, but owing to the death of some of the members and some other members becoming absorbed, I think, in the Board of the United Church, that Board has become inoperative. The trustees of the Presbyterian Church are requesting the House to pass this Bill, the Presbyterian Church

of Queen's Road, St. John's, to enable them to take over control of that property and legally dispose of it according as the trustees see fit.

I move, Sir, the second reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Who is seconding this motion?

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I second the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Seconded by the honourable member for Fogo, the motion is that this Bill be now read a second time.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member is replying I wonder would he tell us who are the trustees of the Presbyterian Church, or who are sponsoring the Bill?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this Bill I would like to say that there is absolutely no objection from this side of the House, and for one reason particularly, and that is that it has been introduced by a member who undoubtedly is an authority on church matters, all church matters of all churches, shall I say, in Newfoundland. I am happy therefore to support it and I know that he would not introduce a Bill which would be detrimental to any churches in this country. It is so unusual to bring in Bills concerning churches. I am happy to see that the honourable member for Placentia West has introduced that and has done it in a fine manner—Certainly I support it in every respect.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of all the members, but I will supply them when the Bill goes into Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPEAKER: It is in a petition, and the Bill will go to a Select Com-

mittee now if it is passed by the House.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Select Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: I will name the Select Committee now—The honourable member for Placentia West; the Honourable member for Bonavista South; the honourable member for Fogo; the honourable member for White Bay; the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. This Select Committee has a week in which to sit and bring in its report.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend The Maritime Hospital Services Association, Re-Incorporation Act, 1949."

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill, Sir, is to authorize this organization to carry on its activities in the province of Newfoundland in conformity with that carried on in other Provinces. The organization, Sir, has had their Bill amended in the recent months in the Legislative Assembly of the other provinces in order to widen its scope of activity. This Bill, Sir, is for the exact purpose now, the association, Sir, asks the right to enter into contracts with groups or employees or employers for hospital services and so on for the purpose of contributing to the cost of services required by members of the association, act as agent for such groups and the right to charge fees to carry on their work. They request rights to purchase property or real estate, to provide for pensions for their retired employees and finally, Sir, the association requests the right, the sole right, to use the symbols, the American Hospital Association Blue Shield, Blue Cross, or any of their successors. The Association has had these rights grant-

ed, Sir, in the other Maritime Provinces. This Bill is just a matter of conformity, to bring Newfoundland on the same basis and for them to have the same powers in the Province of Newfoundland as they have in the other Maritime Provinces.

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

MR. MIFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I second this motion.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I happened to see in the report of the proceedings in the Legislature Assembly in Halifax the other day where this Bill was going through the Nova Scotia Legislature, and that it was amended to the extent of introducing Optometry, I wonder if the honourable member introducing this Bill is aware that took place. In addition to hospital and medical attention and nursing services there was the providing of optometry. This is a very good organization. I am wondering what the effect is going to be when the Federal Insurance Scheme goes into effect. I presume that some arrangement has been worked out so that this will continue its activities—Perhaps the Minister could tell us?

MR. McGRATH: I think that company would continue some of its activities because the proposed arrangement for health insurance is coming in bit by bit, only hospitalization is contemplated at the present time. Such an association as this would still cover the cost of medical treatment in hospital and so on. There would still be a field for them. Only one portion of their field would be taken over to start with. Eventually I do not see there will be any place in the state for such an organization as this. That will obviously be a number of years

before their function is taken away from them.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the relevancy of Clause 4—The act shall be deemed to have come into force on the 7th day of April 1951. Why retroactive six years and what is the effect of that.

MR. HIGGINS: They must have done something wrong.

On motion Bill read a second time.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the honourable member for Placentia West would answer that question of the Honourable Minister of Health?

MR. SPEAKER: I am going to put the Honourable Minister of Health on that Select Committee.

On motion Bill read a second time ordered referred to a Select Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: This Bill has now been read a second time, and in pursuance with our Standing Orders I would have it considered by a Select Committee, the Honourable Minister of Health; the honourable member for St. John's South; the honourable member for Placentia West; the honourable member for Trinity North; and the honourable member for Labrador South.

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Corrections Act."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Welfare of Children Act."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill—"An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education (Teachers' Training) Act."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Honourable the Premier asks leave to introduce a Bill—"An Act To Authorize the Government of Newfoundland to Enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Exploration Limited."

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

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill—"An Act to Amend the James M. Boylen (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1955."

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

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill—"An Act To Consolidate the Law Relating to the Raising of Local Taxes for Schools."

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

Second Reading of Bill—"An Act To Provide Assistance for Teachers By Ways of Loans for Certain Purposes."

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, during the past five years it has been my duty to introduce and move for second reading of a number of Bills dealing with a variety of topics. I do not think that any one has given so much pleasure as the one which it is now my responsibility to move for second reading.

This is a Bill—"An Act to Provide Assistance for Teachers By Way of Loans for Certain Purposes." I think I should give the House a brief background leading up to this Bill. It will be recalled that early this year, that is early in this calendar year, the Government through the Department of Education, called a conference to deal with the teacher shortage in Newfoundland. That conference was made up of representatives from the Department of Education, the several Superintendents of Education, the directors of the various divisions with the Department, supervising, inspectors of education who have covered all parts of Newfoundland and are quite familiar with the geography of the different parts of the Province; members of the "NTA," in fact the Newfoundland Teachers' Association had its entire executive present at all the sessions of the conference; the denominational boards of education were represented there, each denomination having at least one chairman of the board; the amalgamated schools were represented there through the association of the amalgamated schools, the Parent Teachers Association was represented as were several other bodies who were vitally concerned in this matter of the teacher shortage. This conference which lasted for four days, during

which a great variety of topics were discussed, and resulted in some forty-nine, I believe was the exact number, of resolutions being adopted for representation to the Department and through the Department to the Government of the Province.

Amongst the resolutions were two which are embodied in this Bill today. (1) It was pointed out in the discussion that a number of Boards of Education, perhaps the majority of them were faced with the ever recurring problem of finding housing accommodations for married teachers. The actual circumstances are familiar I am quite sure to most of the members of this House. A man goes into a community and becomes principal of a five-room school in this community—let us say Wesleyville—After he is there two or three years and has given satisfactory service and the board is anxious to hold on to his services, he gets married and wishes to set up housekeeping. No suitable house is available and he is not in a position to purchase a house. As a matter of fact most teachers are reluctant to engage in the expense of purchasing a house when they are not too sure of the future. Those of us who were teachers faced that over and over again. In a community like Wesleyville or Grand Bank they are not too sure how long they will be in the community. Even if they could afford to make a capital investment they are reluctant to do so when they do not know how long they are going to have their money tied up there. So that if suitable accommodations were not available, with rent, in all probability the teacher concerned moved to some other community where such accommodation were available, and in some cases he left the profession altogether. That is one aspect.

Another aspect of it is that a board may wish to engage the services of a competent teacher particularly experienced as a principal of a school, and so he applies. They offer him a reasonably good salary and he agrees to accept provided they supply him with proper living accommodations. Over and over again it is the man's wife and family who decide whether or not he is going to go to a particular place to accept a teaching post. Over and over again Boards have been faced with this problem.

Now one of the resolutions adopted by the conference was one that the Government should create a teachers' housing fund whereby the Department of Education would be able to advance, not to the teacher but to the Board of Education, sums of money to enable them either to rent vacant homes or to repair or to rebuild homes or to build homes or to purchase homes for their teachers.

That matter was submitted to the Government and the Government agreed, the Government decided to set up such a fund, create such a fund on a modest scale to begin with, because after all these are experiments. As far as we are concerned we believe it will be a tremendous boom to Boards of Education and to teachers. Nevertheless it is being done on a modest scale. The decision of the Government was that ten thousand dollars a year for a period of three years would be supplied to this fund and at the end of that time it was felt that part of the fund at any rate would then be a revolving fund and if necessary it could be enlarged but that perhaps the fund would then be a large enough one to carry on a self-perpetuating basis.

Now this Bill creates the machinery whereby such a fund could be opened.

Another matter brought to the attention of the conference and resulting in a resolution was the difficulty that many teachers have of completing their professional studies particularly those who have become married and have families to support. Now as is well known to the House, the Government through the Department of Education indentures every teacher who wishes to take professional training. But the indenture is for one year only, six hundred dollars, which enables the teacher to go to college to take a course in education for one year only. A teacher may not get a second indenture. Over and over again there are cases through the Province where a teacher has perhaps one year, but because he is married, because he has responsibilities he cannot go back to the university to take a second course. There are teachers who have been able to acquire three years but need the fourth year to obtain their degree. They are unable to obtain the money as there are no longer funds available to them as there are in most provinces and in most states in the western world.

So another resolution was made at the conference and submitted to the Government—That a teachers' loan fund would be set up whereby teachers, deserving teachers, would be enabled to borrow money from this fund to complete their professional studies. Again this Bill here sets up the machinery whereby such a loan fund can be administered. The Government decided that here too a fund would be created on an experimental basis for a period of three years, again with the idea that funds would become self-perpetuating at the end of that time. Ten thousand dollars a year would be provided in the current estimates which will be presented here shortly.

The estimates will contain a provision for ten thousand dollars for a teachers' loan fund. It is the decision of the Government to provide an additional ten thousand each year for three years. So in all the fund will be at least thirty thousand dollars by the end of the third year. We feel that repayments will be in the process of being made for the first loans that have been made both in the housing funds and the other fund. So that it is quite possible that in both cases the thirty thousand dollars which we envisage will be sufficient to permit these funds to be operated. It may well be of course that one of the funds, particularly housing, will have to be enlarged. That is something we shall see in the future. At the present time we feel that ten thousand a year for three years would be the maximum amount we ought to undertake until we see just how it is going to work out.

Now this Bill here, Mr. Speaker, provides for the setting up of two boards to administer respectively these two funds I referred to here today. The board of the housing fund will consist of the four superintendents of education, the Roman Catholic, Church of England, United Church, Salvation Army and also the representative of the Pentecostal Assembly in the Department, and also the officers within the Department whose duty it is to administer the amalgamated schools of the province. So that every phase of education will be represented on this board. There will be regulations made, of course, under this Act—But normally when envisaging something like that a school board will approach the loan board and say: we want a loan of a thousand dollars to renovate a home here which is available to the board and we intend to do that re-

novation and rent the home to the teacher on an economic rental basis. We will make repayments as the money comes in. So that the loan board will make the thousand dollars available to the school board for that purpose on the conditions which will be drawn up later in the regulations. This will not be a hand out in any sense of the word. This is intended to be administered on a strictly economic basis and guarantees of all kinds will be provided, security provided to see that the loan is well looked after. We do not anticipate any difficulty at all. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that both these funds will be administered with strict adherence to the denominational principle. That is the only way we can do it anyway under Terms of Union and the Educational Act. In any case we would not wish to cause any differential in this, which would only be likely to create complications and traps of one kind and another. Nevertheless as happens with some of these denominational grants there is a give and take. If the Salvation Army, for instance, do not require all that is their portion for one year and the Church of England requires more than is its portion there is a give and take. I have no doubt the same will apply in the administration of these funds.

The Teachers' Loan Board will be on a wider basis for obvious reasons. On that board we shall have not only all the superintendents and other persons that are required but the dean of the Faculty of Education at the University and also one representative to be nominated by the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. The chairman of both these boards will be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

The rest of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, sets forth the various formalities

whereby the Board will operate, for instance the furnishing of bonds, the provision of the submission of the boards' financial statement, keeping of minutes and for the auditing by the Auditor General's Department. These matters can be discussed when we go into Committee. I do not think I need spend any more time on them now.

The important thing at this stage is the principle of creation of two new boards, two new funds designed to assist and improve, to assist in the training and the retention of teachers in Newfoundland. I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, I feel that the principle of the Bill is sound. It occurs to me—perhaps this is not the time to bring this up—the amount of ten thousand dollars as mentioned for each board it seems to be insignificant if there is any real demand or anything worth while to be done along these lines. We all, I think, have some knowledge or some experience of costs of building and renovations today. While I think the thing is very good the amount involved or mentioned seems to be very small. That is unusual for me from this side to be telling the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable gentleman will forgive me, I believe the principle is for the funds to be set up, that amount is something, as you say, can be taken up in Committee.

MR. DUFFY: I see, Mr. Speaker. There is just one other matter in connection with this and that is the mechanics of refunding these loans. Now the teachers are a very fine body of people, and I speak with some experience of some excellent teachers throughout the country, but there is,

I believe, a pretty large turnover in teachers. Probably there will not be as much with married teachers. But many teachers leave the profession and take up other positions or for some other reasons they leave the profession. I would be interested in knowing more about the refund of this loan.

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I should like to support the Spirit of this Bill. I think it is very timely.

MR. SPEAKER: That word "Spirit," that is singular?

MR. ABBOTT: Well, I support the principle of the Bill. It is very timely, Sir. During the years of my association with school boards, for ten years I was Chairman of the Amalgamated School Board of Grand Falls and during that time we were confronted with this problem of housing of our married teachers. Time and time again we had to refuse qualified teachers simply because they were married and we had no residences for them. Now this makes it possible for a board to provide a residence for a married teacher.

Furthermore we know that young men regarding teaching today as a profession. We have a great many young men, married teachers, that naturally want a residence and if that residence is not available then we do not get the good teachers.

We also have young men and young women too who aspire to higher learning. They want to improve their grade but have not the funds. That is a way whereby they can be assisted.

As I said before, I do think this is a very timely Bill, and I heartily support it.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I think I can wholeheartedly support the statement that the Bill is very timely and the principle of the Bill is sound. Nobody can argue against it. The practical considerations that move the introduction of this legislation have, I think, been admirably explained by the Honourable Minister of Education. The only observation I would make, Sir, is that there are going to be certain practical difficulties in administration of these two funds to which reference has been made because certain it is that whilst mention has been made of certain sums, does it require any great stretch of the imagination to see or visualize at least applications coming in in far greater quantities than the amounts mentioned by the Honourable Minister in introduction of this Bill. Certain it is, Sir, that we can all be in agreement with the idea of assisting not only teachers in the Province to stay in that profession but to better qualify themselves to serve the youth of Newfoundland.

I do say, Sir, one can support the principle without acquiescing wholeheartedly in the light of expectations of it being easy to administer.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I am opposed to the principle but neither can I say that I am entirely in accord with the principle of their Bill. I consider that any man in any profession should be able to earn enough salary or wages, as the case might be, to look after his own housing and to look after the financing of his education. I would say therefore that if our teachers were being properly paid—and I agree that this Government has increased the salaries—there is no more reason for the setting up of a loan board than to build houses for teachers nor to fur-

ther the education of teachers than there is for the setting up of a loan board for lawyers or members of the other professions. I know you would like to have one, and very much so.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: We are having a discussion within the ranks. The member for St. John's East is calling for order.

MR. HIGGINS: Protection really.

MR. HOLLETT: Of other professions than teachers and there are a lot of them. I am not against the teachers—I am just arguing for the sake of making a few remarks—because I being one of the older generations here in this House, and there are a few of us here who do recall how we were compelled in my day to further our education by going in a trap skiff and catching fish and as a result of the wages which I got I went to school and went to college, as a matter of fact.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why does not the honourable gentleman tell about housing when he was a magistrate?

DR. ROWE: How many houses have the magistrates built—or have been provided for them?

MR. HOLLETT: In Burin I paid my rent. I was in my own house in Bell Island. In Grand Falls, I grant you, I had it rent free.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable member had a house provided for him. Whether he paid for it or not, the house was there.

MR. HOLLETT: In Grand Falls.

MR. CURTIS: It now applies to the whole country.

MR. HOLLETT: That is only within recent years. But people I grew up with, of the age of myself and the honourable Minister of Fisheries and other honourable members in this House we had to further our own education by our own efforts. If we could not get a loan from the bank we had to go out and earn it. Now that probably did us some damage, some injury—I do not know. I am just wondering what effect this loan board is going to have on the profession.

Now we have set up industrial loan boards, we have set up co-operative loan boards, we have set up fishery loan boards. As a matter of fact the whole history of the Liberal Government since 1949 is loans, loans, loans. Loans for one thing and another right from "A" down to "Z" is the history. The history too, Sir, is that nobody pays the interest on these loans. Now then are our teachers going to take a sample out of the book of the past eight years and say well, nobody else pays interest on loans you get from the Government therefore we get the loans and do not pay any interest back?

And I say there is a difference where a married man with a family who as a teacher goes to an outport looking for a home. There is not the same call for it today in the outports because in practically every outport today you will find a dozen houses which are vacant and which can be occupied for paying very small rent. As a matter of fact it is the policy of the Government to take the people out of these communities and instead of having twelve hundred settlements to have one hundred and twenty. So I think the idea of the Government should be to coordinate

the whole plan and not go letting out loans to this one and that one and another one for building houses for the furtherance of education because I think if a man or a woman, a boy or a girl wants an education he ought to get that by himself, by his own efforts, without having it handed to him by any Department of Government. Mind you I am not against the principle whatsoever, because I know there are cases, and I am quite sure the loan board which will be set up will use its discretion—But I want to make these few remarks because I feel this Government is wandering into the wilderness, into the wilderness of a welfare state and have been too ready to do things which should have been done by us, the people. They have been too ready in a good many cases to help where people would have gotten along better without that help. Now the welfare state may be alright—it may be the age to which we are destined—it may be the age which is better for humanity, as far as I know, but in my reading—

MR. FORSEY: To a point of order—We are not discussing the welfare state. I want to know if we are discussing the Welfare State Bill?

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is in order. He is speaking about this Bill as tending towards the welfare state. I think it is in order.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker!

As I said before, I am not criticizing the principle of this Bill. I think the principle has its good aspects, but I do want to caution the Government in setting up these boards to put those boards in the hands of people who will be able to, shall I

say, administer them in a proper fashion. Because there are always people in this world, Sir, and you will find them amongst teachers as amongst lawyers, you will find them amongst clergymen as amongst other people, who are always right there to come looking for something—If you got the board there they are going to come and look for it. Therefore I say to the Government, if you set up a board set up one giving them wide discretionary powers and see that they do not overstep these powers. Because I do feel that too many offers of assistance from the Government is not good for me, not good for you, not good for the people. That is all I have to say. I am not against the principle of the Bill at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that toward the end the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is not against it, after arguing for the whole of his speech against it, it was pleasant for us to hear he was not really against it.

Mr. Speaker, so far as the fund to enable teachers to get homes for themselves is concerned it seems to me not only to be a good thing but a very necessary thing. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition must have noticed as we all have noticed in recent years the increasing difficulty of getting people to go away from St. John's to the rest of the Province, to act as teachers—

MR. BROWNE: Why do they want to stay here, I wonder?

MR. SMALLWOOD: To act as teachers, doctors or welfare officers or other types of occupation. The whole tendency all over the North American Continent, I suppose all over the world, is for people to move from the countryside to the more urbanized

parts, into the cities and towns, if you like. In the United States in the last fifty odd years you will see that and may be as recently as twenty years ago over half of the people of that great nation lived in the countryside and far fewer of them lived in the cities. Today the position has been very much reversed. Now here in Newfoundland that tendency is very marked, it is unmistakable. The population of St. John's has grown enormously. I remember well when the population of St. John's was about twenty-five thousand. I remember that and I am not as old as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: Oh no!

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I am a very comforting distance from him.

MR. HOLLETT: I hope it is comforting.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Comforting, yes. I get comfort when I look at the Leader of the Opposition but when I look at some of my friends over here I feel a little discouraged. I remember when the population of St. John's was about the same as Corner Brook today. Today St. John's has seventy or eighty thousand people. It is a fair-sized city. It is one of the larger cities of all Canada. Now that is not because the birth rate in St. John's is particularly high or that the death rate is particularly low. It is because of a tremendous number of persons pouring in to this city from all over this Island of Newfoundland, pouring in from the outports. Now the same thing applies to Corner Brook and the same thing applies to Grand Falls and Buchans and other urbanized areas. It has become extremely difficult to get teachers to go out to the outports. It is becoming not only extremely difficult but in many cases impossible to

get nurses to go. The Minister of Health could tell a story of the absolute impossibility of getting nurses, to get Newfoundland girls, our own native Newfoundland girls, outport girls, born in the outports who come in here and get their nurse's training to then be willing to give up the urban comforts of St. John's and go out to the absence of these comforts in our outports or to get teachers or to get welfare officers to go and to get doctors to go. It has become terribly difficult.

Now while I am a great believer in the whole area of centralization, re-allocation of our people, a great believer in it, there is a limit to the amount of reallocation you are likely to get, practically speaking, in the next eight, ten, fifteen or even twenty years, a definite practical limit on the amount you are going to get. So that practically speaking for a good many years to come you are going to need a great many school teachers to go out into the outports and doctors and nurses and welfare officers. I think that nearly all of the magistrates in Newfoundland today have houses provided for them by the Government. They pay a rent for them and the Government in the course of time gets back the money it cost to put the houses there to buy them or build them. In a great many cases the Government has provided the houses for doctors. All over the Province today you will find houses provided by the Government for its employees who happen to be medical doctors. In other words the Government have taken a lesson from the churches. Virtually all the churches in Newfoundland today, virtually all of them virtually everywhere in Newfoundland have houses that are owned by the churches and occupied by the clergy-

men who are domiciled and resident in a particular parish or circuit or area where they serve.

MR. HOLLETT: Look at the pittance they are being paid.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not talking about the value of the houses, the value of the salary or income, what I am talking about is the practical question of providing some ordinary creature comforts for the clergymen who are asked to go out to the out-ports, for the nurses and for the school teachers and doctors or the magistrates in this age when the question has become so important, far more important than it was twenty or thirty or forty or fifty years ago. There was a time in Newfoundland when you could get teachers, far more than you needed, who would go out to the out-ports and grub around somehow and not kick or complain too much. There was a time when you could get doctors to trudge it on foot and on horseback or in open boats, the old Newfoundland equivalent of the country doctor who went about in his horse and buggy. Old Doctor McDonald lived in Greenspond for years and travelled the whole of the North side of Bonavista Bay and who spent all his life for those years travelling in open boats and on foot and who would have considered it a great luxury if he had a horse to ride horseback. But those days are gone. It has become impossible today — salary won't do it—you cannot offer any salary today to a teacher to go to certain parts of Newfoundland. — They just won't go.

Now the Minister of Education is faced by that situation.

MR. HOLLETT: Will they go if you build a house for them there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't say that any one solution will solve this problem by merely providing a fund out of which school boards can buy or build homes which they will own and which they will rent to married teachers as and when they can get married teachers. That is not going to solve this problem, but a combination of the better wages, homes, electrification, centralization, water and sewerage, movies, recreation and entertainment, the ending of isolation so that if you are in a remote place at least sometimes you can get aboard a car or bus and drive to Grand Falls or Stephenville or into Bonavista or into Corner Brook or somewhere for a weekend—a combination of all these things and you may — do not guarantee — but you may in the next few years reverse the present trend which is a trend completely away from service in the out-ports by nurses and doctors and magistrates and welfare officers—I do not know about clergymen but a great many other types of persons.

I am quite proud of what the Minister has brought in here. I think it is a good thing. It is an excellent thing. It does not go far enough. The Honourable Member for St. John's Centre said he agreed with it thoroughly but that he was a little disappointed in the amount of money. I think probably the Minister in replying—if I do not anticipate what he is going to say—will point out that it is only ten thousand dollars in a few years. It may be a hundred thousand dollars in a few years. It may very well be! It will probably increase year by year. If you look over the history of the Government in the last eight years or the last eighteen years of Government you will see that many a programme began in a modest way

but grew to quite important proportions. Similarly with this idea it can grow year by year as in practice it turns out to be a good thing.

Well now, on the other point I must confess that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition surprised me with the completely antedivulian sentiment he expressed with regard to the manner in which people, boys and girls, young men and young women ought to get their education by going out and earning it for themselves.

MR. HOLLETT: No. I said they did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman said they ought now to do it— This is the way young men and young women ought to get their education.

MR. HOLLETT: No, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Premier is misquoting me, entirely misquoting me. I do not permit that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have no desire in the least to misquote my honourable friend. It is the last thing I want to do. If he did not say that he did not say it. That is that—He did not say it—But Mr. Speaker, I ask you to look at the United States for a moment. I ask you not because I am an intensive admirer of the United States—That is not the reason—But of all the countries in the world, perhaps, they have in the United States a virtual passion for education—That fact is well known.

MR. HOLLETT: What kind?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The quality is a matter of philosophical discussion. Any time the honourable gentleman would like to have a few hours he could come over some weekend to

Russwood and we could talk all day Sunday on the philosophy of education, what is the quality and what is the quantity and what kind it should be.

MR. HOLLETT: That would be agricultural business?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I dare say what we would say might help to fertilize the farm. But, Mr. Speaker, they have in the United States an altogether astonishing passion for education. I think every last living soul in the United States has the ambition that his son, if he himself, missing becoming president of some bank or railway, is going to get that opportunity for a good education. The result is that there is no country on the face of the earth today where education is such a passion as it is in the United States. There must be tens of thousands, there must be hundreds of thousands and indeed there must be millions of scholarships. Not only is it the land of scholarships but it is the land in which numbers of individuals and corporations create funds out of which scholarships are granted, great foundations with hundreds of millions of dollars in them. There are endless numbers of those foundations. So that in fact there must be literally millions of scholarships. Not only that but look at the opportunities there are for young men in universities to earn their way through college. I had personal contact this year with something of that kind. I had a son of mine who went to college this winter, this past winter. He took short courses of an agricultural character in Michigan State University. Now that is one of the great land grant universities of the United States started by Abraham Lincoln for the sons of farmers. It has twenty thousand students and two

thousand staff. A number of students equal to just about the population of Corner Brook, our second city. That is one university. In that university there were literally thousands of students that were on scholarships or who were paying their way through the college with employment given by the college.

Now to say that here in Newfoundland of all parts of the world that no one should have an education except what he goes out and gets for himself is, I suggest, not what the honourable gentleman meant. He could not have meant it.

MR. HOLLETT: I did not say it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Good! I forgot the honourable gentleman did not say that and therefore he could not have meant it. He could not possibly have meant that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for St. John's Centre put his finger on it. "This is good," he said, "to this extent." "But it is not good enough. It is splendid but it is not quite splendid enough. It is not big enough, not extensive enough." To which I say in reply: "give us a little time. We have just gone through the best eight years yet." The crucial word in that remember is the word "yet." It is not "the best eight years." But the best is yet to be. That is just a beginning.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to the discussion which has already taken place on this Bill. I would like to say that I understand some of the observations made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in regard to

his surprise—I do not know if that is the right word—at any rate his concern about the Government establishing one other loan board, i.e., the Teachers' Housing Loan Board because I do not think the Teachers' Educational Loan Board is really a new plan at all. It is a new way to handle the matter. As the Minister said, there is already a similar scheme in existence whereby the teachers in training get loans up to six hundred dollars a year.

DR. ROWE: That is not a loan. It is a grant—an indenture.

MR. BROWNE: It amounts to the same thing. It has a condition attached to it, if accepted he is bound to teach for two or three years—two years I believe.

Now I had some experience when I was a member of the Board of Governors of the Memorial University College. We had a fund there that was created I do not know if it was out of savings or set up by the late Dr. Paton, I am not sure—But we had a fund there. I remember drawing up the rules for the management of that fund whereby we loaned money to university students to enable them to go on to higher grades and get their degrees. It was supposed to be a revolving fund. It would be alright if it had been properly managed. I think it is necessary that a fund of this kind should be controlled properly, like a business, and not be too easy-going in regard to the management. Now at that time, as the Minister will remember, the late Dr. Burke was the Chairman—if ever there was a man who was easy-going and who could be very diffident about asking anybody about how his loan was getting on it was the late Dr. Burke. He would be the last man in the world to think of reminding a person he

was behind in his loan. As a result some persons fell behind in repayment of their loans, and the board was handicapped in regard to the amount of loans they could make because it was not revolving. But I must say this, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it it enabled men to get their university degrees and become engineers and enter other professions which would have been very difficult for them to do otherwise.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. BROWNE: I am thinking of one man in particular who became a very prominent engineer, much to my surprise. I never thought he had it in him, but he became head of a big concern on the Mainland. I would rather not mention his name. I know all about him. He is not living now—if that is any clue to anybody to find out who he was. He is dead now. But he did become quite a prominent engineer. I do not think he would have made the grade if he had not had the assistance of this fund. So, Mr. Speaker, the experience we have had in connection with this fund and I suppose that fund is still going on. I do not know how it is being managed now. The Minister perhaps could look it up and see how it is getting on.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable gentleman would excuse me—I would like the Sergeant-at-Arms to take note of a disturbance in the corridor and see that it is stopped immediately—We cannot be disturbed in this fashion.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this is an age, I would say, when the idea of giving loans has become more familiar and while the Leader of the Opposition was very much afraid that this fund would run into difficulties

such as other funds created by the Government have run into, I believe that if it is properly managed—and I think it will be—It will have to be properly managed—these difficulties won't arise in connection with the Teachers' Educational Loan Board.

In regard to the housing loan board it seems to me that in answer to my honourable colleague here from St. John's Centre that although the sum of ten thousand dollars looks small and would not by any means be able to furnish houses it is possible that a Board of Education may have some funds of its own with which to start the thing and then if there is some assistance from the Provincial Government the Federal Housing Act would come into the plan and supply the rest for the purpose of building houses. I am sure that we are all anxious to see that there are teachers willing to go into those places outside the main centres; and we can understand the difficulties of obtaining teachers to go there after they have lived in St. John's and enjoyed the happiness of living in such a highly civilized community as St. John's. However, Mr. Speaker, seriously speaking there are amenities that they become accustomed to and they will not do without. That not only applies to the teachers but it applies to many young people—and I do not want to go into that—It is quite obvious that young people who have been away from home do not want to go back there and most of the population in St. John's consists of people who are here from outside St. John's and like to stay here. It is true that amount of money may not at the beginning provide many houses, but I think that if it works, as I believe it should, in connection with the Central Mortgaging and Housing, that in that way they may be able to get

more houses than the sum seems to imply.

Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said, we are in favour of the principle of the Bill, and we hope that it will be managed very carefully so that the best advantages may be had from it.

MR. SHEPPARD: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to support the principle of this Bill, together with many other members of the House. I have had some slight experience with educational matters and I have also for many years served on a school board—I do not feel competent to comment too much on Section 8 of the proposed Bill and it would probably be out of order if I did take it by sections, but I would like to make particular reference to assistance by way of housing.

Now in my district we have some fairly large settlements, settlements which could be almost regarded to be on the fringe area, in a way, of St. John's, where we have a lot of amenities unfortunately not enjoyed by other communities in the country—I would particularly refer to Harbour Grace itself. We have always in my experience and I think it has been the experience of previous boards, had great difficulty in getting the right type of teacher to come to the town because of this very thing which is dealt with here in this Bill. You would normally expect in a town of the size of Harbour Grace to have plenty of spare houses. That is not so. In effect what happens when a teacher comes in is this: He probably would spend two or three months during the summer time looking for a house and then find at the end that he has to go into an establishment which is substandard. It would be substandard

for him, in fact for any type of worker. Now our teachers, I contend, hold a very distinguished position and should be very honourably placed in our communities. It is only right that they should not be subject to a condition which will make their lives and their family lives unbearable. I was rather amazed by some of the remarks by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I am not going to quote anything he said, but I gathered the impression that he was trying to convey to the House that our teachers and our young men and our young women should receive no assistance to help them either on the way to higher standards of qualifications or by way of other amenities.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to that point—I think I said that if they were probably paid and made good salaries then we would not need to make loans. I hope the Honourable member for Harbour Grace understood that.

MR. SHEPPARD: I was coming to that point, Mr. Speaker. I rather gathered too that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was under the impression that under Section "B" here of Section 8 that the loan would be to the teacher or the individual. That is not so. The loan would be to the Board of Education which in turn would be responsible, I presume—I not only presume but I am aware from the Bill, they would be responsible to the Loan Board which in turn would be responsible to the Department of Education. In the final analysis the school board, the individual school board would be the acting agency of the Loan Board.

Now I would refer to what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition conveyed to me—he was probably trying

to insinuate that we should let all of our young people get into the fishing boat, as he did, and in the summer-time and thus be able to equip themselves to come back and get a better education. There are many members in this House, Mr. Speaker, who have received aid towards higher education. I think, Mr. Speaker, I will be safe in saying, as a matter of fact I am aware that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is one of the honourable members. I understand that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is a Rhode's Scholar and as such has had his higher education helped along that way by that great foundation.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to that point? The aid, as the honourable member chooses to call it was not Government aid. It was a scholarship which was won and not handed out.

MR. SHEPPARD: I am quite aware of that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are not all scholarships won?

MR. SHEPPARD: I am quite aware of that, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's great credit and to the great credit of the country that he should have been a Rhode's Scholar. I am not trying to take anything away from him by making that reference.

MR. HOLLETT: What are you trying to do?

MR. SHEPPARD: I am commenting on the way the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was trying to insinuate, which I feel sure the teachers and the young people of this Province will not appreciate, the fact that the young people and teachers should receive no assistance of any kind from

the Government or from any other source.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of order—What the honourable gentleman is saying in regard to me is trying to insinuate something I don't think he has the right to say. If he in his poor judgment understood it to say that he should say so and not that I insinuated—certainly I did not say that and I did not mean it.

MR. SPEAKER: That point is well taken. I do not think the honourable member should have used the word "insinuated" but he should say what he gathered.

MR. SHEPPARD: I say, what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition conveyed to me—

MR. HOLLETT: It is a matter of intelligence is it not?

MR. SHEPPARD: I think it would be, but during recess I had occasion to speak with several other members of the House of equal or higher intelligence than myself and they seemed to have received the same impression as myself.

MR. HOLLETT: I reply—It is a matter of intelligence.

MR. SHEPPARD: Mr. Speaker, if anybody in this House has had experience with education on the local level he knows that this proposed assistance to teachers will be one of the greatest inducements to teachers to increase their education and also to remain in the places where they are doing a good job and where they are liked but from which unfortunately they are sometimes forced to move because of the pressure built up in their families because of poor housing

conditions. Now if the local boards of education assume responsibility for this loan what is the difference between that and the grants which are now made to local boards of education for the building of schools? I contend, Mr. Speaker, that one is but an extension of the other and a very necessary expansion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A good point.

MR. SHEPPARD: I do not wish to take up any more time on this, Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly on the matter. I have wrestled with this problem during the past eight years. I have sat with a board of education which had been stretching its purse strings to the very limit; a board of education which last year, after paying all its debts could show us and show the people of the Church of England of Harbour Grace that the school which housed three hundred and fifty pupils had a credit balance of fourteen dollars and eighty-five cents (\$14.85).

MR. HOLLETT: At least it had a credit.

MR. SHEPPARD: Yes, through the hard work mainly of the Secretary of the Board of Education, who was also burning the midnight oil when we as a board were not burning it—But I can tell you the board also burned the oil and we worried and worried—and this is one of the things which were worrying us in a town like Harbour Grace. How much more is it a worry to school boards in some of our smaller communities. I think it is a great shame for the impression to be given by any member of this House that the Government should not by means of this legislation try to rectify a situation which is causing concern in all of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill in its entirety.

MR. FORSEY: I rise to support this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to keep the debate going or trying to match wits with anybody, but how the Leader of the Opposition can feel that he said nothing after the remarks he did make about this Bill is beyond me. If you were to take his concluding remarks you would call it a tempest in a teapot. If you were trying to appraise what he did say, you would say the hand that held the dagger stabbed it in the back of the teachers. Now I do not think he meant what he said. I think he feels that as Leader of the Opposition he has to be opposed to everything goes on on this side of the House.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order—Would the honourable member quote the statement he is referring to that I said?

MR. FORSEY: I suggest the House be given a chance to hear it again, because I am quite sure it was nothing but an attack upon this Bill to aid teachers—and I come from an area—I don't quite agree with my honourable colleague from Harbour Grace—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I must rise to a point of order—I have been attacked by several members on the opposite side. I rose and supported the principle at first and at the last but I made a few remarks in between, which did not constitute an attack on anybody—I take strong exception to some of the comments made by some members on the opposite side.

MR. FORSEY: I would suggest to him he is having trouble trying to convince the people that we are not the right party. He should not try to do it by opposing what we do, apparently the people like what we do?

MR. HOLLETT: Is that on the principle of the Bill?

MR. FORSEY: According to that statement, as I interpreted it, this Government is blamed for its anxiety to aid the less fortunate people.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order—The honourable gentleman is absolutely giving a wrong interpretation of anything I said. I will not stand for it, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask if you would try to stop such remarks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order—If any honourable gentleman gets up and misinterprets anything the honourable member said—he cannot misquote but he certainly can misinterpret.

MR. HOLLETT: It goes on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was explaining his point, and I think perhaps the honourable member who has the floor would from now on confine his remarks to the principle of the Bill—The point made by the Honourable the Premier is correct: If an honourable member is misinterpreted or misunderstood or misquoted he does not rise to a point of order but does rise and ask the honourable member to yield, or “would the honourable member allow me to put him right.” It is not a point of order.

MR. FORSEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker,—having too made my point I will not revert to that any more except to say—let us forget the bickering anyway—Let us look at the goodness of the Bill—That is exactly what it is—I think the honourable member for White Bay South ought to be congratulated on bringing this Bill before the House.

It is one of the things, I think, we need in our area. In Corner Brook today, the City of Corner Brook, we are fast losing our best teachers because they have not the financial means to meet the scale of housing in a large industrial area like ours where the average wage is so high and the dollar has not too much value. I say this kindly, and I hope my colleagues on this side of the House won't mind saying it, they are a little hindered in their chances to obtain gratitude by the ridiculous black market going on in housing today. There is a rent control act which does not have the teeth it should have, and I do hope the Government will before long put the necessary teeth into that act so that teachers and people of lower income can stop being exploited by those of higher income brackets who will pay any price even though the ceiling has been fixed since the early forties—If we are going to get the right type of teachers we are going to have to assist them in every way, housing, better education and higher standard of wages. Certainly if housing is the crying problem why should we wait. Every teacher is an example of conduct in his area, and surely we are not going to expect results for a teacher if we drive him to, as the honourable member for Harbour Grave says, into a substandard home,

I heartily support the Bill, Sir, and I feel the Minister will see it goes far enough. I am glad to see he has brought it in here.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak there are several points on which I should undoubtedly try to throw some light.

First of all I was very interested in the comments, and criticisms if you like, made by my honourable friend

from St. John's Centre. It is exactly the same thing as came into my mind at the time of the discussion, i.e., the actual amount of ten thousand dollars. I would like to point out that there is nothing arbitrary about that figure. For the first year we thought it should start at ten thousand dollars, and in fact we had to have some sort of term for it and we decided on three years at ten thousand dollars each. But there is nothing that says it could not next year be raised to twenty or thirty if necessary and funds are available.

Also there is this point: It is not the intention of the Government to build houses nor to give sufficient money to boards to build houses nor to give sufficient money to boards to build houses themselves. This thing will be done on a share basis. It may well be that in certain instances the teacher may himself contribute something towards a house, the board something and the board will borrow from the Department to make up a deficiency in most cases. For example this year we had a board which wished to employ a married teacher. They had a house available but his wife was not willing to go to this place because there was no sewerage and water. The board could put it in and obtain the teacher but the board did not have money and therefore lost the opportunity to get that teacher.

My honourable friend also raised another very interesting point and a very important point; how could the money be refunded? In other words will this fund be administered efficiently. The answer is yes. I can assure my honourable friend of that. I will tell you why. In the first place let us take the money for homes, the loan for homes. This will be made to the board of education and not to the teachers. I want to make that

clear. It will not be paid to any teacher but to the board of education. A board will sign an agreement. There will be some kind of an agreement drawn up. The board of education will sign the agreement. The Loan Board may very well have a mortgage on the house. There will certainly be a scheme for repayment, I have already discussed it with the superintendents constituting the board and I suggested to them, and they agreed with me on this, we will have a provision there whereby we can deduct at the source from the board maintenance grant that it will receive from the Department every year the amount of money that the board has agreed to pay back to the Loan Board. In other words it may well be merely a paper transaction.

Also I may say that we intend to have the thing pretty tight in this respect, that we would know the terms of the rental agreement before the loan is made and we will receive back from the Board a proportionate share of the rental as repayment. Now the board may very well be in a position to repay us perhaps in one year instead of over three, four or five years, whatever the term is, in which case we will be able to do that. There will be a provision there as far as the loan to the teacher is concerned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The only connection the teacher has is renting a house and paying the board. You are not providing teachers anything but the opportunity to rent a house.

DR. ROWE: The Loan Board will have no dealings with the teacher on this matter of the housing loan. On the other hand the other loan will be between the Loan Board and the teacher. Here again I am glad my honourable friend has raised this point,

as did the honourable and learned member for St. John's South, it is one I myself felt very strongly about—If the House would bear with me I can make this personal reference. I happen to be one of many hundreds, including others in this House perhaps yourself, Mr. Speaker, and certainly some of my friends who took advantage of that loan presently created by the late President Paton. A small loan was established there at the university whereby students wishing to continue their university work could borrow a small amount interest free. Now I borrowed two hundred and fifty dollars. That was the maximum, I think. They advanced me that and it assisted me in going to college for my initial year. The year cost approximately eight or nine hundred, and that two hundred and fifty made it possible. Now here is the interesting thing—I don't know whether I signed a formal agreement or not. It was probably just an undertaking in writing. I do know that after I finished the year of college and went back to work again I made no immediate attempt to pay it and no attempt was made to collect from me. It must have been perhaps a year or eighteen months that I suddenly received a peremptory demand for immediate payment of that amount. Well in order to do so I had to go to the bank and borrow two hundred and fifty dollars. Actually the thing should have been much tighter than it was. There should have been a scheme, and that is what I have already proposed to the Department—Let us say a married teacher needs one year to obtain a degree. He applies to the Board and gets a loan, let us say of eight hundred dollars. The cost of going away might very well be two thousand. He required eight hundred. He gets that loan. I sug-

gested and again they agreed with me—and this will be incorporated into the regulations—he will not be expected to repay until he has been back at work for twelve months. But when a year has elapsed after his return to work then he will make monthly payments—We will have a scheme whereby we will deduct those monthly payments from him right at the Department.

MR. BROWNE: You should have an insurance scheme in connection with that, too.

DR. ROWE: I think that will be part of it. I might say the Act necessarily provides for the drawing up of regulations. These regulations will come before the Government.

MR. HOLLETT: You eventually had to go to the bank—Why not go in the first place?

DR. ROWE: I very much doubt in the first place I would have gotten it. As my honourable friend has raised that point I am going to tell him something of some interest. He is a Rhode's Scholar. The late President Paton on one occasion said to me—"I suggest to you that you come back here to the university again for one year. Perhaps it may require two years and I feel certain you will be qualified for the Rhode's Scholarship." I said: "I have no money." He said: "you can get two hundred dollars, I think, from a loan up there." I said: "I have no money at all. I will need seven or eight hundred." He gave me the names of some persons to go to to see if I could borrow from them. I went to these persons. I went to them. They were three substantial men in St. John's, one of whom at least is living today. That was in the depths of depression. I could not get any

money from anyone. I went also to a couple of banks. They would not consider giving me one cent. I had to go out and go teaching for thirty-six dollars a month. By the time I did get back and was able to qualify myself academically I was too old to get it.

The point I want to make is this: had there been such a loan without any doubt I could have qualified at least for that loan and in all probability I would have been able to get the university professional training I did acquire by the time I was twenty-five or twenty-six. Instead of having to wait and do it periodically and not have to wait until I was thirty-nine years of age, I could have been able to do so. I think that point is relevant.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I would like to ask what about all the scholarships we have up in the Memorial University? There are quite a lot of scholarships. I am just asking my honourable friend here if he knows anything about them.

MR. HOLLETT: We are talking about teachers now.

DR. ROWE: On that point, as far as I know all of the scholarships are taken up every year. Sometimes the position arises where somebody is awarded a scholarship and forsakes that scholarship or vacates it in preference for some other line of work or doing something else. Most of us here perhaps have done that very thing. I was once offered a thousand dollar scholarship and turned it down because I did not want to go to that university to carry on my studies. But I think ordinarily all our scholarships are used up and all our loan board money to the university is used up too.

There is one other point of some interest here—The Honourable Leader of the Opposition spoke about the relationship between this policy of the Government and our policy of centralization. May I say this—This housing fund is not intended to apply to the small isolated parts of Newfoundland whose future is in doubt. These are not the places where married teachers go anyway. The Town of Lewisporte has never had a married teacher as principal of the school for the last ten years. The reason for that was that during that period Lewisporte was an expanding community and housing was always at a premium, and a man who came there and got married invariably found no suitable house available—Either he did not have the money or he did want to run the risk of investing in a house in a community where he might remain two or three years. So that invariably when a principal got married he moved to some other place where housing was available.

The honourable member for Harbour Grace made a reference here when he compared this money with the money we give school boards for schools. But there is a difference. The money we give the boards for the erection and furnishing of schools is gone forever. That is an outright grant or gift, if you will, which is gone for ever more, whereas this is only a loan. It is true I hope, it will be interest free, but it will only be a loan and will be repaid within the stated time and will be used and re-used over and over again. My hope and the hope of the Government is that these two funds will in time become self-perpetuating so that the Government will not have to make any further expenditure in connection with them.

There is one final point I want to make—there are two or three others

but time is running out — The Hon. ourable Leader of the Opposition spoke of what we are doing for teachers. He spoke of the fact that if the teachers were paid enough salary we would not have to do this. Maybe that is partly true. What boards of education are up against is the fact that teachers who go to any place as principals have no assurance that they are going to remain there any length of time.

MR. HOLLETT: Why?

DR. ROWE: He has no assurance—He may not want to do that. Most teachers are ambitious—Mr. Speaker, I could cite from my educational experiences hundreds of examples—then again I would like to make this personal reference—I went in 1946 to Wesleyville as principal of a six-room school. I went there for one year. Every teacher is appointed for one year. I went one year and did not know how long I was going to stay. As it happened I stayed for two years. By chance I had a chance to buy a fine house, very reasonable and I could have raised the money, I think, to do it, as it happened. But I did not do it. I paid rent for that house because I had no idea how long I was going to stay there and I did not want to tie up six, seven or eight thousand at that time.

MR. HOLLETT: May I interrupt for just a moment—The Honourable Minister said that the teachers had no assurance that they are going to stay in any particular place. From whom does he get the assurance and why can he not get the assurance.

DR. ROWE: That is inherent in human nature, Mr. Speaker. Most teachers are ambitious.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not talking about teachers but the people who hire them.

DR. ROWE: Well no board that I know has ever given a blank cheque to a teacher. They are hired by the year, and any board can get rid of a teacher simply by giving three months —There is no real assurance —

MR. HOLLETT: Why do you not arrange that he has some assurance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Every board that employs a teacher be required to give four, five or eight or ten years contract—How could that be done—How could that be required?

DR. ROWE: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that fact is not at all clear to people. The Government nor the department of Education, neither employs teachers. Teachers are employed by boards of education, who are independent of the Government and the Department. It is true the Government supplies the money to the educational authority who in turn allocates it to various denominational boards of education.

The final point is one I want to make—It is true when we bring in this Bill here which will authorize us to assist teachers in getting housing it is only doing, as the Honourable the Premier pointed out, what is already standard practice for other professions. In order to get doctors to go to various outports in Newfoundland the Government had either to supply housing or to assist in the acquisition of homes. In order to get magistrates they had to do the same thing. I will not go into details, but the Honourable Minister of Welfare knows, he is up against the same problem. Everyone who is a Minister of a Department knows that problem. So that in this respect we are only giving teachers the same kind of treatment afforded other professions, other field workers in Newfoundland and in industry.

But the important point, Sir, is this, what we are doing here is not for the teachers of Newfoundland. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition seems to forget one important thing. In certain of his remarks from what he has said his feeling is that possibly we are pampering, at any rate we are doing too much—there is that possibility—I appreciate that—But what the Government is up against, and what the Department of Education is, in Newfoundland is that there are over one hundred thousand children who want an education and that at the present time possibly upward of fifty thousand of those children are not getting the kind of education that is even the minimum standard of education we think they should be getting. What we are doing here is not for the teachers of Newfoundland. It is for the children of Newfoundland. This is not going to be a cure-all, of course. As the Honourable the Premier so well puts it, it is only one of many things I could list right here now if I had the time, in order to raise the standard of education. We believe it is a good thing.

I 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.

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, Thursday, at three of the clock.

THURSDAY, May 2, 1957.

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

None.

Notices 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 Judicature Act."

I also give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Confirm To United Towns Electric Company Limited Certain Rights and Powers."

Notice of Questions

None.

Answers to Questions

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I had a question addressed to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply on the Order Paper a few days ago. I wonder if the new Minister would look it up and see if he could give me an answer.

QUESTION No. 86:

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I think I may answer—The answer is in course of preparation.

QUESTION No. 90:

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, arising out of the honourable gentleman's question, I asked the Deputy Minister to contact the manager of the St. Lawrence Corporation to ask if he could let us have some information regarding the reduction in the operation of the St. Lawrence Corporation which took place recently. We have

been supplied with this information. Mr. Poynter advises that within the last week a five year contract with the United States Government to purchase St. Lawrence fluorspar has expired and as a consequence the bulk of the Corporation's market was lost. It has been found well nigh impossible to find alternative markets in Canada for Newfoundland fluorspar because of two reasons (1) all fluorspar enters Canada duty free and most that does not enter comes from where production costs are reported to be about one-sixteenth of local costs due to lower standards of living and lower labour costs and (2) Newfoundland fluorspar must go to the Canadian mainland in Canadian bottoms which charge two dollars per ton more than ships of foreign register. The St. Lawrence Corporation is continuing the effort to get into the United States market through Wellington, Delaware and Cleveland, Ohio, where the Corporation has its own plant. However the prospect of getting it there and competing with Mexican fluorspar coupled with the apparent impossibility of peting with Mexican fluorspar coupled Canada is not encouraging enough at present to carry on at a full rate and stockpiling at St. Lawrence.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the House to revert to notices of questions here I put on the order paper. I give notice I will on tomorrow ask the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply to lay on the table of the House the following information—

Orders of the Day

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Relating to the Newfoundland Teachers Association."

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, in rising

to move second reading of this important bill I do so with a great deal of pleasure both professional and personal. This Bill represents the new constitution for the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. The first constitution was in force for more years than I can remember. I do not recall the exact date when the Newfoundland Teachers' Association was set up. I did know at one time but I have forgotten. I know it was sometime before I was born. It is true there were some amendments from time to time. I think in fact there are altogether three on the Statutes now, and that is the reason why a new one has been drawn up.

I said I move this with a great deal of pleasure both professional and personal, and I did at one time have the honour of being the President of the St. John's Branch of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. Apart from that fact there is the natural interest I have as Minister of Education, in seeing this great organization, of which many in this House were former members, prepare a new, a modern and a streamlined constitution. Mr. Speaker, in a sense this could almost be called a Private Bill. However it is not technically a Private Bill, because they requested me to introduce it into the House and I agree to do so.

Before I go into any of the details of the Bill I would like to take this opportunity, and I think it is an appropriate opportunity to express my thanks and thanks of the Government of this Province to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association for their co-operation and for their sincerity and efforts in assisting the Department and the Government to promote the cause of education. I have only been in the Department for ten or eleven months,

less than a year, and in that time the association right from the first has gone all out to assist me in the various measures we have studied and adopted to promote the cause of education.

The necessity of this new constitution has been brought about by three main factors. First of all there is a growth of the association, especially the growth in the professional sense of the word. I suppose when first set up the total number of teachers in Newfoundland was not perhaps more than five or six hundred. Today we have thirty-six hundred teachers and that number is increasing by possibly one hundred every year. Secondly since the organizations constitution was adopted, as in all other cases of this kind, a great amount of revision has been considered necessary because of the changes that have taken place in the last forty or fifty years. The third reason is that the original constitution was in certain measures an experiment and therefore contained clauses which in the light of experience have been shown to be impractical.

Under the present Act the by-laws are incorporated as part of the Act. Under this new Bill the by-laws will be taken outside of the Act itself and will enable the association to have a more flexible constitution. As matters stand at the present time, if the association has some simple measure, say respecting a scholarship, it would have to have that incorporated into the constitution itself by legislation.

Let me say very simply that the present Bill will make it possible to pass by-laws without having to affect the original Act.

Conditions have changed too in respect of those teachers who might be-

come members. Under the present Act some teachers are contracted out without any volition on their part. In the new Bill all teachers including religious teachers (and this of course is done with their consent) will be contracted in automatically unless they decide otherwise. They have a certain period of time in which to elect whether to remain members of the association or to be excluded. That applies to all teachers, Mr. Speaker.

Many parts of the present Act have been found to be impossible to implement. In the original Act sufficient consideration was not given to the differences presented by geographic distances. It was found, for example, that a governing body of the association cannot meet during the winter time due to travelling conditions and also because of the loss in school time. That provision in the Act which made it necessary to call together conventions of all the teachers of Newfoundland from time to time is, of course, out dated in view of the fact that the present number of teachers is something of the order of thirty-three hundred and that number makes it impossible to find proper accommodations and in fact makes the whole thing altogether too unwieldy.

I am going very briefly to list a half dozen ways in which the new Bill would be different from the old. I have already pointed out that under the present Act by-laws are part of the Act. Under the new Bill the Act is separated. By-laws may be by a two-third majority of the convention.

Under the old Act the setting up and administration of regional branches was made part of the Act. Under the new Bill that will be done by by-laws.

I already pointed out that under the old Act certain provisions exempt-

ed certain classes of teachers. Under the new Act all teachers holding a valid certificate or license from the Board of Examiners are members unless they wish to be written out and indicate their wish in writing.

Under the old Act the executive body of the Association consisted of five representatives of the Roman Catholic, five of the Church of England, five of the United Church and one of the Salvation Army. Under that new Bill that representation will be preserved but there will also be an opportunity given to religious member representation from other religious denominations.

Under the old Act an advisory council was the governing body and the old Act, as I indicated, prescribed a convention of teachers that convention involving all the teachers of Newfoundland. Under the new Bill there will be a convention of delegates not a convention of teachers but a convention of delegates. So that that convention will be smaller and will certainly be more mobile.

The new Bill also clarifies the fees.

MR. BROWNE: What do you mean by clarifies?

DR. ROWE: The old Act was not clear and created some confusion according to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. In the new Bill the provisions for the deductions of fees are clarified.

The additional clauses included in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, provide for subsidiary services such as credit unions, hospital plans and for the granting of scholarships and the like. It prescribes a penalty for breaches of the code of ethics as outlined in the by-laws. I should point out here that by-laws respecting discipline are subject to the

approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The new Bill provides for the disposal of property and borrowing and investing money and provides for agreements with other persons or associations.

It will be of interest to this House, Mr. Speaker, to know that, as I understand from the executive, they now have fairly substantial financial assets and they hope to provide some kind of an educational building which will not only house the offices of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association but will, I believe, be capable of being used for other purposes as well.

This is a very lengthy Bill and no doubt there will be clauses there that honourable members on both sides of the House will want some clarification on. That I take it will be done in committees. I think I have covered the main points of the Bill and I have great pleasure in moving second reading.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Honourable the Minister that there are one or two things that undoubtedly in Committee will require clarification. The principle of this Bill is one with which nobody can have objections. It is the right of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association to regularize their position. But there are, as the Minister says, one or two items that quite honestly seem almost to smack of regimentation. It is implemented into the Bill that unless a teacher notifies the Minister, I believe, that he or she does not wish to be included and rated as a teacher within a certain time in each year that that person is automatically a teacher, or a member of the association rather. Then there is a second provision which at first look seems to smack of regimentation, i.e., the auto-

matic provision for deduction of fees from salaries. There is undoubtedly, I am sure, a very reasonable explanation for that and I know that in committee or even in his reply the Minister will explain what appears on the face of it to be rather unusual provisions.

But with the principle of the Bill, with these rather minor, but in my opinion at least important queries, certainly we on this side have no reason to oppose the legislation in any way.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I presume this Bill has the endorsement of the various denominational superintendents.

DR. ROWE: (nods). Yes.

MR. BROWNE: In the main it follows the existing law. I had not known that teachers were automatically made members of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association until I noticed it here now. It appears to be very little different from what was in the law prior to this Bill, the only change being the time in which a man or woman is given to notify the Minister that he does not wish to be a member.

The only feature I think that I don't like is that it seems to be making a teacher more and more a civil servant. I like to see as many independent people as possible in this country as in any other country, and the more the people are brought under the control of the Government the less independent they are and the more inclined they are to do whatever the Government wants them to do because they are afraid of offending the Government. I do not say that in the past the Teachers' Association has shown any disposition to be afraid of the Government. In fact I think on

occasions it fought it very stiffly. I have a very high regard for those who have been responsible for the conduct of that organization during the past few years. They are undoubtedly a fine body of men and women, and the organization must be well conducted to have survived so long.

The one feature in it that I noticed on a cursory reading to which I took exception or objection is the very wide powers in regard to disciplinary measures. I am not sure that it is advisable that we should depart from the ordinary law of the land and provide the council of this organization with such strong powers. I would like the Minister to indicate where he gets a precedent for this because if this could be done in regard to others. I have no doubt that the Law Society exercises similar discipline over its members if they do something that is contrary to the ethics of the association, but to have it placed here in the Act and give it to a few people on the council seems to me to perhaps go too far. However when we get into committee I presume that we will analyze that with more care.

With regard to the point raised by my honourable and learned colleague on my left the Minister did say on that point about the deduction of fees that he was hoping to clarify the situation but that there was a provision in the law previous to this Bill which could have been interpreted, I presume, as giving the Government power to deduct fees. Well that is one of the features about it that seems to me to be questionable, putting that into an Act. I can understand people asking the Government to deduct their fees. I know there have been many debates in the House of Commons as to whether employers should have the power to deduct fees, to check off

Bills. It has been favoured by the CCF for many, many years and it has been accepted by many employers and here the Government has already some of that power. But it seems to me it would be preferable if the teachers themselves were in a position to authorize the Government of their own accord to deduct that rather than have it made part of the law. However, Mr. Speaker, these things we can take up in detail when we get on to them in Committee.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I think we have to drop it now or adopt it. I do not think we have any right in Committee of the Whole to discuss these principles now adopted in second reading. Then they cannot be discussed not any one rejected in Committee of the Whole. These are the principles now before the House and we have either to accept or reject them at second reading. We cannot even touch on them in Committee of the Whole.

Now the one principle to which the honourable member objects is that membership should be made compulsory, so to speak. Actually it is not compulsory. A member may contract out. In the absence of his electing not to be there automatically he is in. But the room is there for him to contract out. Now the honourable and learned member says he ought rather to contract in. Each individual teacher ought to elect personally as an individual his decision to become a member and not be obliged to contract out. It reminds me of the great controversy existing some years ago in the United Kingdom, the Labour Party said a good many people is not a federation. It is a federal organization made up of many, many constituents and bodies labour parties, social democratic federations, co-operative unions and an

enormous number of trade unions. Now in the trade unions it is provided in the constitution of each trade union that it is affiliated with the Labour Party and that individual members in paying their dues will be paying a certain amount to be passed on to the Labour Party. In other words in England if you belong to a union affiliated with the Labour Party your dues include a certain portion to be passed over by the union to the Labour Party, and thus the Labour Party in England his many millions of dues paying members. The Tory Party as might have been expected, in England objected strenuously to that and objected to the Labour Party having that source of revenue with which to operate. So they argued for many years that no trade unions ought automatically to be contributing to the Labour Party but that a member ought to be put in a position where he could elect whether or not—Just as the Opposition today are anxious that the teacher ought to elect whether or not he will belong. Surely enough after one general election when the Tories came into power they passed that legislation abolishing the general position that has prevailed for half a century, and creating an entirely new position under which any trade unionist who wished to contribute dues each month to the support of the Labour Party had to elect to do so.

Now the natural inertia of so many people would cause them to fail to do so because they just would not be bothered. They do not mind doing it but do not want to be bothered about it. So that the income of the Labour Party fell off considerably until with a change of Government the Labour Party came in and restored the position that had existed. That position exists today. Automatically when

you join a union in Britain today you pay certain dues and part of the dues you pay are paid over to the Labour Party, and that makes you as a trade unionist a dues paying member of the Labour Party. You do not have to especially elect to do so, but you may contract out.

So we pass legislation making it automatic every teacher to be a member but that the teacher may contract out if the teacher did not want to be a member of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. Now the suggestion comes from the Opposition that when we do what the House of Commons did when a Tory Government came into office in England. The answer is no. The teachers asked us, the Newfoundland Teachers' Association asked us. We agreed that we would enact this legislation. It is not obligatory for any teacher to be a member of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. Any teacher can contract out if he wishes to do so.

The other point raised by the honourable and learned member for St. John's East is the check off. Now why not the check off? That is, that the union dues will be checked off their pay. That exists all over the world. Here in Newfoundland every person who works in the mill at Corner Brook is a member of the union and union dues are deducted by the company from their pay and passed over to the union. Similarly in the mill at Grand Falls and it is certainly so in Bell Island and certainly the case in Bell Island where every mine worker is a member of the union and all are paying dues to the union they do not dig down into their own pockets and out of their pay pass it over to the financial secretary of the union. It is deducted from their pay. That trouble

is saved for them by what is known as the check off.

MR. HIGGINS: It is also saved for the union.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The union pays a slight fee to the company deducting it to help cover the cost incurred by the company in deducting it and passing it over to the union. Now the same thing applies in the Woods Labour Union. Today the dues of the members are paid and the actual mechanics of it is this—The Company deducts the union dues at the source, that is the man's pay, and the company as such passes it over to the union as such. That is the union check off. That is universal. There is nothing new about that.

MR. BROWNE: It is not universal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly, universal throughout the earth, the whole civilized world, all over the Continent of Europe, all over the United Kingdom and Ireland and all over the Continent of North America and I dare say a large part of South America. It is universal. I remember arguing the point with the father of the honourable and learned member for St. John's East when he was Attorney General in the Monroe Government and I appeared before the Cabinet leading a delegation of the mine workers' union of Bell Island which asked for a check off. That was in 1925, I think. The Attorney General of that day—Newfoundland was not particularly well advanced in those days in trade union philosophy and techniques. The Attorney General just did not happen to be aware that was a practice. Now it was not a practice universally then as now. He was surprised when I told him it was a fairly commonplace thing around the world although it was not as commonplace as now. That was in

1925. So that there is nothing at all unusual existing in Newfoundland Teachers' Association membership fees being deducted at the source by the employer and paid over to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association—There is nothing unusual in that—It is the normal thing. It might have been a revolutionary thing thirty or forty years ago but in 1957 it is not. Ask any trade unionist in Corner Brook, in Buchans, in Bell Island, Grand Falls, Gander. I do not know what the position is here or what the Railway Brotherhood does. I do not know if they have the check off or not. It is certainly a very commonplace thing.

Now there is just one other point—I confess I did not follow the honourable member for St. John's South. He made the general observation with which we must agree, the freer people are the better, the lesser they are just tools and creatures of the Government the better. That is true—a very worthy sentiment. But what has that got to do with this Bill or any section in this Bill? Is there any suggestion that the teachers are being made servants? Is there any suggestion they lose their independence, their freedom, except in the sense that used to be argued by pure and unadulterated Tories when they argued against trade unionism as an assault upon freedom and liberty of a man. That old Tory argument used to be used against trade unionism—a vicious attack upon the rights of man to be free and independent because they were asked to belong to trade unions and because the man made a contract with his employer and one of the provisions of the contract was that no one could work in the man's employ except members of that trade union. That was a terrible attack upon personal liberty. Well, except in

this sense I did not see why this particular Bill is any attack upon individual liberty. I just do not see it.

MR. MERCER: They are made more independent by belonging to a union.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exactly. When you join a union you are likely to get better pay and that enables you to be freer than just a dozen and out with no pay at all. So that the only attack on freedom that I can see would be an attack on the Newfoundland Teachers' Association itself. I do not think there is any doubt in the wide world that if the Newfoundland Teachers' Association disappeared tomorrow the lot of the teachers in the course of time would be considerably worse than it is. Now I know the honourable and learned gentleman is a great believer in freedom. I know that he is. It is all right for him to advocate his ideas. That is all right. There is nothing wrong with that. But he ought at least to be a little adaptable, not like the old gentleman who in every speech he made managed to say "Cartage must be destroyed." Except in that spirit I cannot see why the honourable gentleman in this Bill should be talking about freedom, slavery and serfdom. He did not use these precise words.

The importance of being free, independent and free. Not free means to be a slave, does it not? More or less—a slave to something or someone.

I did not intend to mention this Bill. I was going to sit peacefully and enjoy myself.

MR. BROWNE: You are enjoying yourself now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I always enjoy myself. But when the honourable gentleman gets up and sees in a per-

fectly innocent Bill an insidious attack upon the freedom of the individual it is time for someone to throw a little common sense on this matter.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, some of the things of which we have been speaking for the last few minutes are really not now at all. The Newfoundland Teachers' Association dates back to the turn of the century, and as early as 1916 arrangements were made and consent given whereby there was deduction of the association fees for the members by the Government of the day from teachers' salaries and passed over to the association. Unfortunately during the years from 1916 up to 1949 the Newfoundland teachers were faced always with a membership which rarely exceeded any more than sixty per cent of their possible number and consequently for a number of years there was agitation by the teachers themselves, that is the association, before the Governments of the day for the kind of Act which this Government brought in in 1952, wherein, with due deference to my honourable colleague, was submitted the first major constitution of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association.

This Act does introduce one or two measures, which I think are all for the benefit of the teachers themselves and the work in which they are engaged. Under the Act of 1952 the by-laws were incorporated as part of the legislation and consequently before any changes could be made in the by-laws it was necessary to come for legislative sanction. Now one of the things that this Bill introduces is that by-laws are separate and can be dealt with as normally the by-laws of any association can be, without reference to the Act which brought the association into being.

The other measure to which some comment has been made is the matter of disciplinary measures. I might point out that the matter of discipline is one for internal arrangement amongst the teachers themselves. There have been many instances in the teaching profession, as in any other professions, where sometimes the code of ethics are flagrantly ignored; and the association feels that it should have its right to be competent to deal with such members of the association. But it does not affect the competency of the teachers as teachers to still be employed by any board who wishes to do so—Only as a member of the organization he is disciplined.

There are two or three other measures embodied in this Bill but these have been referred to by the mover of the Bill I might say, Mr. Speaker, I myself am quite interested in the development of the association which this Act portrays. I played a small part for a number of years in the association, and was most actively associated in trying to get the legislation of 1952 into being so that teachers themselves might have some standing. Because by bringing all the teachers into a union the teachers gain strength where they are not only in a position to fight for better salaries but they are in a position to do much better work towards the bigger purpose of improving education in Newfoundland, I believe the record of the organization during the last few years has redounded very well indeed to the credit of the organization in the wider interest they have taken in education as a whole and the improvements which have been brought about during recent years, and improvements which are to continue into the future largely through the help and assistance and co-operation to be given by the

teachers themselves banded together as one unit. It does not destroy nor take away from the teachers any benefits in any way. It helps them as a unit to try and bring about general improvement for themselves and for the purpose in which they are engaged.

For these reasons I am very glad indeed to support this particular Bill.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak in this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member would permit me—I think I might at this time, inform the House, for the benefit of new members, when the mover of a motion rises the second time he automatically closes the debate. So that if anybody wishes to speak he must speak before the person who made the motion rises a second time on second reading. I take it there is no other member who wishes to speak.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a word to say regarding this section (6). "Any person or persons referred to in sub-section (1) may elect to be excluded from membership in any year by notice in writing to the Minister, etc."

There is no definite union, as far as I can see. If a man excludes himself from this union of teachers at any time—in other words, he pays dues two years and then decides he is not going to pay next year—Is that not true? Is that right? Is that a union or not a union?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He can't do any more or less in any union.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: If a union is going to be like that there will never be any union and if fellows do not

pay there is no membership in the union.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that matter can be brought up and dealt with in Committee. It is a particular clause of the Bill—this is on the principle. Maybe the Minister can explain at that time.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I think most of the points that I did mean to discuss were raised by my honourable friends on the other side already and dealt with by the Honourable the Premier and my predecessor who was for some years Minister of Education, in fact the first Minister of Education in this Government, and for four or five years guided the education of Newfoundland with a great deal of success.

First of all I do want to stress the point—The Government here is not introducing any new thing whatsoever—the Government itself has been asked to introduce it to the House. The Government is here introducing and recommending a constitution which was drawn up by the teachers themselves at a legal conference of the teachers. This entire constitution as we have it here today was drawn up at the conference of the teachers and approved by the teachers and thereafter referred to the Department of Education, which recommended that it be enacted into law.

As my honourable friend and colleague has pointed out, there is no new principle involved. Statutory membership has been in force some years. We are not introducing the deduction of fees at all from the source. That has been in force some years. We are not introducing it. The teachers themselves asked for it. The teachers have elected to do so and we saw no reason

why we should object to it. So we ask this House to enact it into law.

MR. BROWNE: I think the disciplinary provisions are new.

DR. ROWE: I will review that in a moment. My honourable friend referred to the section of the Bill which refers to discipline. Well there are two things there I would like to draw to his attention (1) there is nothing new in it. The principle simply gives the association the power to discipline a member to the point of expulsion from the association. I do not know of any similar organization that has not the power, certainly the Law Society can expel a member and has expelled members from its association. The Medical Association of Newfoundland has done the very same thing as I recall in three instances in the history of Newfoundland—I do not know of any organization—certainly a union can expel a man for misconduct of one kind or another. But we should keep in mind that any disciplinary clause is subject, before it can be enforced, to prior approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. That in itself is a brake on any arbitrary action on the part of any organization, and secondly, before any disciplinary action can be taken there must be an enquiry and the person who is the subject of the enquiry has the right to appear before his peers and plead his case. Certainly any action on the part of the association does not affect the status of the person concerned as a teacher. That is his expulsion from the association would have no effect whatsoever, certainly no direct effect on his status as a teacher—I grant you it would have a moral effect.

MR. BROWNE: Being put out of the association?

DR. ROWE: But it does not take him out of the teaching profession. Take for example the man now President of the Association, Mr. Parrot, if expelled tomorrow it would not mean he would lose his job as Principal of a school.

He is Principal here in the city—It would have no effect on him.

MR. BROWNE: No effect?

DR. ROWE: Any more than perhaps a moral effect.

Finally in connection with the discipline here, any person has the right to appeal the judgment of the association. He can appeal to the courts. That provision is written right into the constitution here.

Then the point that the Honourable the Premier dealt with, the comments made by my honourable friend from St. John's South with regard to his fear that the teachers may become civil servants. Now just what there is about civil servants my honourable friend finds it necessary to exercise fear about—but I think, if they did become civil servants they would be under the direct control of the Government—I assure the honourable gentleman that if he has any fears in this matter he ought to accompany me to some special meetings and prize givings that I find necessary and pleasant to visit. If he were to sit down as I have had to do at such occasions in the past six months on public platforms before six, seven hundred or a thousand persons and hear the principals and others make criticisms in the strongest possible language of the Government and the Department of Education, i.e. the Government's Educational Policy, I do not think he would have any fears that any of our teachers are being intimidated. I find

nothing of timidity about these teachers here in St. John's. I do not think they are at all scared of the Government. I can not say I can find it in my heart to be too critical because they are only doing what I and others in this House today did a few years ago.

In this business of deducting fees at the source I have one comment to make: There are thirty-three hundred teachers involved, many in isolated and scattered places in Newfoundland where mail, particularly in wintertime is unreliable. Others are in places where they are cut off for long periods of time from communications. It has been requested by the teachers themselves. It is a convenience in precisely the same way as the Blue Cross, for example. They never see the Blue Cross. They never pay them a cent. It is deducted from the cheques every month, at the source. It is a great convenience to everyone concerned. It is a great convenience for the teachers of Newfoundland to have their fees deducted at the source.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is just one other point before I sit down—The honourable and learned member for St. John's South wondered whether this had been approved. I think he would be interested to know that when the Newfoundland Teachers' Association submitted to me this draft constitution my first action was to call together the Council of Education which is made up, as I pointed out here previously, of the Minister, the Deputy Minister, the several Superintendents of Education who sit in on that council as representatives of their religious denominations—not as civil servants but as representatives of their several official and statutory representatives of the several denominations—of their respective denominations. Now

I presented that constitution and said—gentlemen, here is what the Newfoundland Teachers' Association is asking the Government to enact into law—I want you to study it, go over it, scrutinize it and if necessary get together on it. As a matter of fact they came back to me and said there were certain aspects of this constitution they felt they would like to discuss with the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. The executive of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association met with several superintendents of education and met on several occasions and thrashed out the various points at issue. Finally the constitution was presented to me. I then, of course, presented it to the executive Government for consideration. That is what we have here today.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say, this constitution while it is not new yet does consolidate a great deal which has been done during the years. It modernizes the old constitution and clarifies a great many points needing clarification.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in moving 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 Authorize the Government of Newfoundland to enter into an agreement with British Newfoundland Exploration, Limited."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, somebody asked in the House a day or two ago who BRINEX were and where they were incorporated. Yesterday the Attorney General answered that BRINEX had been incorporated in Ottawa, by Dominion Charter. BRINEX is in fact a wholly owned

subsidiary company of BRINCO. They were organized for the purpose of departmentalizing the activities of BRINCO to some extent at least by channeling all their drive in mineral exploration and possible development into a separate organization wholly owned by them. So they set up BRINEX as a separate company, wholly owned. BRINEX, therefore, is a separate entity which is quite apart from BRINCO itself as such.

Now their idea is this—In Newfoundland and generally in Labrador they have—BRINCO have—in their possession a very large concession from this House, over a very considerable area of land. Now the concession they have is not the land itself but only the right on that land to search for minerals. That is all they have. They have that exclusively. They have no surface rights in the BRINCO Act, namely, to explore and exclusively to explore; they or their nominees, exclusively to explore for minerals and having found any mineral, they then have the right under legislation to apply for a grant of the minerals in question on conditions that they will develop these minerals. Now all of this has been concentrated as far as minerals are concerned into BRINEX. They have their town geologists and specialists to conduct exploration themselves, but also to entice into Newfoundland or Labrador or both certain large and reputable mining companies, each of them perhaps specializing ordinarily in some particular mineral—For example, where asbestos is concerned they would attempt to bring in a company whose specialty has been asbestos or where copper is concerned and similarly where nickle is concerned and so on—and not only to bring them in by giving them sub-concessions for a limited period of time on which they can ex-

plore but also to enter into partnership and other business deals of that kind with such companies, leading to joined exploration and joined development.

Now this particular Bill deals with that, and if it is enacted into law it authorizes the Government to enter into an agreement with BRINEX or the Newfoundland Exploration Limited for a four-year concession from the 14th of March on four areas in this Province—Steel Mountain, which is a reserved area in Western Newfoundland, inside St. George's, consisting of an area of one hundred and forty-two square miles, applied for by BRINEX on the 19th of December and approved in principle by the Government on the 1st of February past. Of course approved subject to the passing of the Legislation.

Secondly, Lewis Hills Area, which is a reserved area in Western Newfoundland consisting of an area of one hundred and seventeen square miles, applied for by BRINEX on the same date in February last.

Thirdly, the Hall's Bay Area, a reserved area in North, Central Newfoundland, consisting of seven hundred and forty-three square miles of the former Falconbridge Concession Area—applied for on the 24th of April, 1954, by BRINEX, and approved in principle on the 4th of September in the same year, 1954.

Finally, an area in Central Labrador formerly held under concession by Canadian American Metals, Limited, known as CAMCO, consisting of an area of twelve hundred square miles and adjacent to the present BRINCO concession area in Labrador.

Now with regard to these four areas, Mr. Speaker, may I say briefly, this Steel Mountain is an area which is

believed to contain iron ore, in fact is known to contain iron ore. Steel Mountain itself is so interesting as a deposit of iron ore that I went once to Germany and negotiated with Krupps a contract which was at least carried out in part. The House may be interested to know that the first full fledged meeting of Krupps held after the war was held for the purpose of discussing with me and the Attorney General here and with the then Minister of Finance and present Minister of Highways and others this very important project. They signed the agreement which was to this effect, that they would come to Newfoundland and they would go to Steel Mountain and they would go inside to Steel Mountain, in that general area, and search for iron ore.

They would send high class geologists, mineral geologists, and they would do it all at their own expense. The Newfoundland Government for its part would lend them tents, camping equipment and cooking utensils such as prospectors and men in the bush use, and lend them a jeep or some kind of four-wheel drive that would enable them to use in such rough terrain as a vehicle might be able to get over, and if necessary to lend them an aircraft or at all events to provide the use of aircraft and quality, both, if they should find the iron ore especially and if they should find that the coal deposits on the west coast or anywhere in Newfoundland where there might be coal deposits were of sufficient quantity and quality they would in that case, in the case of finding either but especially both, but either coal or iron, if they could find either in sufficient quantity and quality and these deposits should be made available to them by the Government in that case they would establish a steel

mill in Newfoundland using the well-known Krupps process for making pig iron. They carried out their part of the agreement to this extent at least—They sent their engineers, geologists and mineralogists, three very distinguished men to Newfoundland and they went into Steel Mountain and beyond Steel Mountain some miles up through the bush and prospected and explored. They got out, I think—I am speaking from memory—some forty tons of iron ore and shipped it to Germany and put it through the Krupps Steel mills where they tested this iron ore and found it to contain too much titanium to be good iron ore and too little to be good titanium, depending on the purpose in mind. They were in there so late that year that we got a small aircraft in there to bring them out. They were caught in the snow, and the camp and cooking utensils are in there yet, and perhaps some other things, I do not know. At all events it was too late in the year to do more than get them out. They went back to Germany. Some time after the analysis of the iron ore had been made and it was determined the ore was not very attractive. So that they abandoned the whole programme. In the meanwhile—and this will be of interest to some members of the House more especially the honourable member for Fogo who is not here at the moment who was then the member for Port de Grave—In the meanwhile others came from Krupps, very high class and very famous men in Europe, and searched around for a source of iron ore and a site for a steel mill. At that point I negotiated over a period of weeks and the Attorney General accompanied me, with DOSCO in the hope that we could make a satisfactory deal with DOSCO for the purchase of iron ore in Bell Island to be turned into steel

in a plant at Bay Roberts. All of this came to nothing in the end.

Now BRINEX wants to go in and take a look, a hard look, an efficient look, at that iron ore. Nothing may come of it. But they want to look and see if there is anything to it.

Lewis Hills in the Area—I think I am right when I say it is the area inside of Bluff Head in the Port au Port Bay, which contains the area bordering on, in fact, immediately contiguous to Bluff Head asbestos deposits, in a very notable serpentine area. It is a highly mineralized area, very pronounced in its serpentine character of its geology. Serpentine goes with two things, cromite and asbestos. BRINEX want to take a good hard look. Their idea is to bring in with them there some notable concerns who specialize in cromite and other firms who specialize in asbestos, and take a good hard look.

The Hall's Bay Area is part of the twenty-three hundred square mile concession we gave to Falconbridge some years ago, which incidentally lead to the bringing of Mr. M. J. Boylin's firm to Newfoundland. It was our action in giving that concession to Falconbridge which lead to the present Boylin and O'Brien Gold Mines activities down in that important part of the Province.

Part of the rest of the seven hundred and thirty-four miles is contiguous to the existing area which BRINCO has been examining very carefully. They now want to include and bring in other concerns with themselves to take a hard look at that.

MR. BROWNE: Where is that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the North, Central Newfoundland. I will

give the House a picture of it. If you can picture White Bay in your mind, coming right down to a sharp "V" with the Baie Verte Peninsula to the immediate right of that, on your right hand, to the South east, all that Baie Verte Peninsula and then go on again still further east in (a map is a helpful sort of thing) and coming across take in all of Green Bay, a large part of Notre Dame Bay as far east as a line drawn from Pilley's Island in the North and coming south to a point just east of Millertown Junction. That is the area in question. It is immediately contiguous to their own area which is to the west of that and immediately contiguous to the Boylin Area which is immediately to the east of that. In other words it is sandwiched down between their own existing area and the Boylin or former Falconbridge concession. It is six hundred and forty-three square miles.

MR. BROWNE: It says here, an area approximately thirty square miles—is that not right? On page five?

MR. HIGGINS: That is the Hall's Bay Area.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. It is a wedge-shaped piece which lies exactly in between the BRINCO area to the left, if you are looking North, and the Boylin Area to the right. Now the Boylin Area is part of the Falconbridge Area. There was a part left. This is the part that was left.

The fourth area is in Central Labrador. It is an area formerly held under concession by American Metals, the Canadian Branch, which is called Canadian American Metals and has the short name of CAMCO. It is twelve hundred square miles immediately next to the area of BRINCO at the present time. If I am not mistaken that is in by Steel Lakes. That would

be roughly speaking to the North West of Northwest River and immediately next to the existing BRINCO Area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, BRINEX would have for those four years from the 14th of March, the exclusive right to explore for minerals over those areas. The Government are to be supplied with an annual report of the work they do or have done by others, and a statement of expenditure that they incur or are incurred by others through their instrumentality, of course; and taxes on mineral they find and develop to be those of general application. They would be subject to all taxes of general application. Of course they would have the right to assign their exploration rights under the agreement, i.e. to bring in other concerns and either jointly or separately have these other concerns develop, conduct development.

I think, Mr., Speaker, BRINCO has established their good name and reputation in Newfoundland sufficiently to warrant our passing this legislation almost without hesitation.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask for an adjournment of this debate, I wonder if we could be supplied with maps and have an opportunity to study the areas.

Motion, that the debate on second reading be adjourned, carried:

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair:

Second Reading of Bill—"An Act to Amend the Legislative Disabilities Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill which is a Bill to amend in three

particulars the Legislative Disabilities Act.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that I would be able to present to the House at this session a brand new Disabilities Act, as all the Provinces would like to have an Act that is uniform, and I understand the Uniformity Conference will at an early session consider making all these acts uniform. At the moment though there are two or three points in the present Act which we deem it advisable should be amended at this session and not wait until the introduction of a uniform Bill.

The first of these is an amendment to sub-paragraph (1) of Paragraph (a) of Section (4) of the present statute. It says in section (4) Whenever any person of the House of Assembly accepts any office place or appointment of profit or enrolment in or under the Crown or the Government of Newfoundland his seat shall thereupon become vacant.

Now the "Crown" when this legislation was enacted was, of course, the Government of Newfoundland or "The Crown in Right of Newfoundland" but now that we have Confederation the "Crown" has a wider interpretation and would include the "Crown" in Right of Great Britain and the Crown in right of Canada. At the moment a person who has dealings or is under salary or under pay from the American Government is entitled to sit in this House. Anybody who represents the German Government or any other Government in the world is entitled to sit with impunity in this House, but not an employee of the Federal Government. In other words, if one of my learned friends here in this House who happen to be lawyers should be

engaged as counsel by the Federal Government—

MR. BROWNE: The honourable member for Harbour Main?

MR. CURTIS: It might be impossible for him strictly to sit. I do not know whether the honourable member for Harbour Main is acting for the Government or not, but the Canadian National Railway is not the Government of Canada.

MR. BROWNE: Not the Crown? It is a Crown Company.

MR. CURTIS: However, the object of this Act, Mr. Speaker, was that the Government would not have a bunch of paid members in the House and that members of the House itself were not to be paid members of the Government and so be influenced perhaps. But now with Confederation it is the feeling of the Government that this should apply only to employees of the Government of Newfoundland. The Act might have been amended in two ways; by either leaving out the word "Crown" or putting in "The Crown in Right of Newfoundland" or else, as we have suggested we do now, just strike out the word "Crown" altogether and say—When any member of this House of Assembly accepts from or under the Government of Newfoundland then his seat shall become vacant. I think that might be looked upon as a change just made necessary by the change in our Constitution, and I think it is an amendment which will not be objected to from any side of this House.

The second amendment deals with the question of a vacancy occurring in the House of Assembly. Section (5) of the original statute, Mr. Speaker, says that when a vacancy shall occur in the House of Assembly the

Lieutenant-Governor shall within six months after the happening of such vacancy issue a writ for the election and return of a member for the district in respect of which such a vacancy has occurred. That section, Mr. Speaker, has caused a great deal of worry in the past, not to the Government of the day but to the Governor because the Act instructs the Governor that he must do something within six months. Unfortunately the position of the Governor is apt to be misunderstood. We have had to advise His Honour in the past from my Department that that phrase there—means—The Lieutenant-Governor in Council—and the Lieutenant-Governor himself has no right to issue a writ. In any event, Mr. Speaker, it would not be much good for him to issue a writ because if the Lieutenant-Governor in Council do not arrange a voters' list and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council do not appoint a returning officer and do not do this and do that, and if this House does not find the money the Lieutenant-Governor cannot very well issue a writ for an election of any member to this House. So that just in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the position this amendment provides that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall within six months after the happening of a vacancy declare the issue of a writ.

The third amendment, Mr. Speaker, is an amendment to Section 10 of this Act. The original statute which we found when we came in here in 1949 named a list of Cabinet Ministers to whom this Act did apply. We feel that since the offices held by Cabinet Ministers were varying and had been varying from time to time, such as for instance we carried it at the present session by the introduction of a Min-

ister of Highways, it would be better to just provide Ministers of the Crown should be exempted, without individually naming their offices. We added, and those who were here at the time remember, the name of the Leader of the Opposition, because he was, as Leader of the Opposition, in receipt of a salary and consequently needed the protection of this Act also. At the time I think the Cabinet consisted of twelve members and so, at the request of the then Opposition, this Act was amended to say, the number of persons holding office as Ministers of the Crown accepted by that Act shall not exceed twelve. Now, Mr. Speaker, with the larger representation in this House and with the increased work the Government has deemed it advisable to increase the number of Cabinet to fourteen, and thirteen of whom might possibly be said to hold office. There is a difference of opinion to this held by some with whom we have discussed the matter, that the Premier himself, my honourable Leader and colleague, does not hold office and that consequently at the present time we are within the Act and that there are only twelve Ministers of the Crown.

MR. BROWNE: He is Minister of Economic Development,

MR. CURTIS: Now he is. It is for that reason the Honourable Premier vacated the office and only assumed the office now since we gave this Bill. I might say we have wanted to be quite within the Act. For that reason, the Premier, as I said, vacated that office and held no office other than Premier. Now the question is—Does the Premier hold office as a Minister of the Crown? That is a question which I am not prepared today to answer yes or no to. My personal feel-

ing would be that the answer would be yes. On the other hand—

MR. BROWNE: It is a question of whether he gets a salary.

MR. CURTIS: I talked with other lawyers who differ. However we want to make the matter quite clear that the number of persons holding office as Ministers of the Crown, to whom salaries have been voted, is now twelve, and no salary has been voted as Ministers to more than twelve. We therefore suggest in this Bill that this section be repealed. That means it will be a matter for this House to decide from year to year how many Ministers shall be appointed and hold office.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I have explained the various sections of the Bill, and therefore move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General feels that he has explained the Bill. He has explained the Bill but left out three things; giving the reason why he has brought in these three amendments to the legislation—First dealing with the question of removing the word "Crown" from the provisions of the Act as it is today—"Wherever any member of the House of Assembly accept any office, place or appointment of profit or emolument from or under the Crown"—the Attorney General tells us that servants of the United States or Germany Governments could occupy seats here in the House of Assembly. Well now I think he must admit he is being very far-fetched when talking like that.

MR. CURTIS: Could not a member of this House be consul for Germany?

MR. BROWNE: I am not sure he could, but I do not see why he should

not. It is not the same thing at all. The purpose of the Legislative Disabilities Act is to prevent the Government from controlling the House of Assembly, getting control over the majority.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Which Government? The Government of Newfoundland?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, the Government of Newfoundland today has thirteen members and in addition to that the Speaker is appointed on recommendation of the Government and the Deputy Speaker is appointed, that makes fifteen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It makes fifteen what?

MR. BROWNE: Fifteen persons who are under the control of the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Speaker is under the control of the Government?

MR. BROWNE: Under the control in this sense—The Speaker is appointed on recommendation of the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Leader of the Opposition. He either is or is not under the control of the Government.

MR. BROWNE: I say he is appointed on the recommendation of the Leader of the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Leader of the Opposition took him by the arm and dragged him up there.

MR. BROWNE: I know, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member seriously means that the Speaker is under the control of the Government.

MR. BROWNE: What I mean is that the Speaker is one of the offices which is excepted from the provisions of the Act, as it stands at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then so is the Leader of the Opposition—Is he a creature of the Government. He gets a salary. Why not count him in with the Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: I am not asked to pass an opinion on that at the present time. But I am not sure it is a good thing for the Leader of the Opposition to get a salary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the honourable gentleman know of any leader who does not?

MR. BROWNE: It is an innovation. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier is quite able to speak when his time comes, and if he will allow me to make my comments. He is well able to comment and ridicule.

MR. SPEAKER: That point is well taken.

MR. BROWNE: I say, Sir, the Attorney General has not given us any valid reason why the "Crown" should be removed from this Act, because what it means is that the Government through its influence with the Government at Ottawa can secure positions under the Federal Government for members of the House of Assembly, and they can sit in here although they are being paid salaries from the Federal Government. Otherwise why bother it? Why not wait until the uniformity of legislation committee has pondered over the Acts that are in effect in the ten Provinces and then put down something that is uniform. Why go to the trouble of removing

that now? I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I am unduly suspicious when I think that there is some ulterior motive behind this piece of legislation.

If you were to pass on from that provision to the third provision, that the number of Cabinet Ministers may be increased, that no limit is placed on the number. Under the Act at the present time the number of Cabinet Ministers who may receive emoluments from the Crown is limited to twelve. There are thirteen members of the Cabinet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fourteen.

MR. BROWNE: Thirteen receiving pay at the present time and one Minister without portfolio who is employed by the Government, and I presume some provision was made to exonerate him. There must be some provision here in the Act which exonerates him for accepting a position as Chairman of the Commission on Financial Terms. I think there is some amendment to cover him. He has received a salary for the services he performed. Therefore there are thirteen members of the Cabinet and one who is a Minister without portfolio but who is Chairman of this Royal Commission.

Now, Sir, if this is repealed then the Government may enlarge the number and take in more until it actually has a majority of the Assembly, as it did in the last session. Where are we then? The theory of the House of Assembly governing is gone because it is only while the private members exceed the number of members of the Government that the theory of the House of Assembly governing can maintain.

In regard to the third provision introduced here about a vacancy in the

House of Assembly and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council within six months—That gives control of the Government again. Under the Act dealing with the House of Assembly the person resigning sends his resignation to the Governor and it is the Governor who receives that resignation who has the power to issue that writ. In the House of Commons when a person resigns, a member resigns, he sends his resignation to the Speaker and the Speaker issues a writ. But under our Act, when a person puts in his resignation he puts it into the Lieutenant-Governor.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): That was previous to Confederation. Our Interpretation Act I think you will find "Lieutenant-Governor" means "Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council."

MR. BROWNE: Since Confederation—I have the Interpretation Act here — "Lieutenant-Governor" means the "Lieutenant-Governor of the Province or other chief executive officer or administrator carrying on the Government of Newfoundland on behalf and in the name of the Sovereign, by whatever title he is designated." There is a distinction there. When the distinction is removed it places within the power of the Government the control of elections. While at the present time it does not make very much difference, because the Government is so strong that it does not need to worry, there have been occasions in the past where there has been only a majority of one or two and it was possible therefore for the Government to hold out or would be possible with this amendment for the Government themselves to hold up a by-election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For how long?

MR. BROWNE: For more than six months. It was actually done for more than six months.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But it was unconstitutional. That was not the Government's fault. I was a member of the delegation that called on the Governor at the time.

MR. BROWNE: Here is the section which deals with it—Section 4 of the Legislative Disabilities Act—“Whenever any member of the House of Assembly tenders by writing under his hand to the Lieutenant-Governor the resignation of his seat in the House of Assembly.” So the person who resigns hands in his resignation to the Lieutenant-Governor and then the Lieutenant-Governor within six months is supposed to issue a writ. Now then the member puts in his resignation to the Lieutenant-Governor and the Lieutenant-Governor issues the writ under this legislation here—I cannot see any reason why it should be changed. I think it is all right. What is the demand for it? How did this come up in the first place? Why is the Government anxious to remove the word “the Crown” from the authority and why is the power to issue a writ taken from the Lieutenant-Governor in Council? Why again is the Government anxious to remove the lid from the limit of the number of members which may hold office under the “Crown”? I think, Mr. Speaker, that we must oppose this legislation. We disagree with the principle involved in this Legislation and therefore must oppose it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the third section of this Bill which says that Section (5) of the Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor: “Whenever a vacancy occurs in the House of As-

sembly the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall within six months after the happening of the vacancy direct the issue of a writ of elections for the election and return of a member for the district in respect of which the vacancy occurred.”

It was stated by the Attorney General, as the law reads at the present it makes the Governor of the Province, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province take the part of the Government.

MR. BROWNE: He has done so for a long time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did so for a long time with very unfortunate results.

MR. BROWNE: When?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, with very unfortunate results a number of years ago, as the honourable and learned member should know, some very unfortunate results. I see the honourable and learned member for St. John's East nods his head. He remembers the occasion and so does the honourable and learned gentleman remember it. I remember well—I was a member of the delegation called on the Governor at the time. What happened then? He defied the constitution. He could not defy it now. The Governor then was answerable only to Downing Street or to the Dominion Office to the Colonial Office. Now the Lieutenant-Governor is answerable to Ottawa. There is a second course of action—Mr. Speaker, let this be understood clearly and without any doubt, there is a Government in Newfoundland and the Government consists of the Governor and the Queen's Ministers. That is the Government. The Lieutenant-Governor as Lieutenant-Governor has certain rights and the

Queen's Ministers as the Queen's Ministers have certain rights, and the two together make up the Government. Let that be clear. The Lieutenant-Governor as such acting without his Ministers have certain rights but they are extremely limited. One of them would arise if this House passed into law and a vacancy occurred and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council failed to cause a writ to be issued within the six months the Governor's duty would then be to see one was issued, but only after the Government let six months pass without causing the writ to be issued within six months. It would be normal function of the Government carrying out the law—if it failed to do so it would be in the same position exactly as a Government which occupied office after the expiration of its term of office.

Let us compare for a moment a by-election with a general election, just to bring it out and make the matter clear. The law provides that a Parliament may exist, a general assembly may live a certain length of time—I think it is five years from the date it first sits—not from the date of the election—Let us assume therefore that a given Government exists for five years, holds office for five years and then does not do what it normally should.

MR. BROWNE: The House of Assembly?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said a "general assembly" I used those words. Let us assume that the five years pass and the Government do not do what they normally do—What they normally do is that the Premier goes to the Governor and says: "I recommend a dissolution"—and the Governor proceeds to dissolve the general assembly, the Governor not the Government.

The Governor dissolves it on the recommendation of the Premier any time the Premier recommends it virtually. Suppose the Premier does not follow then the normal course and lets the five years elapse and still has not recommended the dissolution. Now the law has been violated and not only the law but the basic law, the constitution. At that point the Governor has the right and the duty to dissolve Parliament without the Government's request at all. All that comes in a general election. In a by-election the normal course should be the same as a general election provided it is within the term of five years—In one case it is six months and in the other it is provided within the term—The normal way is for the Governor to do it on the advice of his Ministers, in other words the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. But now let the six months pass without the Ministers having advised the Governor—in other words without the Lieutenant-Governor in Council having caused the writ to be issued, let the six months pass and you have precisely the same position as you have when five years are allowed to pass and no dissolution is recommended. In either case the Governor set in and uses his constitutional duty and fulfills his constitutional duty and exercises his constitutional right in one case to dissolve and in the other to issue a writ for a by-election.

MR. BROWNE: Where does the Lieutenant-Governor get authority to issue the writ—He does not get it under the Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Look up the Letter Patent. Remember we were very careful when we signed the Terms of Union I wish I had it here and I would quote for the House the exact words where rights and prerogatives

and conventions, the whole of the Constitution, as it existed at the very moment before Confederation is fully preserved, so that the original constitution, the original directives to the Governor then makes up our Constitution—carefully preserved—Remember we retained one of the present Justices of the Court of Nova Scotia, then Dean of Dalhousie University, we had him as a Constitutional advisor in the delegation negotiating the Terms of Union, and on his advice and after thorough discussion we carefully preserved that, and the Governor's rights is now the Lieutenant-Governor's rights. It is constitutional—It may or may not be written out.

MR. BROWNE: You have removed this right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No we have not, not at all—We have done no such thing. We do not propose to do it either.

MR. BROWNE: You are doing it now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not at all. We are not doing it now. That is just a word the honourable gentleman is using. The Constitution of Newfoundland, as it existed immediately prior to the sixteenth day of February 1934, is revived at the date of Union and shall, subject to these Terms and the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1946, continue as the Constitution of the Province of Newfoundland from and after the date of Union, until altered under the authority of the said Acts. This is from the terms of union. It is a term not generally known. Nobody paid much attention to it, but it is of the utmost importance. It preserves our constitution. We did that on the specific advice of Dean MacDonald, presently Mr. Justice Mac-

Donald of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia—It is a term to which nobody paid attention in Newfoundland.

Now under that clause of the Terms of Union—and do not forget the Terms of Union are now the Constitution of Newfoundland and not only the words there but the words existing in any directives to the Governor, any letters patent, any documents existing prior to the 16th of February 1934 form too our Constitution.

MR. BROWNE: Any statute including the Disabilities Act?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is true. This is a segment of it. But the big point is that there is not any doubt at all—It may not be the case and I do not know whether it is or not that any Lieutenant-Governor of a Canadian Province by virtue only of the fact he is Lieutenant-Governor, receiving his appointment at the hands of Ottawa, has imposed on him the duty to which I refer, but certainly it is imposed on our Lieutenant-Governor because it is imposed on him by the Constitution of Newfoundland as it existed on the or up to the date of the coming of the Commission, because its existence is preserved in Clause 7 of our Constitution, i.e. Newfoundland's Written Constitution.

Let us assume for the sake of argument that this clause here becomes law—"Whenever a vacancy occurs in the House of Assembly the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall within six months after the happening of the vacancy direct the issue of a writ of election etc." Let us assume that becomes law. Let us assume a vacancy occurs. Let us assume that within the six months the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, which means the Government Ministers, in practice it

means the Government, let us assume the Government do not recommend to the Governor or do not cause a writ to be issued so that the law is violated. At that point the Constitution of Newfoundland provides that the Governor or the person who has taken the place of the Governor, namely, the Lieutenant-Governor, fulfills the same right, has the same right and fulfills the same duty under our Constitution as it was up to 1934, as the Governor did. Alright he then uses his power, steps in and issues the writ.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Premier, what is his authority for saying that? How can he say that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not a lawyer. Number two I have not all the directives and letters patent and various documents. I suppose a lot of them are here. They are reprinted in our Revised Statutes. I have not time to read them all and find out the exact clauses. But if the Government fails to issue a writ within six months and the six months expire and the Governor, whose clear duty it is—I say that was brought out very thoroughly in the St. John's By-Election of 1927. I was an editor of a newspaper at the time, and had occasion to consult a number of lawyers and did most of the writing that was done—I remember vividly and what happened was this—There is only one member left on the opposite side, as a lawyer, who can speak on this. I have no doubt the honourable and learned member for St. John's East will speak. I ask him now to imagine the Government, the Queen's Ministers or the Premier, if you like, because it is his prerogative, fails to advise the Governor when the five years are up to dissolve the General Assembly and call a general election.

MR. BROWNE: Could I remind the Premier how long it was before the by-election was held in Burgeo.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, and not only Burgeo, other by-elections.

Now try to picture that happening, and the five years elapse and the Premier does not request a dissolution or advise one—What happened then. The law says five years is the life of a General Assembly dated from the first day of the General Assembly. The General Assembly exists from the day the members come up and sign the roll and are sworn in—Five years from that date and no dissolution takes place upon the advice of the Government. What is then the position? Does that mean there need not be any more elections from there on? Has no one any right, no one any duty, the Government having neglected their duty, their clear duty to follow the law. But they have neglected it. They have not advised a dissolution. Therefore no dissolution takes place on advice of the Government. But remember there is a Governor. Now what happens? I ask the honourable and learned gentlemen to consider that and give us an answer. I have given the answer myself. The answer is the Governor has no choice but to order an election and dissolve the General Assembly. He must do it. Similarly and in exactly the same way he must do the same if six months pass and no by-election.

Now this question of emolument under the Crown—There were two members of the Opposition who sat over there for years, one of them sat there for about six years and the other sat there for about three years. I am not talking about the Leader of the Opposition either. I am talking about the Late Ronald Fahey who sat there

three years and Mr. Frank Fogwell who sat there about six years, both of them all the time receiving in addition to their sessional ideranty money from the Crown.

MR. BROWNE: From a Crown Company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: From the Crown. The honourable gentleman said so himself here a moment ago—I am taking the honourable gentleman's views now. I know the honourable the Attorney General said it was a question but the honourable and learned gentleman said there was no question. He said that the honourable member for Harbour Main received emolument under the Crown as solicitor for Canadian National Railway. I say that two members of the Opposition sat here one three and one six years receiving a salary from the Canadian National Railway. But, Mr. Speaker, take note of this—"The Crown in right of Canada"—"The Crown in right of Newfoundland"—Now all the amendment provides is that a Canadian National Railway man can still sit in the House and not be in any doubt as to whether he violates the law and the Constitution. If any railroader in Newfoundland in the Canadian National Railway or employee of the Canadian National Telegraph wishes to run for the House of Assembly, and gets a leave of absence from his employer to come and take his seat in the House, then if this becomes law he can do it. If this does not become law it is setting up cause for his vacating his seat, losing his seat, even after being elected. The whole purpose of Carter's Purge, as I think it is called, because I believe in fact it was Sir Frederick Carter who introduced it here into the House, was because there was a

time when the Government would put everybody in the House on the payroll, and not so many years ago, not only the officials, the employees of the House but all the members of the House, everybody got in on it.

MR. BROWNE: Everybody on the Government side.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On all sides, enough to give them clear and unmistakable control, because the Government proceeded to buy up the members by giving them all kinds of jobs, most of them without any duties or responsibilities or work. This was to guard against an utterly vicious thing, a thing that would violate all semblance of Democracy. Carter's Purge was introduced into Newfoundland. It was not original. It was done in the United Kingdom to the mother of Parliamentary Government, and copied in Newfoundland and introduced by Sir Frederick Carter and known as Carter's Purge. It provided that except for sessional pay and salary perhaps to Mr. Speaker and to the Queen's Ministers, except for these. In that case having been elected and having accepted positions of emolument the Queen's Ministers had to be elected or re-elected by a by-election, in nearly every case. Every man who came in had to go right back, his seat being vacant because he took a position of emolument. Mr. Monroe amended that.

MR. MURRAY: Were there any defeated?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know. I imagine there well might be.

Now to prevent a vicious Government from just buying up all the members Carter's Purge was introduced. What is the essence of Carter's Purge? That the Canadian National Railway

Employees should not hold a seat? That is not the spirit at all. That any lawyer who accepts jobs from the Government of Canada or any department of the Government of Canada or any Crown Corporation of Canada, a piece of law work or any kind of work shall thereby lose his seat in the Newfoundland House of Assembly? Is that the spirit of Carter's Purge? It is not the spirit of Carter's Purge, Mr. Speaker. It simply means except as provided by written law no one holding a seat in this House shall receive any Newfoundland Government money. That is what it means. It does not mean the United States of America nor the United Kingdom nor Nova Scotia nor it does not mean the Government of Canada. It means money at the disposal of this Government. It is to prevent this Government from buying the members of this House that that law was brought in. Now it is not to prevent members of this House from receiving money from the Government of Canada. If it did some of the members here would have to vacate their seats right away, because they are young enough to have children who receive Family Allowances they would probably have to get out because they receive Federal Money from the Government of Canada. Yes, it is that simple.

Therefore to make the matter certain and to carry out Carter's Purge surely we say no one except those mentioned, those specific Queen's Ministers, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, no one except these shall receive emolument under the Crown but if anyone else does he vacates his seat—But "The Crown in Right of Newfoundland." In other words, the Government of Newfoundland. What is wrong with that?

The honourable gentleman may stand and fight hard. He won't change that position.

MR. BROWNE: I know I won't.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I say he won't change the position—The position is clear as daylight.

Now the third point, as to the number of Ministers. I do not know of any Province in Canada, and it certainly does not exist in the Parliament of Canada nor does it exist in the United Kingdom, the mother of Parliamentary Government, a law which says there shall not be more than so many Ministers. That does not exist. There is no such legislation. It never existed in Newfoundland History—It never did—until one day Mr. John J. Higgins who was Leader of the Opposition when we were introducing some amendment said—Why do you not put a limit on the number of Cabinet Ministers—We said: "All right. Put it in." Now we are saying it is not all right. It is all wrong. Now I may say there we are fourteen members of the Cabinet. It is going to stay that number. If, as I believe the population of Newfoundland increases enormously in the next ten or twenty years, if, as I believe, it becomes necessary to have a membership of the House increased up to what it was twenty-five years ago, forty members, I say we then might have another Cabinet Minister—We might then have fifteen—I do not know. That depends on the circumstances. There is certainly no intention on our part of increasing the number above the present number. But we say it is ridiculous, especially as the House itself each year in voting or not voting the salary of a Minister has full control over the matter. After all the Queen's purse is controlled by this House and

not by the Government. It is what this House votes to the Queen that the Queen or the Queen's Ministers can spend for here. Each year the House votes the salary not only of the membership but of the Ministers as well. That is where the control should come and not by a written law. So that amendment is perfectly sensible and logical.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this Bill there is just one little thing we have all missed, and I am sure the explanation of the Premier just a few moments ago has been very fool proof. He told us all exactly what it should be and what has been in the past. I began to ask myself—when is an election not an election—When is it a by-election. I don't know whether or not that is a misprint it is called an election. It is not, it is a by-election. It really would be better to put in a correction because it would look an awful lot better—after someone vacates his seat to call it a by-election.

I think it is a very substantial and good Bill and I have much pleasure in supporting it.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I did not actually have anything to say in this matter, but in view of the fact that the Premier has instructed, or requested me it is almost obligatory on me to offer some opinion. I would merely say that in so far as the argument, I am not taking issue with him on the main trend of his argument, because I am inclined to think that very largely he has made points that I am prepared to accept if not necessarily adopt. I am prepared to accept the reasoning of his age—He however did make one statement, Sir, which I think is not tenable. He took the example of the honourable and learned

member for Harbour Main and said in effect that any member of this House who happened to be a lawyer who acted for a Crown Corporation would be disqualified. I do not think that is so. I refer specifically to Section 3—Sub-section 20 of the original Act which reads that the above section (that is the disqualifying section) does not apply nor extend nor include nor in any way affect the following persons—Any person acting as solicitor or Counsel for the Crown the Government or for the legislature, or for any public department, public board, or public body in any civil, criminal, or quasi criminal proceeding.

However, as I say that is only a minor thing. I do feel that my honourable and learned colleague from St. John's South is not exactly straining at a gnat when he raises the issue as to whether the words in Chapter four where the word "Crown" has been eliminated. I do think that objection has been met by the Premier's reply but I would not say entirely refuted. I still feel the elimination is unnecessary and to some extent objectionable.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not make it "Crown in Right of Newfoundland"?

MR. HIGGINS: Are they not synonymous terms—"The Crown in Right of Newfoundland" and the "Government of Newfoundland"? That is a matter very well might be met in Committee. I have an uneasy feeling when we come to a final decision the thing is going to pass exactly as it is. However that does not in the meantime debar me of the right of exercising my vocal cords.

The section the Premier quoted—He has a very remarkable grasp of history both recent, ancient and modern. He can recall circumstances at

tending on the failure of the Governor to call a by-election. I can recall that to some extent, Sir. It may very well be argued, as the Attorney General did in effect say, the Lieutenant-Governor without the advice of the Government has no power at all. If the situation as posed by the Honourable the Premier did arise, and it is conceivable it could still arise—it did arise, as he has said, once before—and the Lieutenant-Governor did not act. It would imply some action by the Opposition or some public spirited citizens or group of citizens to see he did do so. The Lieutenant-Governor by himself could do nothing. It seems to me a question of just going around in circles. Certainly it is that clause that calls for a by-election in six months is one that has been honoured more in the breach than in the observance in the past. I do think if the Government does its duty an election will be called. If it does not do its duty then the remedy is available to the interested party be they in Opposition to the Government or public spirited citizens to remedy the wrong.

Finally, Sir, with respect to the repeal of Section 10, I am prepared to accept unqualifiedly the explanation of the Honourable the Premier that the then Leader of the Opposition, as would be characteristic, should pick on the number twelve. It is a good round figure with good historical qualifications and associations. I do not know if there is Apostolic succession. It is a good number.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I may say we don't claim Apostolic—

MR. HIGGINS: I dare say the gentleman who named that figure would be the first to deny that, I do say, Sir, I think, and I am prepared to accept the assurance of the Premier that he

is not presently contemplating there will be any increase. But the things must surely come if the country continues to expand as it has—then we will have an increase of Ministers. I am not saying we should have everybody on the other side a captain, I think that would be wrong. I think it would defeat the whole idea of the rule of Parliament if we had a Cabinet that comprised a majority of the House. I should not say that. I was going to say worse even. Even I would not accuse the Honourable the Premier of that. I think if we accept as correct, and I believe it is correct, the statement that there is no other Act which says the number of Cabinet Ministers in any Legislature shall be twelve, ten, fourteen or so on. There appears to be no valid objection to this repeal. I do think though there is some validity to the objections raised by my honourable and learned colleague from St. John's South on the elimination of the word "Crown". As to the rest of it, I must say in substance I agree with the Premier's explanation.

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

On division the Opposition voted Nay:

MR. BROWNE: Carried on division.

Motion that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday at 3:00 of the Clock, carried.

FRIDAY, May 3, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg

leave to present a petition from the people of the north side of Bay Bulls, with regard to the widening of the road and the maintenance of their road. Now, Mr. Speaker, this road is built along the edge of a cliff on the north side of the harbour where the bulk of the people live. On the left side of the road there is a cliff. And on the right side as you go down. It is supposed to be built up with earth and rock, and there is a straight eighty foot drop to the sea below. Now the public wharf from which the fish from two plants operate is down this road. When actually built this road might have been suitable but at the present time it is completely inadequate as well as being unsafe for the purpose. Beyond a section-man working along the road there has not been any real maintenance done on it for a number of years. As it stands now it is actually a menace to safety for the people using it.

The petition has been signed by about one hundred and fifty voters and residents of the area. I wish to support the petition, Sir, and ask to have it laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, having formerly represented those people in a different capacity—

MR. SMALLWOOD: And hoping to represent them again.

MR. BROWNE: And hoping to represent them again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Minister of Provincial Affairs in supporting the prayer of this petition. I know the locality very well. I have a lot of friends living down there, and I hope the Minister in his judgment will believe it is well worth doing. I support it heartily.

On motion petition received for reference to the department to which it relates.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices 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 Respecting the Expropriation of Land."

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Supply): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Social Assistance Act, 1954."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act, 1956."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Did I not understand the Minister of Welfare became the Minister of Supply and the Minister of Supply became the Minister of Welfare?"

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): That is correct.

MR. BROWNE: Well they have given notice of different bills from the department which they represent

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, for a fairly obvious reason. The present Minister of Public Welfare is certainly very much more familiar with the legislation which he has just given notice of than is the new minister. Similarly the minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply who has just given notice of a Bill concerning welfare has done so because he is much more familiar with

it than would be the new minister. So it has been agreed—

MR. BROWNE: I think the Premier is a little mixed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Minister of Municipal Affairs a moment ago gave notice of one regarding welfare because he is more familiar than is the new Minister of Welfare and similarly the new minister of Welfare gave notice of one concerning municipal affairs because he is more familiar with it than is the new Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. BROWNE: Is not that going to be rather complicated?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think not. Does it matter very much which minister introduces a Bill? It is done on behalf of the Government and not on his own behalf. Does it matter which minister explains as long as it is explained?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think it is important.

MR. BROWNE: He is responsible for his department.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a piece of legislation.

Notice of Questions

None.

Answers to Questions

(See Appendix).

QUESTION No. 91:

MR. ABBOTT: The reply to Question No. 91 will be ready for this House at its next sitting, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, on the Order Paper of April 5, I directed a question to the Minister of Finance asking what amount of money if any

was owed by the Government (Question No. 69), to the Chartered banks. In the absence of the Minister of Finance I would direct this to the Premier. I was told this answer had been given. I am quite convinced it has not been given. If it were given in the last session, of course, that did not apply to my question. So I am wondering if there is any valid reason why I should not get that answer. When I asked the minister concerned to direct me to where or how I could get it I was given a most unsatisfactory answer. In the meantime I have done some digging. I am quite concerned. I have had no answer whatsoever. I do not know what the reason is.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps that matter might be revived when the minister for Finance returns, because he gave the answer—did he not?

MR. DUFFY: He did not give the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: He gave the answer the honourable member did get.

Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before we enter upon the Orders of the Day I wonder if I could address a question, I believe, to the Premier. We have no Department of Marine now, and I am wondering if there is any department which takes note when shipwrecked men have been adrift at sea and have been rescued; and whether any public acknowledgement is made of the assistance given in the rescue by ships and by aircrafts of the U.S. Airforce Bases; and whether it would not be a good gesture to acknowledge that assistance?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a Federal matter, done by the Federal Government.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact it was Newfoundlanders who were adrift, Newfoundland seamen, does it not seem to the Premier it would be more appropriate for this Government to do that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It might and might not.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Highways, I wonder could anyone answer a question concerning an accident which took place on Topsail Highroad, near the Road De Luxe, when a woman and child, two people now in hospital were seriously injured as a result of a collision between a bus and a motor car. It was reported that the bus struck a pothole and diverted its course. In view of that fact immediate attention should be given to the potholes on the crowded thoroughfare of the Topsail Highway.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will pass the question on to the honourable minister.

MR. BROWNE: He should be here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the honourable gentleman's opinion. He is at something at the present time of primary importance to the public. Why is not the Leader of the Opposition here? Why is he not here? Why is he absent today? Maybe the House would like me to say why.

MR. BROWNE: I could not say. I am not his leader.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the other member of the Opposition here, and has the audacity to refer to the momentary absence of one minister, when they think it a momentous achievement to get fifty percent attendance.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act To Authorize the Government of Newfoundland to Enter Into An Agreement with British Newfoundland Exploration, Limited."

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the debate was adjourned by the Premier.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, at my request the Bill was adjourned to second reading. When the Premier introduced this Bill he said that the company known as the British Newfoundland Exploration Limited was a wholly owned subsidiary of the British Newfoundland Corporation Limited. Well now I would like to draw the attention of the House at the outset to the fact that there is nothing in this Bill to indicate in any way that the company which the Government is dealing with in this agreement is a subsidiary at all. From my examination of the Bill it appears to me that this company is completely independent, and when the Government is dealing with this company it is dealing with a company independent from the British Newfoundland Corporation Limited; and in that respect therefore any obligations which were imposed upon British Newfoundland Corporation, Brinco, by the original Act passed in 1953 or 1954 do not bind this company. And my purpose this afternoon is to draw the attention of the House to the provisions in the Brinco Act which placed an obligation upon that company to pay royalties to the Newfoundland Government; and which obligation also was to bind any subsidiary of the corporation. If this is a subsidiary then it seems to me it should be shown. Section 14 of the Agreement, as shown on page 280 in the Statutes of 1953 it says as follows: In consideration of the concessions and rights to be granted to the Corporation

in this agreement the corporation agrees to pay a rental each year during the subsistence of this agreement equal to eight percent of the net profit of the corporation as herein defined and these concessions and rights include mineral rights. Then it goes on to say "Net profit means the net profit less losses of the corporations and its subsidiary companies in so far as they are attributable to the Corporation's holdings. They are then computed, as shown in the Consolidated Act, including any profit or loss arising out of the disposal of assets of the Corporation or of any subsidiary corporation—otherwise in connection with the sale, loss or alienation of any of the licenses or rights granted to or hereby to be granted.

Now it seems to me that this British Newfoundland Exploration Limited is another and different company and there is nothing to indicate it is a subsidiary. It is to be governed solely by this Act. Now I have not had an opportunity to find out what effect of the drafting of this clause in connection with this Bill would be. But certainly it is worth an explanation, and I think that the Attorney General should explain it when he replies.

That seems to me to be the chief point that ought to be brought up in connection with this. As far as the rest is concerned it is new territory that has been taken over by this company. The British Newfoundland Corporation has large areas, fifty thousand square miles of territory in Labrador and ten thousand square miles in Newfoundland. This adds another twenty seven hundred square miles, or something like that, to their territory, twenty-three hundred in Labrador and several hundred in Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In what sense have they got fifty thousand square

miles in Labrador and ten in Newfoundland?

MR. BROWNE: In the sense that they have exploration rights over it. Well here is another extension of the rights which seems to be given by independent agreement. What a pity we have not got another two or three hundred square miles, Mr. Speaker, I don't see any harm in that. But the Premier last year, as I recollect, gave us a very glowing account of the results of investigations supposed to be made by Brinco in connection with the discovery of uranium. And we have heard nothing about it since. Perhaps he might be good enough, or someone on the other side might be good enough to tell us what happened to that. It was supposed to be the greatest discovery of uranium that had been made in the world, and that the great deposits in Ontario were almost not fit to be compared to the discovery made by Brinco on their concessions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't exaggerate now.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to rival the Premier in the art of exaggeration.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! I think the debate is becoming too personal now.

MR. BROWNE: I think, Mr. Speaker, we should have some explanation of how this company can be called a subsidiary when there is no reference to it. There should be some reference, by correspondence or in some way, to connect it up with the present company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, suppose there was no connection at all between BRINEX and BRINCO—Let us assume that, for the sake of argu-

ment, there is no connection at all. What would be wrong with it then?

MR. BROWNE: May I answer that? Because under the original agreement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Never mind the connection. Let us say there is none.

MR. BROWNE: Well, if that agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation was a good contract, and I presume the Premier would say that; why not follow out that provision for the rest of the Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman cannot have it both ways. He cannot argue in the one breath that BRINEX has nothing to do with BRINCO and in the next breath argue that the terms of the BRINEX Concession ought to be the same as the terms of the BRINCO Concession. Nor can he liken the twenty seven hundred square miles proposed to be given in the BRINEX Agreement with the sixty thousand square miles given in the BRINCO Agreement. He cannot have it both ways; he just cannot.

Now the fact of the matter is that BRINEX is a wholly owned subsidiary of BRINCO. It is a completely separate company but it is a company that has this connection with BRINCO, that is wholly owned by BRINCO. There are no shareholders, no shares that are not owned by BRINCO. It is a wholly owned subsidiary company—a separate organization—separate functions—but wholly owned by BRINCO. BRINCO formed it. BRINCO incorporated it. BRINCO owned it. And it was formed for the purpose, or for two purposes, one purpose to operate on the BRINCO areas, the BRINCO areas that are not mentioned in this legislation at all but

that are mentioned in the BRINCO legislation. BRINEX will operate on the BRINCO areas, and in so far as they do they will be subject to the terms and conditions laid down in the BRINCO Legislation. They will also operate on territory of their own, i.e. the territory that is named in this present Bill. In that connection they will pay taxes to the Government of general application; whatever is the regular rate of taxes prevailing, from time to time, from year to year and from decade to decade. They will pay—They will not be exempted from any taxes.

Now should there not be a BRINEX? And if there be a BRINEX should they not get a concession? What concession? What concession has its owner got? BRINCO only got the right to search for minerals and spend their own money doing it. What is wrong with that? The Tory Party has voted against in this House. They voted against it; they ridiculed it; they sneered at it and denounced it, and they have never yet given one solitary reason why there ought not to have been a BRINCO, and why this legislation ought not to have given them the exclusive right the legislation did in fact give them—never yet a reason.

MR. BROWNE: That is not so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is so—They have never yet been given a reason. The honourable gentleman was not here and does not know. I assure him there was no reason given beyond sneers and jeers and denouncing. Never yet was a reason given against BRINCO. When I say reason I mean reason of common sense, logic and ordinary common sense—ridiculing and sneering and denouncing certainly, yes, but no solid reason, no reasonable reason.

MR. BROWNE: I don't ever remember making any sneering or jeering remarks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman was not here.

MR. BROWNE: No, but there were discussions in 1954 and 1955—I made the point I thought it too big a concession and thought it should be far more limited.

MR. SPEAKER: The Premier did not name the honourable gentleman, and I do not think he was suggesting that it was the honourable gentleman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would be greatly surprised, I may say pleasantly surprised but none the less surprised if the Tory Party now broke with its own tradition and supported something that means or may mean or is designed to mean the development of Newfoundland. Because their record is absolutely, with not even one break in it from the beginning of Toryism in Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: Well, when was Buchans started?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now BRINEX is a company formed by Dominion Charter by BRINCO, to give BRINCO a specialized department almost, certainly a specialized organization, specializing in minerals. You see, Mr. Speaker, BRINCO are devoting a tremendous amount of their energy and money to the exploration of the water power in Labrador, and I may say, in Bay d'Espoir. They have spent, I think it is, three million dollars. Now they are only supposed to spend something like that on everything in the first five years of their life. In actual fact—

MR. BROWNE: One and a quarter millions they are supposed to spend.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On everything, for all purposes, in the first five years. In actual fact they have spent almost three millions in one of a number of projects, namely: the exploration and the survey and measurement of the hydro-electric potential in the Hamilton River Watershed, where they employed the Montreal Engineering Company and the Shawinigan Power and Engineering Company at a very large and very great cost. They had at one time, I believe, as many as three hundred men working on that great survey. They had helicopters and airplanes, all kinds of engineers, of all kinds of them. Indeed I suppose it would be fair to say it was one of the biggest hydro-surveys ever made in Canada, the one they made of the Hamilton River Watershed. I have read the report carefully; and it is a most impressive document.

Now they have spent in addition to that, to those three millions on the hydro-survey, considerable sums of money in a timber survey. And they are now spending and will this year spend a very considerable sum of money in connection with Bay d'Espoir. So that their activities have become widespread; minerals, timber and waterpower; waterpower in Newfoundland and water power in Labrador. And they thought therefore if they go ahead, as they hope to do, with actual development of the hydro power potential of Labrador and with the half million horsepower that can be developed in Bay d'Espoir they will do so perhaps as BRINCO and BRINCO as such may even form partnerships with concerns whose interest is the development of hydro power, or whose interest is, let us say for the sake of argument, just for the sake of argument, the manufacture of newsprint paper. As BRINCO they might make

partnerships with various concerns who had no interest whatever in minerals. But as BRINEX they are wholly owned, their subsidiary, specializing exclusively on mineral. They cannot as BRINEX, and as BRINEX in partnership with mining companies who are not interested in hydro, with mining companies not interested in timber or paper mills, but interested only in mineral, in partnership with such companies they can explore and possibly develop any minerals they find.

Now that is the purpose of BRINEX. There is nothing mysterious about it and certainly nothing suspicious about it. BRINEX is owned by the Royal Bank of Canada; it is owned, I think, by the Bank of Montreal; it is owned by Bowaters; it is owned by the AND Company; it is owned by Bowings; it is owned by Rothschild; it is owned by Prudential, the greatest insurance company in the world; it is owned by British Alliance, another great insurance company; and as such they have therefore one of the richest companies of the world; and owned by the English Electric Company, and incorporated as one, the owners of BRINCO, some thirty odd of the largest corporations of the United Kingdom and Canada; and they want to go in and do a first class job. How are we to say—No you shall not? The opposition said, no. They voted against it. Well, their record must be consistent—They always voted against the development of our resources. I throw out a challenge. I demand they vote against it; to be consistent.

MR. DUFFY: You will be disappointed if we do not vote against it, the way you talk.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will be disappointed I like to see the Tory Party in a position where they have

a perfect record of obstructing the development of this Province—I enjoy it—it helps to keep them where they now are.

Now there is one other thing only I think we need say—perhaps this is not the time to say it—perhaps it is not in order to say it—perhaps Mr. Speaker you will rule me out of order—but the honourable and learned member for St. John's South referred to it and indeed asked me to say it; it is in connection with the uranium finds in the Monkey Hill area of Labrador.

Last year BRINCO—and I do not see why I should not say this—BRINCO sent a messenger especially from Montreal to St. John's, to me, and delivered to me a document, into my own hands, announcing their discovery of uranium. There were present on that occasion in my office the special representative of BRINCO; not the gentleman who brought the document to me, but a special local liaison officer of BRINCO, namely, Mr. Claude House. He was present on that occasion. Present also on that occasion was the Provincial Geologist, Dr. Baird. Present also on that occasion was the Deputy Minister of Mines of the Government of Newfoundland. These three gentlemen, I remember, the former Deputy Minister of Mines, Mr. Claude House; the present Government Geologist of Newfoundland, the Provincial Geologist, Dr. Baird and the present Deputy Minister of Mines, Mr. Cover.—These three gentlemen were present. And it was they, not I, who sat together, the three of them, collectively worded the description of the discovery. It was they who called it "a Province," comparable with any. They did not compare it with the great discoveries of uranium of On-

tario and Saskatchewan—They did compare that of Labrador with Blind River in Ontario and Beaver Lodge in Saskatchewan. They said: this was evidently a uranium province—A province means an area in mineral terms, in geological terms, a province in uranium is equivalent in oil to the words—an oil field in oil. An oil field may run several hundred miles in length; a uranium province runs many miles in length, maybe twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty—They said occurrences were found over such a distance as to suggest that this was a uranium province comparing with Blind River in Ontario and Beaver Lodge in Saskatchewan. I did not say that because I had never heard of a uranium province. The only kind of province I know was the one I tried to create. That is the only kind I knew anything about, and that is spelled with a capital—I incorporated it in my statement. I did that, and for that I was responsible, for incorporating it in my statement. I did not word it—I did not write it. Now I know nothing in this life nor in this world that should cause anyone to change that statement one iota, one syllable nor one word—There is no change that I know of—The drilling went forward last year in Labrador. Last year the Spring opened later in Labrador than it had done, I think, for a great many years. I believe that in the month of June or was it July the snow was still twelve or fifteen feet deep in the Monkey Hill region, in July—So they had last year just an extraordinary short period during which they could operate in the Monkey Hill Area. I have talked with men who worked down there, geologists. I think they only had a few weeks altogether. And from the standpoint of a diamond drilling programme the period they had was ex-

tremely brief and they were not able in this extremely brief period to prove by drilling what had been indicated by an occurrence on the surface, stretching over a distance of a good many miles. Now if a brief period of drilling, and a period, as my colleague here tells me, in which they had some hard luck with their drills; the fact that they in that brief period did not prove by drilling what had been indicated and is still indicated on the surface means what? What does it mean? Has it got any meaning? It has not got any meaning at all. We are back where we were when the announcement had been made—That has not as yet been proven by diamond drilling. That is all it means—Now make the most of that. The little short triumphs the Tories manage to have, to raise—they last a day or a month. What do they amount to? What are these little brief triumphs, little propaganda victories—what do they amount to when all is over, when the shouting dies down here we are back again, bigger majority, with a bigger percentage of the vote, a bigger number than ever. That is what their little propaganda victory accomplishes and nothing else. And it will be like that. Why? Because we bring in the Bill for BRINEX and the Opposition opposed it. When we brought in NALCO the Opposition opposed it. It always will be that way any development and the Tories block it. That is why the Tories stay in Opposition, and that is why they will.

MR. BROWNE: You are the Government, you are supposed to bring it in.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is why we are the Government because we bring it in.

On motion Bill read a second time,

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

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill—"An Act Further to Amend the Juricature Act"—On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill—"An Act to Confirm to United Towns Electric Company Limited Certain Rights and Powers": On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow:

Second reading of Bill—"An Act To Consolidate the Law Relating to the Raising of Local Taxes for Schools,"

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill, which is a Bill to Consolidate existing Law relating to the Raising of Local Taxes for schools. It is to be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that in 1954 the Government, at the request of several people, notably the residents of Corner Brook, brought in this legislation. The legislation was not the thought of the Government. It was legislation that had been recommended to the Government and urged on the Government for some considerable period of time before the Government finally did accept the suggestions and agreed to this type of legislation.

The 1954 Act was amended again in 1955. But the carrying out of the Act has proven to be more difficult on the authorities whom it constitutes than it should be because of the fact that in the first place its administration was put in the Department of Education, which department had no experience in local taxes, local councils and the like. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the administration was large-

ly in the hands of people outside St. John's, who did not have available to them the facts and figures, the legislation and one thing and another dealing with councils. And so in the case of some communities serious errors occurred due entirely to the inexperience of the authorities who set up the Act.

For that reason, instead of referring back, as the 1954 Act did, to other legislation dealing with local councils and community councils and the like, the Consolidated Act brings these provisions into the Act itself. So that any school tax authority now will find within the four covers of the present amended and consolidated Act all the information they need to carry out the provisions of the legislation, and further, Mr. Speaker, so as to give every possible assistance to any such school tax authorities and to all of them the administration of the Act has been divided for one purpose and for the purpose of collecting the taxes of assessing the taxes and collecting it. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has the authority; but for the purpose of the distribution of the tax, in order that the Terms of Union may be preserved, these are continued in the hands of the Minister of Education.

There is no new principle whatsoever in this Act. It is purely, as I said, a consolidation of the existing legislation, enlarged, however, to contain within its own sections the provisions that are necessary so that the authorities will not have to refer to this Act and to other Acts. It is now wholly self-contained. And it contains, as I say, no new principle at all. It is simply a consolidation of the existing law, and makes it easier for the tax authorities to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I would move the second reading.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion debate on second reading adjourned.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the James M. Boylen (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1955."

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is brought before the House in order to seek the approval of the House for the conditions that the Government propose should attach to an extension of the terms of the agreement governing the Boylen Concession on the Burlington Peninsula.

It will be remembered that in 1951 Falconbridge Nickle Mines got a concession to prospect and explore an area of eighteen hundred square miles, roughly the entire area of the Burlington Peninsula. The Falconbridge concession expired in 1954. In 1955 Mr. James M. Boylen sought an exploration concession of an area of roughly a little short of half of the Ex-Falconbridge Concession. This concession area is the area in which the Baie Verte Asbestos Deposits have been discovered, and in the area where Advocate Mines Limited operate.

Now the principle terms of the concession agreement, as it exists at the moment, are these—Exclusive prospecting and exploration rights for minerals as defined in the Crown Lands Act to an area of approximately seven hundred and seventy-five square miles, plus the twenty square miles known as the Pilley's Island concession. The tender of the concession is for four years. Boylen has the right to stake claims under the regular provisions of the Crown Lands Act, within the concession areas. Boylen must spend

not less than sixty thousand dollars per year on exploring and prospecting the concession area. The Government is to be supplied with annual reports of work done, results obtained and money expended. And, subject to the BRINCO Agreement, the Government agrees to grant crown waterpower rights if necessary for mineral development. Tax is to be that of general application. And Boylen has the right to assign, transfer, or otherwise dispose in whole or in part the exploration rights granted to him.

Last year, 1956, Boylen sought an extension of this concession agreement for a further four years; because he had anticipated that eight years would be required to conduct the full scale explorations programme that he had planned. When that application for extension came up for consideration the Department of Mines and Resources proposed that instead of Boylen being granted a straightforward four years that the extension should be granted according to a formula that would be a recognition of development undertaken to date and also an incentive to do further development work in the future. The Government accepted this formula, and it is set out in Clause 2 of this Bill—Section 2, rather. The formula is this: For every one thousand tons per day of mining or quarrying capacity Boylen installs anywhere in Newfoundland while Boylen's Burlington concession is in effect he will get a one year's extension of that concession agreement. In practise here is how that will work out—The Burlington Concession presently in effect is due to expire on April 5, 1959. If by that date Boylen has not brought in a mine or quarry anywhere in Newfoundland that produces one thousand tons per day or a mine and quarry which together pro-

duces one thousand tons per day, if he has not done that by that date then his concession will expire. But suppose that by that date of April 15, 1959 he brings in Tilt Cove at two thousand tons a day, which is what is anticipated for a start, and say he also brings in Gull Ridge at one thousand tons per day, which is also anticipated, for a start, then his installed and producing capacity will be three thousand tons per day and if this Bill passes then his Burlington Concession Agreement will be extended by three years to April 15, 1962. Then if by April 15, 1962 Boylen does not bring in any new installed and producing capacity then his Burlington Concession Agreement will expire. But if between April 15, 1959 and April 15, 1962 he brings in say Baie Verte Asbestos at two thousand tons a day, then his Burlington Concession Agreement automatically is extended to April 15, 1964, should this Bill pass. The formula provides therefore that Boylen will get an extension of his Burlington Concession Agreement in ratio to the results that he achieves.

Now this is the formula provided for in Section 2 of this Bill; with this extra proviso that additional expenditure on the Burlington Concession Area is not required in respect of the years for which the agreement may be extended. Now the reason for that is this: Every year for the four years ending April 15, 1959, Boylen must spend sixty thousand dollars a year prospecting and exploring his Burlington Concession Area. That has been required as evidence of good faith, evidence he was not going to acquire so many square miles of Newfoundland territory and sit on them and do nothing. But to secure an extension of that concession agreement he must install mining and or quarrying capacity

somewhere in Newfoundland—and you do not install mining and quarrying capacity by spending thousands of dollars. You got to spend millions of dollars to do that. Tilt Cove has cost to date very nearly I understand, nine million dollars, and is going to cost more before Boylen gets into operation in September, I believe.

So if this Bill passes, while it does not require that it be written into the bond that Boylen must spend more specifically on his Burlington Concession during the years for which the Agreement may be extended, he cannot get such extension in the first place without spending millions somewhere in Newfoundland—and with that kind of a deal Newfoundland cannot lose.

I think that about covers the matter, Mr. Speaker. The formula proposed in this Bill should not be taken as that which will necessarily be applied to all future applications for extension of concession agreements. Each application will have to be examined on its merits, and in every case there may be extenuating circumstances which would make the application of this formula impractical—Where it can be applied I do think it will be fair and just to the concession company and that it will protect the interests of the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to get a little diffident about speaking on any legislation introduced here now because it is looked upon as if it was in Opposition, an obstruction. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, we are severely handicapped over here at the present time.

There are on the Order Paper twenty-one different bills. And I think it must be admitted in fairness to us that it is very difficult to analyze in the brief time at our disposal complicated measures that are introduced here, and in very many cases modify and enlarge or extend previous concessions which have been given in previous years—and not only one agreement but in several. So, if I appear to be critical it is only because I have not had a lot of time to study it—and I do come across provisions that seem to me to be a little unusual and call for explanations on the part of the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The trouble with the honourable gentleman is his extra curricular activities.

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Speaker, I regret to say I have no extra-curricular activities, up to the present time, not very much, but I expect to have some in the future and not be able to give much attention as I gave in the past. However, I have examined this Bill and I am grateful to the Minister for his very lucid explanation. It is a very complicated formula devised here, and unless someone had followed it before hand and followed his information. I don't think he could identify any members on the Government side who have not studied this thing who would be able to follow from the explanation given. Yet, I think the explanation is very clear, and I think very fair, Mr. Speaker. We are delighted and I think everybody is delighted to have such an important man as Boylen carrying on work in Newfoundland. His reputation is well known I have heard people say he has never worked a mine before. He has always been a prespector, promoting mining development and then selling them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not so.

MR. BROWNE: I do not say it is so. I do not know him very well. I met him for a very short time. I regret I did not have a further opportunity of discussing his work in Newfoundland with him. But he appeared to me to be a very intelligent person and that he would not be here at all if he did not think he had good prospects.

It is news to us; and that is something else I would like to comment on—We have very little information at our disposal to discuss these measures. The Minister of Mines and Resources and the Premier have the reports from their own people and confidential talks with the people who are interested in getting concessions from time to time; but what information has the Opposition got, except what we can extract from the Government; and sometimes it is not given with very good grace. So that we are severely handicapped in that respect. I think that ought to be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, when members of the Opposition are discussing legislation, especially legislation of this kind. It is our duty to watch and see no concessions are given that should not be given. And if the legislation appears to be carefully drafted with an eye to the protection of Newfoundland then we will acknowledge it. And I do so in this case. I think it is a very good Bill, and we certainly shall support it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

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 (Receivership) Act."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is really a broadening

of the interpretation clause of "Municipalities" under the Local Government (Receivership) Act. As it is now there is provision for the widening up of town councils but there is no provision for winding up of community councils. Some two months ago we received an application from one of our community councils stating that a public meeting called by the people themselves had voted to revert back to the status of a local roads committee and give up their status of community council. We have no legislation by which that can be done. I mean, it is a voluntary action on the part of the people themselves where legislation is required to take care of any assets that may be at the disposal of the community council when they got out of being. In this particular case there was some money, upwards of two hundred dollars in the bank and some small items of equipment and so on. That amendment is proposed in order that somebody may be able to take care of and arrange for the disposal of the assets of the community council.

That is all is involved in this particular Bill. This is the only instance which we know of, and I hope we may not have very many. It is necessary to have this amendment to take care of this thing.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell us which community council has done that? He referred to a community council becoming a local road board instead of a community council.

MR. HEFFERTON: I do not know of any particular reason why I should. On the other hand I made reference to a community council.

MR. BROWNE: The people in the neighborhood must know all about it.

MR. HEFFERTON: It is in Fortune Bay, as a matter of fact Harbour Breton.

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 Summary Jurisdiction Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this bill. This is a Bill to amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act in two distinct ways. Under the present Summary Jurisdiction Act a magistrate must conduct an inquiry into all fires happening within his jurisdiction. Under the Fire Prevention Act, 1954, the fire marshal has to conduct an enquiry into all fires in Newfoundland. The object of this Act is to enable the Attorney General in a proper case to say to the magistrate of any particular area where a fire may have occurred; you need not investigate or hold an enquiry into the cause of this fire because the fire marshal is doing it. Or he can tell the magistrate that, having read the report of the police into the cause of this fire he thinks no useful object would be served by holding the enquiry. Section 2 of this Act, therefore enables the Attorney General to ask a magistrate either not to conduct an enquiry; and even if the magistrate has been instructed not to conduct an enquiry he may still have his instructions countermanded and be asked to conduct an enquiry if as a result of the investigation made the Attorney General feels an enquiry should take place, even though originally he had deemed such an enquiry not to be necessary.

There are five or six clauses there, Mr. Speaker, but they are all just in the way of tidying up the existing

legislation. Now the second object of this Act is to amend or is to reduce the jurisdiction of our magistrates in St. John's and in Corner Brook. As the House knows we have in St. John's a district court and we also have a district court in Corner Brook. We find that the Magistrate's Court in both these communities are very, very greatly overworked. For instance in Corner Brook we have a district court to which the people are not going and which is not being worked to capacity. Now we have a similar situation here in St. John's; we have a district court, which apart from swearing in a few Chinamen and others has not performed any great service to the community; and on the other hand we have a magistrates' court which is handling a terrific number of criminal cases and in addition many, many, many thousands of civil cases.

Now the object of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to distribute this work better and more equably amongst the courts or between the courts. Section 3 therefore provides that when the amount involved exceeds twenty dollars the plaintiff must go to the district court and not to the Magistrates' Court. This means that all that great mass of civil summonses, most of which are defaults, but all of which take time, will now be handled by the District Court; the county Court both in St. John's and in Corner Brook. In other parts of the country the magistrates' court will continue to have their existing jurisdiction. But there is a provision, Mr. Speaker, that the Governor in Council, if they find that this distribution of civil jurisdiction is working any hardship on any one either by reason of unnecessary delays or for any other reason the Governor in Council have power to restore the jurisdiction of the Magis-

trates Court in St. John's and in Corner Brook, if that should be deemed to be necessary.

There is also provision in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, to provide that if, and when, the District Court Judges go on circuit, as the Act appointing them envisages, then in the places where they travel in circuit similar jurisdiction will be vested in them and taken from the local magistrates.

MR. BROWNE: Is that in this Act? It does not appear to be.

MR. CURTIS: Just a minute, Mr. Speaker—I think I know what I am talking about. If the honourable member will see Section 3, subsection 3: The Lieutenant Governor in Council may by order provide that

(a) The Cities of St. John's and Corner Brook, or either of them, shall be included in paragraph 2 for the period specified in the order or without limit of time; in other words the civil jurisdiction of the District Court Judge of St. John's goes to Carbonear and Harbour Grace.

MR. HIGGINS: You said the Supreme Court on circuit.

MR. CURTIS: I should not have referred to the Supreme Court in any way in this Act—What I meant to say, if the District Court goes on circuit in Conception Bay and makes a regular circuit in Conception Bay the civil jurisdiction of the magistrates in Conception Bay will be reduced to twenty dollars; because in that case we would expect the people to take advantage of the visits of the District Courts and give them their business.

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

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I listened with close attention to the in-

roduction of this Bill by the Attorney General. With respect to the provisions concerning the investigations and enquiries of fires I have no comment to make. But quite truthfully, Sir, I am amazed at the proposal to restrict the civil jurisdiction of the Magistrate's Court in St. John's and Corner Brook.

The Honourable the Attorney General says that there are some twenty to thirty cases heard daily in Corner Brook. In the Magistrates' Court in St. John's, and I think we can accept the position the Magistrates' Court in St. John's as a civil court would be just as busy as the Magistrates' Court in Corner Brook. There are only two days normally set aside each week for the hearing of civil actions Tuesdays and Fridays. I think that anybody who has ever attended certainly anybody who has ever practised in the Magistrates Court in St. John's here will agree that there is not any great multiplicity of civil actions. The majority of them, as has been stated by the Attorney General are uncontested. But civil work, Mr. Speaker, does not in any way affect the efficiency of administration of the Magistrates Court. It appears to me that the main purpose in introducing this legislation is to give some work to the judges of the County Court, District Court rather. I cannot speak with personal knowledge of the District Court at Corner Brook but I am prepared to subscribe to the sentiment that was uttered by the Minister of Provincial Affairs that the description of the District Court in Corner Brook not working at capacity would be conservative. I remember as late as 1953 being with a Supreme Court on Circuit; and the presiding judge at the time refusing to hear cases and referring them to the District or Coun-

ty Court Judge; and coming back the next circuit and these cases had not even been considered. I think that the Attorney General is perhaps a little bit unkind in his reference to the District Court at St. John's at least while the admission of Chinese and other nationals as citizens has formed a major portion of their work; there have been some cases and actually judgements given—I know of two—both adverse—

But, Mr. Speaker, merely to create work which will make certain judges justify their salaries is not, I submit, justification for this radical departure; because, Sir, a great percentage of civil claims, small claims could run anywhere from fifty dollars to two hundred dollars. We all know, those of us who do appear in the courts, that quite often a creditor will reduce his claim to two hundred dollars in order to take it before the Magistrate, and willingly sacrifice ten or fifteen dollars to get the thing disposed of quickly and cheaply. But, Sir, here is the position—if it goes to the District Court there is the matter of cost involved which inflicts a hardship on the creditor as well as the debtor, and inflicts a great inconvenience indeed on the members of the profession itself. That is, I should imagine, a consideration which would not weigh too heavily with the House. And then, Mr. Speaker, the judge of that particular court in St. John's laid down the rule that counsel must gown. And if every member of the profession who has to collect fifty-five dollars has to go up and put on a wing collar and make such a change it would be economically unsound.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A few admissions of citizenship should take care of that.

MR. HIGGINS: Quite seriously, Sir, I have been given to believe the Law Society did. I certainly know, informally, submit their proposition on this matter to the Attorney General. I cannot say whether it has been officially done, but I do feel, Sir, before we limit the jurisdiction of the Magistrates Courts of St. John's and Corner Brook we should have a little more valid reason than merely to create work for two gentlemen presently in the medium court. And there is another thing, Sir, while I am at it, although it may not be strictly to the point—I do suggest, Sir, the work of the Magistrates Court in St. John's would be much better done, and it certainly is well done at the present time under very adverse conditions—this is something which the Attorney General knows better than I—the conditions in that court are today abominable, and if we are going to streamline the Summary Jurisdiction Act and try and have the administration of the rights of the people properly attended to, consideration might well be given to turning the court house building into a court house building. If necessary the Minister of Public Works might find another place. That is a point which should not be lost sight of. But over and above all that, Sir, I cannot support this Bill when the reduction of the magistrates, civilly, is so drastic.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I support what has been said by my honourable colleague regarding the difficulties which seem to arise in connection with this Bill as regard the change of jurisdiction. Now I do not know who drafted this Bill. It seems to me it was drafted by some one who has not had very much experience in the courts in regard to civil summonses. Supposing that a client brings to a lawyer a number of collections. They

may vary anywhere from ten dollars to two hundred dollars. Well, he has got to divide up the collections between the courts where he will get them heard although they may be all default cases of ten dollars, fifteen, twenty—up to twenty dollars.

MR. CURTIS: Is there anything to say the District Court cannot take anything under twenty dollars?

MR. BROWNE: But if it does go up there, there is the question of coming down to the Supreme Court and getting stamps and then going back to the District Court—and it is in a very inconvenient place to issue the summonses. There is no bailiff attached there at the present time. A bailiff would have to be attached there and some kind of record would have to be kept—and separated, I suppose, from the regular District Court Work. I don't know if it will all be put together. However, there will have to be a new bailiff. Then there is the question of attachments. He has got to go back and forth, and it is very inconveniently situated. I believe it would be a good idea if this matter was given further consideration. It does not seem to me to be a good idea. Supposing then he gets judgment he has costs, and even though it is a small matter of five or ten dollars there is no provision here for costs. I think there ought to be consideration given to that question because the costs might be out of proportion. In the Magistrates' Court at the present time there is no cost up to two hundred dollars. And that is a wonderful consideration for poor people who mostly have these default judgments against them. And in addition to the Bill that would mean another twenty-five or thirty dollars on a default summons. I think it would be a hardship. And I believe it would be advisable

for the Minister to consider delaying that matter until these points are given consideration.

MR. SHEPPARD: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I would like to make a few comments on the principle of this Bill. On this matter of enquiries into fires and I might say as well enquiries into deaths which take up a great deal of the working time of most magistrates. In most instances where the police have conducted an enquiry into a fire or into a death, or as it is in St. John's or outside of St. John's when the fire marshal gets around to conduct an enquiry it always appears to me that the magisterial enquiry has been a mere formality required by the Summary Jurisdiction Act, and which really amounts to nothing except getting the bare facts sworn to and put on paper and forwarded to the Department of the Attorney General. Sir, the point I want to make is this. In most instances, unless there is suspicion, the police report and the fire marshal's report is of far more benefit ascertaining the cause of fire than is the magisterial enquiry. I feel that most of the former magistrates in the House would agree with me in that respect. Personally I would like to have seen the matter of inquiries into deaths, as now covered by Section 116 of the Summary Jurisdiction Act, also dealt with in somewhat the same way, the same manner—I realize there is a difference in this Province in three respects in that we have no coroners, and the magistrates normally take the positions of coroners or the work which is performed by coroners in other parts of the Dominion. But I do think that in a good many instances enquiries to be accidental and around which there are no suspicious circumstances could also be very well covered in this manner; and a great deal of time and work

could be taken off the shoulders of the magistrates who are at some time and most all times very busy men. I understand the reason for it. We have no coroners in the country and it is advisable to have some sort of an enquiry into deaths.

As regards this civil jurisdiction of magistrates, I gather that the main objection of my learned friends across the way is in the matter of cost. It always struck me as rather peculiar that a plaintiff and for that matter a defendant could come into magistrates court and have summonses issued, judgments filed, writs of attachment and so on issue after judgment at such little cost. I often wondered why the costs were not higher, because I think it is obviously uneconomical to have offices all over this country issuing summonses on which the Government collect the sum of fifty cents in most instances.

MR. HIGGINS: In a few days you might straighten it out.

MR. SHEPPARD: And most of the magistrates in this country in the matter of this civil work are regarded as a civil collection agency, a debt collector or agency, and people come in and file claims and the magistrate has summonses issued many of which may be as high as fifty dollars and give them to the sheriff or the constable to serve—and immediately the summons is in the hands of the defendant he goes and pays the debt, and the Crown received the sum of fifty cents for all that work.

Now with regard to the hardships involved to our learned friends walking or driving from Duckworth Street to Fort Townshend rather than going across to the Magistrate Court, I cannot see any great hardship.

MR. BROWNE: You do not have to do it, that is why.

MR. SHEPPARD: I know. Unfortunately at the present time I am not a lawyer and am not permitted to do it, but I do not see any great hardship involved anymore than going over to the Magistrates Court in St. John's and probably waiting two or three hours to have a summons called and heard, when in all probability that matter could be disposed of in the District Court in probably a matter of fifteen minutes. So that one hardship would be probably outweighed by the other.

MR. BROWNE: Ask your colleague to your left.

MR. SHEPPARD: My colleague, I should imagine, is quite able to express his own opinion in the matter, and probably in due course might do so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not point out it is sometimes helpful for lawyers to have a car.

MR. HIGGINS: Suppose he does not want a car?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then let him stay away from the courts.

MR. SHEPPARD: He must go there, I presume, Mr. Speaker, to augment his earnings.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. SHEPPARD: One of my honourable friends on the opposite side used to deem it quite convenient to come around the Bay on some nice summer days to conduct his cases in the court at Harbour Grace. And I rather think that on some occasions he used to enjoy coming. So that I think our city friends of the legal pro-

fession might probably enjoy taking the fresh air at Fort Townshend and getting away from Water Street. Sir, I see no serious objections there. On a serious note, Mr. Speaker on occasions while on the bench I would have welcomed having another magistrate or the county court judge, I would have welcomed him coming in to my district where I had probably four or five hundred civil summonses piled up on my desk, I would have welcomed him coming into my district to help me get this load of work out of my way and thereby help the people who had the litigations pending. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a good amendment, this is a good Bill, and it fills a long-felt need in as far as most magistrates are concerned in this Province. I have much pleasure, Sir, in supporting it.

On motion of Mr. Curtis the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, just before we adjourned for lunch, or supper or afternoon tea or whatever it was, we were discussing this Bill, "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act," and I would like to call the attention of the House and of my learned friends in the House to the fact that under Section 4 of this Bill this Act does not come into force except and until a date has been proclaimed, for it so coming into force, by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. That clause, Mr. Speaker, was put in deliberately so that all the little objections that my honourable friends have referred to, can be ironed out, I might say I am a member of the Rules Committee, and one of the things the Rules Committee will have to discuss will be the costs to be awarded in uncontested cases

and of small amounts which may come before the District Court. Also one of the questions we will have to discuss is, whether or not we should suggest to the District Court Judges, that gowns be dispensed with in small matters. I am not quite sure we have the right to indicate to the judges that the profession would have the right to sit without gowns. I see it is a bit of a nuisance to have to keep gowns in the offices and bring them with them any time they go and it might be possible to persuade the judges that they would not suffer any great loss of dignity if on some occasions the profession were in ordinary garb. Another matter, Mr. Speaker, and that was raised by my honourable and learned friend from St. John's East when he said the civil jurisdiction in the Magistrate's Court does not interfere with the ordinary work of the court. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, I have to take issue with my honourable friend, because he knows as well as I know that on Tuesdays and Fridays criminal work is simply called and for the most part if at all contentious is postponed because it is a civil day. But as a rule, Mr. Speaker, it has been a practise for civil work to take precedence on Tuesdays and Fridays. Under this arrangement every day can be a civil day, and need not wait for Tuesdays and Fridays, one can have a summons issued and every day can be a civil day.

Now reference has been made to going up to Fort Townshend. I might say, Mr. Speaker, and those who have cars, and most of the profession have cars, of course, except the very few who find it hard to spend the price of a car—they might get a second-hand one cheap. At Fort Townshend there is ample parking space and there is none down on Duckworth Street. And more-

over, Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that my honourable friends opposite would have appreciated the situation of having their clients who wanted to go to civil courts not having to go and mix with those who are there for criminal cases.

MR. HIGGINS: Would the Honourable the Attorney General allow one comment: As the district court is presently located the only place for people to wait is out in the corridor next to the traffic division.

MR. CURTIS: At least they know the people who are next to them are fit to associate with them. You know it is no injury to one's character to be arrested for debt. A debt is honest. It is an honest thing to owe money. Anybody can be unfortunate and not be able to pay his debt especially when there are so many installment buying of articles being urged on people, as is the case today. Anyway I do think the criminal court and the civil court should as far as possible be separated—and if one has a client to bring to a civil court one should not have to bring him there at the same time as when there are criminal cases being heard. And if my honourable friend thinks that the quarter where clients have to sit in the Magistrates' Court are ideal I am afraid I cannot agree.

MR. HIGGINS: I never even suggested it.

MR. CURTIS: They must have improved a lot since I was there last, and that was not long ago. I think, Mr. Speaker, these were the only points raised. I appreciate the remarks of my honourable friend and colleague from Harbour Grace. It is too bad that we cannot take out of the hands of the magistrates these time-taking en-

quiries into deaths by natural causes. But we may find a solution to that question too. I am sure that he and the other ex-magistrates would appreciate the nuisance of having to have fire enquiries throughout their district. And if the magistrates can be relieved of this work it will be some help.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow; (Mr. Browne and Mr. Higgins voted "Nay").

On motion the House went into committee of the whole on various Bills.

Mr. Clarke, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Amend the Legislative Disabilities Act."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, yesterday I tried to find some of the provisions dealing with the disabilities of members, and could not find the appropriate one dealing with the subject. But I have here the 1952 Revised Statutes and similar provisions in New Brunswick is contained in Chapter 129, Section 18, which reads: No persons shall be eligible to be a member or sit or vote in the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick who

- (a) is a senator of Canada; or
- (b) is a priest or ecclesiastic under any form of faith or religious worship whatsoever; or
- (c) holds any office of emolument in the gift or disposal of the Government of the Province, or under any department thereof; or
- (d) is a contractor with or under the Government of the Province or

any department thereof, or is a surety for such a contractor; provided that this clause shall not apply to any person by reason of his being surety for a sheriff, registrar or other public officer, or a surety or contractor for the payment of the maintenance of a patient in The Provincial Hospital; or

- (e) is holding or engaging in, undertaking or executing, directly or indirectly, alone or with another, by himself or by the interposition of a trustee or third party, any contract or agreement with Her Majesty, or with any public officer or department, with respect to the public service of the Province or under which any public money of the Province is expended for any service or work, matter or thing; or
- (f) holds any permanent office, commission or appointment in the service of the Government of Canada, or any department thereof, requiring his full-time services, with a salary or emolument directly or indirectly attached thereto, by whomsoever to be paid or allowed or whosoever payable; provided that this clause shall not apply to any person by reason of his being an officer or a member of Her Majesty's Armed Forces; or
- (g) is a commissioner, appraiser or arbitrator to investigate, adjust, settle or determine any claim, matter or difference to which the Government of the Province is a party, or to investigate or inquire into the management of affairs of any public institution in the Province; provided that this clause shall not apply to members of

the Executive Council of the Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That means Mr. Fogwill and Mr. Fahey could not sit here.

MR. BROWNE: I am not sure of the interpretation of that—a person working for the Canadian National Railway is not considered to have a permanent office in the service of the Government of Canada, and it may be considered that it does not apply to a person employed by a Crown Corporation. But certainly there is no doubt here about the Government of Canada.

MR. CURTIS: But it does say "full-time."

MR. BROWNE: Yes, it says—hold any permanent office, commission or appointment. I suppose any member of the House of Assembly could become a returning officer, or could take part—I am not sure now.

MR. CURTIS: That is the point—Could he?

MR. BROWNE: Here as far as New Brunswick is concerned they have that provision. I looked up the Canadian Act, and the Canadian Act refers only to appointments under the Crown by right of the Government of Canada or a nomination of the Government of Canada—But it seems to me here, Mr. Chairman, that the matter is one that should have been given careful consideration. I do not know whether the officers who drafted this Bill looked up the statutes in the other Provinces.

MR. CURTIS: They did.

MR. BROWNE: If they did, the Attorney General then may be in a position to say how it stands in re-

gard to other Provinces. That is how it stands in regard to New Brunswick. It seems to me we should not go beyond that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At the same time, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we cannot discuss the principle of this clause that has been adopted by this House, and this committee has no right to discuss it.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is not altogether the principle because the principle involved in this is the question whether a person can be employed by the Crown generally, and how far we should go with that definition, because we are still excepting people or excluding people employed by the Crown by right of appointment by the Government of Newfoundland.

On motion clause 1 carried. Clause 2 carried. (Mr. Browne voted Nay).

Clause 3 read:

When a vacancy occurs in the House of Assembly the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall, within six months after the happening of the vacancy, direct the issue of a writ of election for the election and return of a member for the district in respect of which the vacancy has occurred."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I notice in regard to that, as far as Nova Scotia is concerned, I think it is Nova Scotia, resignations go to the Speaker if the House is in session and to the Minister of Provincial Affairs if the House is not in session.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Usually the House is not in session.

MR. BROWNE: Here under New Brunswick it goes to the Provincial

Secretary—So I suppose it does not make much difference whether it goes to the Minister of Provincial Affairs or the Governor—It goes through anyhow—

MR. CURTIS: The Governor just sends it on.

On motion Clause 3 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Relating to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association."

On motion Clauses 1 through 13 carried. Clause 14 read:

14.—(1) The Council may, in manner provided by the by-laws, reprimand and censure any member, associate member or life member or suspend or cancel his certificate of membership if he is guilty of unprofessional conduct, negligence or misconduct or if he has been convicted of a criminal offence by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(2) Before any reprimand or censure or the suspension or cancellation of a certificate of membership is made under subsection (1), the Council shall hold a formal enquiry into the alleged misconduct of the member concerned and shall afford such member a reasonable opportunity to be heard at the enquiry either on his own behalf or by counsel.

(3) When holding an enquiry under subsection (2), the Council have all the powers conferred on a Commissioner by Section 3 of The Public Enquiries Act, Chapter 24, of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952,

(4) A reprimand or censure or the suspension or cancellation of a cer-

tificate of membership made under subsection (1) shall not affect the competency of the person affected by such reprimand, censure, suspension or cancellation to continue or resume his employment as a teacher.

(5) Any person affected by a reprimand or censure or the suspension or cancellation of a certificate of membership made under subsection (1) may apply to a judge of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland for an order cancelling the reprimand or censure or restoring the certificate of membership so suspended or cancelled, and the judge upon hearing the application may make such order and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem just.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this is a new provision. It is the first time it has been put in, and no one knows how it is going to work out. And as far as the clause, a man may apply to the Supreme Court for an order cancelling the reprimand or censure—Now what happens; a man who is censured or reprimanded has his character well damaged and few people will hear of what happens when he goes to the Supreme Court. Now I notice—"If he is guilty of unprofessional conduct, neglect or misconduct—Now I do not know what is meant by the word "neglect" there—Does it mean a matter of an accident? Does it mean if he has fallen down over the stairs through his own fault? It does not seem to have any meaning. Neglect is not a crime. It seems to me this should be confined to unprofessional conduct or some positive misconduct.

DR. ROWE: I presume it is neglect of duty.

MR. BROWNE: Then it should be neglect of duty—And should it not be

"wilful neglect of duty" because we do not want to make it so as to give some officious person the right to interpret the provision against a man because he thinks so. A proceeding of this kind should only be taken when the matter is grave—I would say—"some grave neglect of duty" or some words like that. I think the Minister ought to consider dropping that word "neglect" and inserting something like "grave neglect of duty."

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to go along with my honourable friend there. I just want to point out one thing—This clause says, and I am sure it is the most serious substance of the clause—"The Council may in the manner provided for by the by-laws, do so and so—Now the Council, I draw your attention, is made up of members of denominational members, making in all a total of seventeen—and I would think that the interest of any teacher would be pretty carefully safeguarded by the council itself. A teacher by definition in Newfoundland belongs to some church, and it is quite obvious with all that representation there—for instance if a teacher were a member of the Church of England, the five members of the Church of England on the Council would be on guard to protect his rights. I do not think in actual practise there will be any great danger here. On the other hand, as the honourable member pointed out, there could be some misinterpretation and ambiguity in that matter. I do not feel too strongly about it. I wonder if the honourable the Attorney General would look at it for a moment. I would be inclined to think we could revise that to "wilful neglect of duty" instead of the word "neglect". It is in Section 14 (1).

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps we could have that section stand, and we could look at it.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, while we are on that—in the last part of that section—if he has been convicted of criminal offence—Now criminal offences run from very minor things to greater things—A person who drives forty miles an hour in a twenty mile area could be charged with a criminal offence. Surely that would not be grounds for —

DR. ROWE: Note the word "may" up there. "The Council may"—

MR. HIGGINS: The minister is perfectly right. That gives some discretion there.

DR. ROWE: I think after all we will have to rely on the Council. Who will these people be? They will be people like Brother Darcy of St. Bon's; Mr. Andrews, and other leading principals and teachers. I think we have to rely on their good judgment and common sense.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, but at the same time, Mr. Chairman, there should be some such wording as serious criminal offence." For instance suppose a man is convicted of impaired driving during the summer holidays, down in some summer resort, I do not know that he should be censored too severely in addition to some other punishment.

DR. ROWE: I would be quite happy to have the word "serious" put in.

MR. CURTIS: I think we might have the section stand.

Motion, that section 14 stand, carried.

On motion clauses 15 through 17 carried. Clause 18:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, here on a point of privilege. I would like to point out, I did not object to this. I was quoted this morning as saying I objected—This method has been in effect with the Civil Service Association ever since it was set up in 1936, and I was president for fourteen years, and made the arrangement. I pointed out to my honourable friend here that the provision is in the Act.

DR. ROWE: My honourable friend did not get due credit that time—His honourable leader got more.

MR. BROWNE: Here in the "Telegram" tonight, I have another bone to pick—"No hand-outs," said Browne—and my name is not mentioned in the article at all.

MR. CURTIS: Should not my honourable friend kick when he gets a Bill for that advertisement.

MR. BROWNE: That is not an advertisement.

On motion clause 18 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, on a technical point here—I draw the attention of the Attorney General with respect to this appeal—does not that affect the provisions here—the by-laws in earlier sections. It is the rule of interpretation that a later section has precedent over an earlier section?

MR. CURTIS: Of course if these regulations are part of the Act—but they are reserved—Yes, the honourable member's point, Mr. Chairman, is interesting. Since we have held up clause 14 we might as well hold up this clause, too.

Motion, that clause 20 stand. carried.

Motion, that the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again, carried.

A Bill—"An Act to Provide Assistance for Teachers By Way of Loans For Certain Purposes."

On motion clause 1 carried.

Clause 2:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in regard to that definition is there provision further on for a person who is at Memorial University, say, taking a course to improve his standing—suppose he wants a loan—he should not have to go back and be engaged in teaching to be qualified for one—That means a person who holds a valid certificate and is engaged in teaching school. If he is at the university he is not then engaged in teaching school.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is a teacher who is released as a teacher to go to university to continue his studies is still regarded to be teaching school in Newfoundland. I do not think necessarily that the rights of any teacher are invalidated when he resigns teaching to go to University to continue his professional studies.

MR. BROWNE: He is not then engaged in teaching school—is he?

MR. CURTIS: The only question is if he is engaged in teaching school when he makes the application—suppose he makes the application when he is actually in college—Would you accept an application, for instance, from a person who never taught but who is at the Memorial University?

MR. BROWNE: What I mean is—suppose a person takes one year and when he has finished one he says: "I have to take another to go on and finish—I just inherited a thousand dollars from my grandfather, and I am in a position to go ahead and take another couple of years"—He is not then

engaged in teaching—is he therefore regarded as a teacher?

DR. ROWE: The honourable member's point is, I think, well taken because he can only be indentured one year. This is the whole reason for this loan board, because our teachers can anyway for one year.

MR. CURTIS: Does the minister contemplate, Mr. Chairman, lending money to teachers before they become teachers?

DR. ROWE: No, after they have gone to University—They have been teachers first then go to the University. We have three hundred right now at the University who are indentured teachers, i.e. they have been teaching and they are now there. They were teaching with licenses, after summer school or something like that, and are now there at the University with an indenture of six hundred dollars a year—but at the end of the year if they want to go on a second year and borrow from this loan fund can they do so in the light of this clause?

MR. CURTIS: I would say not. I wonder if we could hold that and come back to it later.

MR. MURRAY: If we put in "indentured teachers" would not that cover it?

Motion, that clause 2 stand, carried: Sub-clause (1).

On motion clauses three through five carried: Clause 6:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister if it is the intention to have any new officials or whether it will be done in the meantime by officials of the department?

DR. ROWE: On that point, Mr. Chairman, I had discussions with the

appropriate officers of the department, and they feel at the present time at any rate there will not be any need for any new appointments there. It is conceivable that as the number of applications increases we might have to second some persons or appoint some new persons or create a post and appoint somebody—certainly not in the immediate future or for the present.

On motion clause 6 through 10 carried. Clause 11:

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman, repayment—on that clause I would be interested in hearing—that was mentioned the other day—the mechanics of this thing. Now I imagine provisions will be made to insure the repayment of loans, but it occurs to me that this type of loan, even though the provisions might be made to get this money back, it may possibly not be enforced due to the purpose of the loan—And I was wondering if it would not be a good idea to incorporate into the Act the actual mechanics of refunding so there would not be any possibility of letting the thing go. Actually I do not know whether that would be sound or not.

DR. ROWE: I may say we considered that very carefully—As I pointed out the other day, this fund will be a revolving fund, self-perpetuating. Therefore it is of the utmost urgency that every person who borrows shall repay at the earliest possible opportunity, otherwise it would be denying some other person the opportunity, the right, of having an opportunity to go to University, or some other family from having, say, housing. And I can tell the honourable gentleman the superintendents and the deputy minister and myself and I am quite sure whoever might succeed me in the depart-

ment, are quite determined there shall be no looseness about the repayment. I did discuss that very possibility of incorporating it into the Act—it was agreed by everybody it would not be feasible to do that, otherwise it might impose penalties or hardships or in some way tie up in undesirable ways—in any case any person who as a teacher goes out from our department it can be taken out from the source—and in the case of the boards we hold the string there because they have to get maintenance grants from us every year—and if they owe money and we are not getting reasonable repayments or they are not making a reasonable effort to repay we can deduct it at the source. I would point out that in some cases repayments will only be paper transactions—Take any superintendent, take Mr. Kirby, the Church of England Superintendent, if one of his teachers is not repaying properly and he is under pressure, as he will be from a host of other teachers who want to borrow, naturally he is going to be pretty well intent on getting back that money. In any case every loan will be a legal document and have safeguards. I do not think, apart from an Act of God, sickness or death or something of that kind, we are going to have much trouble there—and that view is shared by everyone within the department as well, I might say, as the executive of the “NTA.”

MR. MERCER: It is provided for in the next section.

DR. ROWE: Yes, I know.

MR. BROWNE: Could not the death part be covered by insurance?

DR. ROWE: That is right.

On motion clause 11 through 13 carried. Clause 14:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, would it not seem reasonable to have the thirtieth day of April there?

DR. ROWE: That very point was in my mind, Mr. Chairman, in a normal year the House would be closed on the thirtieth day of May.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We hope.

DR. ROWE: Yes, I would be happy about that. I wonder if the Attorney General would agree with that?

Motion, that the clause be amended to read the thirtieth of April instead of the thirtieth day of May, carried.

On motion clauses 14 through 17 carried.

Motion, that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again on tomorrow, carried.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to it referred and have passed a Bill,—“An Act To Amend the Legislative Disabilities Act,” without amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to it referred and on Bill No. 35 and No. 36 have made progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received, committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

On motion of Mr. Smallwood, all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House I give notice I will on tomorrow move for the appointment of the Honourable Leader

of the Opposition and the honourable members for Placentia West, Bonavista South, Burin and White Bay North, who shall be chairman, to be a select committee to consider the question of the unit of measurements or weight of salt cod fish, and report their findings and recommendations to the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at three of the clock. In doing so may I say I won't have the pleasure of being present on Monday as I have to go to Halifax to attend the Conference of the Maritimes Provinces Premiers. I will be accompanied by the Honourable the Minister of Education. So that we will both be absent for at least half of the week. We hope to get back Wednesday night and if not then certainly on Thursday, weather being suitable and God willing.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn, I wonder if the Premier could tell us when then we are likely to have this budget, and if during the session—the Royal Commission on the Pensions of Retired Civil Servants?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is due in the city in about half an hour from now, by train, having gotten as far as Stephenville Crossing by air. I hope to confer with him tonight, indeed we have a meeting of the Cabinet tonight, and I will know more about it after I have seen him. I would rather think it would be probably, say, Monday week. I am only guessing. I do not know how long our interim supply will carry us along—but I do not see how he is going to be ready before Monday week, but that is not a promise that is only a guess on my part

without having a consultation with him.

The Royal Commission we hope to get appointed—I have approached one person of three we had in mind, and he has consented to serve. I have not yet approached the other two we had in mind. So that I do not know, but I should imagine it will probably be after the House is closed when we appoint them, by the Fall, no doubt, they will put in their report and their recommendations—in other words in time for the legislation, if legislation should be required, at the next session of the House, next winter—Incidentally this is not a Royal Commission to consider many thousands already in receipt of pensions or the thousands of civil servants pensions to those presently employed by the Government whether they be established civil servants or not; and not those who are in retirement. It is the whole question of the civil servants pensions, to try and put it on a thoroughly good basis from the standpoint of the civil servants themselves and good from the standpoint of the Treasury, from both standpoints.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at three of the clock.

—
MONDAY, May 6, 1957.

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**

None.

Notices of Motion

None.

Notice of Questions

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of questions on tomorrow.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct an oral question to the Honourable Minister of Welfare. Is that properly done on the Orders of the Day?

MR. SPEAKER: Maybe we can wait until just before the Orders of the Day.

Answers to Questions

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, I had a question addressed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Solicitor General a notice of motion?

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 to Amend the Bills of Sales Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. John's South.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question on the Order Paper addressed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply. I was promised an answer today. I wonder if he is coming into the House.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): I will draw it to his attention, Mr. Speaker, when he comes in.

MR. BROWNE: The Minister of Highways is not here. I had a question I wanted to address to him.

Perhaps the Minister of Public Works could tell me. The Minister of Highways has stated that there are going to be no roads paved in Newfoundland this year. I was wondering whether that applies to the resurfacing of Topsail Highway, which is in very bad condition.

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I have no information.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is in his place, I should like to ask him if he has an answer to a question on the Order Paper a few days ago regarding supplies to Northern Labrador.

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, the only question that I have in my possession is the one relative to the supplying frozen fish. That is QUESTION No. 91. That is still in course of preparation.

MR. BROWNE: I am referring to QUESTION No. 86. It was addressed to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply on April 29th.

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, that must have been asked before I took over the office. I have not the question. I do not know if my predecessor who is now the Minister of Welfare can answer.

MR. BROWNE: I must be under a misapprehension. The Honourable Minister told me I would have the answer today.

MR. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, that was the answer to QUESTION NO. 91.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, which Minister is going to give me the answer to this question?

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I might tell you the first question is in course of preparation, as far as I know. I have not checked on it today because of the transfer. I have not bothered about it, but I will. I can bring it to the Minister's attention.

MR. ABBOTT: I shall be glad, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would do that.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct an oral question to the present Minister of Welfare. It is in connection with the matter he and I had some conversation on Friday and again today. Can the Minister inform the House whether it is the intention of the House to take any action in the matter of some five families who this morning were dispossessed, in Hunt's Lane in St. John's? My information is, and I may say in all honesty, I have not checked the accuracy of it, but I believe the Minister's Department is at least familiar with it, at least the Honourable Minister who was the Honourable Minister up to a few days ago made some enquiry about six months ago—they are amongst the people who are dispossessed. The house is being demolished and several families at least have no means whatever of obtaining accommodations anywhere—they are not financially able to acquire homes—and amongst them is at least one expectant mother. Perhaps the Minister may give me some information on that.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, I can only say I took the matter up this morning with some officials of my Department. As far as I could gather the evicted tenants fall into two categories: some being able to pay for their own support and others not. Now the second category falls defin-

itely under the Department of Welfare, and has been referred to the City Welfare Office to try and find some accommodations for them.

MR. HIGGINS: May I ask if these people who were not able to look after themselves and who do come within the orbit of the Department, if they will be looked after somewhere tonight and that they won't be on the street.

MR. HEFFERTON: No.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know again whether the Minister should answer this question or the then Minister of Public Welfare regarding the institution at Whitbourne—asking if it had been brought to his attention allegations of improper conduct against certain parties, and whether any investigation had been made—Who is in a position to inform me what happened in regard to that?

MR. CURTIS: This matter, Mr. Speaker, has been under close investigation by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for the past ten days or two weeks, and we expect to be able to answer shortly.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare can tell me if any of these boys—well I suppose all of them—at that institution have their letters censored? Here is a letter from one of the boys given to me by one of the parents today, in which he stated that he was brought out of town by two of the wardens. if they call them that, two of the officials, and the van stopped within fifty yards of his home and delivered a parcel to the home, and never let the parents see the boy. Do you know anything about that? This is a letter from the boy saying he stopped at a quar-

ter to eleven in the morning, and was not allowed out of the van to go see his parents—It seems strange.

MR. CURTIS: Did he say why he was in the van?

MR. BROWNE: He did not say why. He may be one of the boys concerned.

MR. CURTIS: I think the investigation is all being carried out at Whitbourne.

MR. BROWNE: When do you expect the matter to conclude?

MR. CURTIS: I thought it would be by now.

MR. BROWNE: Would you be in a position to give a statement tomorrow?

MR. CURTIS: I certainly will tell at what stage it is.

Orders of the Day:

A Bill, "An Act to Consolidate the Law Relating to the Raising of Local Taxes for Schools"—

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the debate on Second Reading of this Bill was adjourned.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have an adjournment of that until tomorrow—I am not in a position to proceed today.

MR. CURTIS: I move the adjournment until tomorrow, Sir.

On motion second reading adjourned.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act to Further Amend the Companies Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the second reading

of this Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act."

The position as my honourable friends may know, and as all the House should know, in our Companies Act, is that it is a very ancient Act that should have long since been discarded and a new one brought into force. I happened to know that about ten years ago there was a Committee drafted a brand new Companies Act. Later on, I think, the judges of the Supreme Court undertook to prepare a new Companies Act; and now, I understand, the Committee on uniformity of Legislation is considering a uniform companies Act for all the Provinces of Canada. But until that Act comes into force, Mr. Speaker, we have at least to keep our present Companies Act up to date. The object of this Bill is to amend the Act so as to allow any two companies having similar objects and thereafter to operate as a single company.

This is purely an enabling Act, because if any two companies are to amalgamate under the powers granted by this Act the shareholders of each company will have to be consulted and they will have to approve the merger. In the past this has been a slow and difficult task. If two companies hitherto wanted to amalgamate it was necessary for one or the other to go into liquidation and to have the assets acquired by the other company. Now, if this Act passes, the Bill passes, the shareholders of each company will be able to vote to amalgamate the two companies and the two companies may amalgamate and the shareholders will be merged as shareholders of the amalgamated company.

The draft of the Bill before us was drawn largely from the Ontario Act, but in certain features it has been brought up to date by adopting some provisions of the Committee on Uniformity of Legislation.

The second point dealt with in this Bill is in relation to amending Section 227 of the existing Act. 227 of the Existing Act is a very long section, but it provides for enabling the liquidators in certain cases to accept shares in a company as consideration of the sale of property of that company. In other words, if the liquidator is winding up a company under Section 227 he can accept in a company or in a new company in payment of the assets of the company which he is winding up and which he is to dispose of. This section refers to costs, it refers to the liquidator of a company, it refers to a company who is purchasing these assets, but "company" in this Statute has a limited meaning—"Companies" mean companies under the Companies Act, which is not general enough—We have been asked by practitioners if we enlarge that interpretation of the word "Companies" by including with "Companies" other companies, a purchasing company, which would include any company registered under the Act.

Now the exact wording of Section 4, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to amend in Committee, so I won't give the exact wording now, as I do not think it would be proper—But having looked into the matter personally I did not like the existing wording, and consequently will ask in committee to have an amendment made. The principle will be the same. The idea is to enlarge the meaning of the word "Company" and

not limit it to companies incorporated under the Companies Act, because we have lots of companies not incorporated under the Companies Act. We have companies, as you know, incorporated by Statute, and incorporated by Dominion Charter and under the companies that we have registered here. The idea is to enlarge this description of the word.

MR. BROWNE: Are there any companies incorporated by an Act of the House of Assembly?

MR. CURTIS: Are there any? If the honourable member read up that well-known company of NALCO he will find it was incorporated so — BRINCO was incorporated under the Companies Act.

The Bill also provides an interpretation clause, making clear the sections in regard to the Hudson Bay Company. That is a company incorporated under the Statutes, and the question as to its position under the Statutes; and the question as to its position under the Act has come up by reason of the amendment we passed last year. We have a section in this Bill providing that the Companies Act will include the Hudson Bay Company, which is, I believe, a company incorporated by Statute of the Federal Parliament.

Another section of the proposed Bill, Mr. Speaker, provides that every domestic company recorded to be registered under this shall file, etc. and any company registered or has register under Paragraph 5 of this Act shall be deemed to be registered under this part. This is a bit technical, Mr. Speaker. The actual position is that under part five of the Act a company may register under part 6 a company shall register, and

the object of the section that I am referring to is to provide that if a company registers under part 5 it need not then register under part 6. It is a technicality and the amendment will only appeal to members of the legal profession and budding lawyers who may be sitting in the House.

The other amendment, in Section 7 of the Bill, just provides for the bringing into effect of the Government year, April 1st to March 31st., instead of the last day of March as in the present Bill. The date affected from registration of foreign companies is the 1st. day of March. It is felt it would be advisable to have this extended to the 1st. day of April so that the year of the companies will correspond with the Government year.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I have covered all the points—

MR. BROWNE: Except the coming into force.

MR. CURTIS: The coming into force clause, Mr. Speaker, just brings it in force as at the date the amendment came in last year, makes it retroactive, just these amendments amending the amendments made last year. It is therefore deemed opportune to have them dated at the date of those passed.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this is a sort of a short Bill but it is rather intricate. On the surface it looks reasonable enough until definition (6) is reached where it refers to a company that might mean one which is not incorporated under the Act. I am wondering why this provision for amalgamation is brought

in. I cannot quite feel that some companies are going to amalgamate and that it is they who have asked for this legislation being brought in. I think the Attorney General ought to enlighten us on that matter, because we will be imagining things which perhaps don't exist—When he is replying, I wonder if he would be good enough to do that.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the Attorney General if this means any new companies or the old companies at the present time re-incorporating—any old companies would have to be re-incorporated, or is it just from a certain date this would be?

MR. CURTIS: If there is nobody else to speak—Replying first, Mr. Speaker, to the question raised by my honourable friend to my South-East, I might say—This Act will not affect any existing companies to any extent—As far as I know, Mr. Speaker,—replying to my honourable friend from St. John's South—I know of no company that is at the moment anticipating taking advantage of this amalgamation clause. I might say it is the practice of the Attorney General's office to try and keep legislation as far as possible up to date, and it has been suggested to us those provisions should be made available in case they are required. I know of nobody who wants to use them. As a matter of fact there is an Act coming up later on in the session—I think it was given notice of yesterday—it is on the Order Paper for second reading today—that is a case where this Act would not suffice. But I want to assure the honourable member that this legislation is purely legislation to bring our Companies Act into conformity and up to date with the other Companies Acts of the other

Provinces, and that no sinister motive is involved at all in bringing it in.

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 Amend the Assessment Act."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, in sub-section (1) of Section 2 of our present Assessment Act there is provision for assessment of the capital value of property in those municipalities not less than one every three years. Now last year, 1956, Port aux Basques, Deer Lake, Carbonear, Harbour Grace and Placentia were due for reassessment. At the same time a new assessment had to be made for the town of Mount Pearl Park, Glendale. At that time we were carrying out an assessment for Corner Brook, which through the amalgamation was quite an extensive matter. The result was that instead of completing our work we had anticipated by December 31st, 1955, we had to put our complete staff of assessors out there in order to get the work done some six months later than anticipated. Consequently the assessment and the re-assessment in other areas could not be completed within the statutory period. The amendment before the House today makes provision where by order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council this statutory period of three years can be extended in order to allow that assessment and re-assessment can be carried out, otherwise we find that certain of our municipalities, Placentia for instance, cannot get their Bills done for collection of property tax this year.

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

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, as I see it this means that the original sec-

tion has not any meaning at all—What it means now is that the assessment can be carried out as long and when the Government sees fit. As I see it here Section 11 (1) reads—"The assessors in every municipality in which a tax on property is imposed shall in accordance with the provisions of this Act assess the capital value of all the property, whether subject to taxation or not, within the municipality not less frequently than once in every three years, and (2) Any property assessment in effect prior to the date of commencement of this Act is valid until a new assessment has been made under this Act." The amendment reads "Notwithstanding subsection (1), where an assessment is not begun or is not completed within the three-year period named in that subsection, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, in any case in which he deems it expedient, by order extend the time for beginning or completing an assessment by such period as he deems fit." That means it can go on all the time. It seems strange there should be assessments carried on in that fashion. However, it is a matter of detail we can deal with in Committee, and pay more attention to it then.

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, this Bill is designed to authorize the Federal Government to amend its legislation, its Judges Act, and enable it to appoint a fourth judge to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. At the present time our Supreme Court consists of three judges. The constitution is as drafted by this House in 1904 when was passed a Judicature Act. That

Act provides as does our present legislation for three judges. If a trial takes place before one judge and an appeal is necessary it is the practice, and is both the practice and the law, that appeals from that judge's judgment is to the full bench, to all three judges, of which the dissenting judge is a part. In other words we are faced with the position of a judge sitting on his own appeal. That situation has never been considered satisfactory by Counsel, by solicitors where they were acting for an appellant or for a respondent. Counsel feels that if they have an appeal to make they have the right to make that appeal to a new Court. The purpose of this Bill is to provide for the appointment of a fourth judge so that there will be four judges of the Supreme Court, one who would hear a matter originally and the remaining three who would be available to hear an appeal.

Now the Bill as drafted does not make it obligatory that the three judges hearing the appeal should be the other three judges, because in drafting the Act the draftsman envisaged the position of a judge being ill, in which event an appeal might be held up pending his recovery. So that the Act provides only in so far as it is possible an appeal from a judge will be to the other three judges.

This House has power to amend the Constitution of the Supreme Court. We can increase the number of judges to four or we can increase the number of judges to five. In any event the increases that we authorize will not become effective until the Federal Government sees fit to amend its Judges' Act, because by the Federal Act, the Judges Act, provision is made only for three judges for Newfoundland, and if a fourth judge is to be added it

will be necessary that the Federal Government amend its Federal Act and provide for the appointment of a fourth judge. So that this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is purely an enabling Act, enabling the Federal Government to make provision for a fourth judge; because unless we make provision for a fourth judge they cannot.

I do not think I need go into the various clauses. They are all very simple, and they simply change the (3) to (4) and put in some non-serious amendments.

The Bill before us, Mr. Speaker, also curtails somewhat the present situation whereby warrants of attachments can be issued at great cost to a defendant. This Bill proposes that the issuing of an attachment will be restricted to cases where an application is made to a judge and the judge agrees that it is desirable to issue an attachment. We recently had a case, Mr. Speaker, where quite a substantial industry had everything attached on a claim that was baseless—It was to do away with that situation that really drew attention to the fact that this is the only country in the world, the only Province in Canada where you can walk into court and attach a man's bank account and everything else. It is improper, Mr. Speaker, I maintain, and never should have been done, to have the plaintiff in a position where he can attach the property of the defendant before there has been a trial. Now he must go to the court, and he must satisfy the court that there is good and proper reason why he should be issued an attachment, and he should be able to satisfy the court that if it does not issue an attachment certain assets may be lost, and not made available. I think there will be no disputing the wisdom of this clause which

wipes out a practice which has been in existence in this country since 1904 at least, and which really must be looked upon as a bit of merchant legislation drafted solely to enable him to attach the fish of the fishermen. The very fact that it does not exist and has not existed in any other country would suggest there was some peculiar reason why it should be in this country. However if my honourable friends can tell us it takes place anywhere else, in England or in any other Province of Canada.

The other amendments are simple amendments. The next one I would refer to is a small amendment which is made necessary by an error on the part of the Committee drafting the revision of the Statutes. If my honourable friends will refer to Section 274 of the Schedule to the Act, Chapter 114 of the Consolidated Statutes they will read the schedule entitled—the rules of the Supreme Court appended to Chapter 83 of the Consolidated Statutes is altered or amended under provision of the said Chapter shall be deemed part of this Act—Now, Mr. Speaker, I presume the Committee on the Revision of the Statutes must be mixed up with the Terms of Union—The Committee overlooked the fact that there were amendments made to the Judicature Act which were not made under the provision of the chapter by which the Legislature, particularly in 120, the legislation itself is amended, the Judicature Act is amended—Therefore I am suggesting that these seven or eight words be stricken out so that the Bill could read—"the provisions of the schedule as amended by striking out the words, "under the Provisions of the said Chapter, shall be deemed part of this Act." The Committee overlooked the fact that amendment had been made by the Legisla-

ture and that they are now part of the amendment but are part of the consolidation.

The other amendment, Mr. Speaker, simply deals with the question as to the coming into force of this Act. It is suggested that the last amendment to which I referred be postdated to the date on which the Revised Statutes came into force. The other amendment will come into force as and when Section 2 to Section 8 come into force, as and when they have been approved by the Federal Department, by reason of their agreeing to amend the "Judges Act."

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

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, part of this Bill, I think those of us who practice in the courts will certainly agree with the statement of the Attorney General that the situation in so far as appeals are concerned has been long a source of complaint. I am not prepared to go all the way and say both the respondent and plaintiff object to having lawyers sitting on an appeal. It is always good to have a man sitting who has committed himself, he is not likely to change his mind. Generally speaking the principle is sound. It is not likely, I presume that the changing the amount of attachments from twenty to two hundred dollars is to bring this Act in line with the proposed revision of the Summary Jurisdiction Act. I would not be in the position my learned friend from St. John's South may be to say whether or not historically there is authority for attachment before judgment. Certain it is that at first glance it would appear that the proposed legislation would seem to be more satisfactory more particularly when you have the limitations clause.

Because there is no doubt at all, Sir, that it is ridiculous for a corporation or an individual to have all their assets tied up conceivably to the extent of say twenty thousand dollars for a claim that may not exceed two thousand, and that before judgement is affected at all. The situation has arisen, we all know, where a man may take out a large claim, a fancy amount of twenty or thirty thousand or fifty thousand dollars damages for a claim which may or may not have any real basis and even if it had a real basis might well amount to a matter of a couple of thousand dollars, and would tie up assets involving ten times that amount. For that reason, Sir, I think there is very real sense in the proposed amendment.

The other sections do not appear to be particularly important but are just a matter of bringing the legislation in line with the situation that will exist, I presume, and of course the coming into force is not fixed yet. I presume that if and when it is brought in force the Federal Government will in the final analysis make the decision as to the fact that there shall be a fourth judge. Until then the situation stays wide open, and I suppose rumors will continue to fly.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, in regard to the question of the appeals, I think it is desirable that we should have three new judges hear an appeal. I was the victim of a reference made by my honourable and learned colleague here, when Judge Kent changed a judgment back in 1923, a judgement given by a jury and there was an argument before the full bench, and when the judgment was given for the plaintiff there was an appeal against the judgment to the jury. I remember so

well because it happened on the day of the election, May 31st, 1923, and I was a candidate, and the news came to me at the very place where the cause of action had arisen, in Argentina, that the appeal had been allowed to the Reid Newfoundland Company and Judge Kent had changed his opinion. But usually, as my learned friend says, a judge who gives an opinion usually sticks to it. It is very reasonable and logical that when a man gives an opinion, which is his considered opinion, whether right or wrong he is prejudiced. I think it is natural that a man is prejudiced in favour of a decision he has given some thought to, and it is therefore preferable that there should be three fresh judges, and I hope that as often as possible that will be done.

In regard to the other matter raised by the Attorney General as to the question of the attachments, which he speaks of as "Merchants Legislation." He used it several times, but I don't remember ever having acted for any merchant, and it was against perhaps lesser merchants than great ones. The reason why the attachment was usually levied was because some persons were likely to make a disposal of property or leave the country, and it was a very common thing to have a man arrested—in fact I have had a man arrested last year in that way; he had given a guarantee and there was certainly every probability that he would leave the country as soon as he heard of a writ being issued against him. I had him arrested and taken by the sheriff, but he paid the bill. But I do not think it is quite so useless or harmful as the Attorney General would have us believe. However, I

think we can look up the English Law and see what the practice is there.

Now in regard to the coming into effect of the various provisions, I think these are in order.

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

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Expropriation of Land."

On motion Bill 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 Further to Amend the Social Assistance Act, 1954."

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

Honourable Minister of Public Welfare asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act, 1956."

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

On motion House recessed for ten minutes, after which Mr. Speaker, returned to the Chair.

Motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on various Bills, carried.

On motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Clarke Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Policies of Accident and Sickness Insurance."

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe on the last day we were discussing this Bill two sections were allowed to stand, Sections 3 and 5 and the Schedule.

MR. BROWNE: I would move, Mr. Chairman, that Paragraph (f) be added—to read: "The Civil Service Insurance Society."

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I don't quite go along with that, whether it would be advisable to accept just one fraternal society by name there. As the honourable members know there are several of these sickness and benefit societies operating in Newfoundland, the Knights of Columbus, Masonic, the Star of the Sea. To accept one specifically I think would be poor legislation. I would go along to the extent, and I had consultations with the solicitors of the House here, that we would put a clause in the Bill saying that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may exempt all fraternal societies from the operation of the Act, if it should become necessary. I do not know if that is satisfactory or not.

MR. BROWNE: He might not want to except them all. Strictly speaking I do not call this fraternal society—it is not particularly—it is a society incorporated under the companies Act.

MR. MURRAY: The definition for fraternal society is here, you see. Has the honourable member looked at the definition in the interpretation clause here?

MR. BROWNE: Yes—That would cover it. Well then suppose the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council overlooks passing that exception on, how would you go about it? They would

have to make an Order-in-Council would they not?

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I imagine if no hardship inures to anybody we would not hear about it at all, but if it did lead to hardship it would be brought to our attention, and then it would be brought up before Cabinet and as a mere matter of form the Order-in-Council would be passed.

HON. DR. J. McGRATH (Minister of Health): I would like to know where an organization such as the "Blue Cross" would fit in if we were to change that definition to fraternal societies. It seems to me that might apply to some mutual organizations and insurance companies—you might suddenly find a much bigger field.

MR. MURRAY: The amendment I suggest would cover all that. We could specifically exempt, if necessary. If we did not hear from them we would of course assume everything is all right.

MR. BROWNE: I do not know if the Railway Employees Welfare Association is active now, because recently the Canadian National Railway introduced its scheme. I think they also have "Blue Cross," but the Civil Servants Insurance Scheme is based on the Railway Employees Welfare Scheme. It is a very simple thing which constitutes an ordinary application form and that is all there is to it.

MR. MURRAY: I feel myself, Mr. Chairman, the amendment we suggest would take care of any eventuality which could come up. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may exempt any fraternal society from the operation of any provisions of this Act. That is the amendment proposed.

MR. BROWNE: Does that mean a society makes the application?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, and obviously if they were not satisfied—

MR. BROWNE: That would be all right.

MR. MURRAY: We could put it in, say, as Clause 30 and make Clause read Clause 31. Or maybe the proper place would be to make it Clause 29. Make Clause 29 Clause 30, Clause 30 Clause 31.

MR. BROWNE: I withdraw the amendment.

On motion Clause 3 carried.

Clause 15:

MR. MURRAY: That was another matter the honourable member brought up. All I have to say about that, Mr. Chairman, is that this Act as it stands ordinarily across Canada, every insurance Act in the other nine Provinces has this clause. The Life Insurance Act in operation for several years in this Province had an absolutely similar clause.

On motion Clause 15 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Now the right of examination—

MR. MURRAY: Now, Mr. Chairman, this is also a standard procedure in effect all across Canada, and as long as it does not seem to be too unreasonable, concerning accident and sickness insurance I think they should have the right, if a person has been insured for a very big sum, to call for an autopsy if necessary. The right is very, very seldom exercised and has never been abused.

MR. BROWNE: Okay. What about the limitation of action.

MR. MURRAY: That is also standard.

There are some minor amendments here in Section (3) 3—You will see 26 there. That should be 27. In Clause 13 the word "person" should be "persons", in the third line.

On motion clause carried.

Schedule carried.

MR. CURTIS: I would move, Mr. Chairman, I would move that instead of the present Section 29, the following be Clause 29—"The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may exempt any fraternal society from the operations of the new provisions in this Act; that the present Section 29 be Section 30.

On motion Clause as amended carried.

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Chairman, that the present Section 29 be inserted as Section 30—

On motion amendment carried.

MR. CURTIS: I move that the present Clause 30 be Clause 31.

On motion amendment carried.

Motion that the committee report having passed this Bill with some amendment carried.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act."

On motion Clauses 1 through 3 carried. Clause 4:

MR. CURTIS: Before Clause 4 is read, Mr. Chairman, I move that we put in a new Clause 4. The Clause, Mr. Chairman, has been circulated.

"4. The said Act is further amended by inserting immediately after Section 26 the following as Section 26A:

Assignment of premium refund; 26A

(1) Where an insured assigns the right to refund of premium that may accrue by reason of the cancellation or termination of a contract of insurance under the terms thereof and notice of the assignment is given by the assignee to the insurer, the insurer shall pay any such refund to the assignee notwithstanding any condition in the contract, whether prescribed under this Act or not, requiring the refund to be paid to the insurer or to accompany any notice of cancellation or termination to the insured.

Termination of Contract. Where the condition in the contract dealing with cancellation or termination by the insurer provides that the refund shall accompany the notice of cancellation or termination the insurer shall include in the notice a statement that in lieu of payment of the refund in accordance with the conditions the refund is being paid to the assignee under this section."

Mr. Chairman, I move that amendment.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the question whether the credit corporation would re-assign the balance of any insurance immediately upon repossession of a vehicle which has been covered automatically?

MR. CURTIS: I presume, Mr. Chairman, that if one of the loan concerns lent money to insured to pay a premium on an insurance policy that they would have to account for any other monies.

MR. HIGGINS: A hard outfit—they account for nothing.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I would not be sure they do.

Motion that Clause 4 be renumbered as Clause 5 and Clause 5 as Clause 6, and the new Section 4, as read, be inserted, carried.

MR. MURRAY: My interpretation of the new section is that there was no provision in the previous Act covering insurance of trailers, and this section covers it.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the Bill with some amendments, carried.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance."

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, in reference to this Bill, I might say the position is that several new amendments came down to us from the Superintendents Association regarding the Act of 1954, and as a matter of fact did go considerably better, that we repeal the Act of 1954, and put in an entirely new Act before the House rather than insert these new amendments. There were so many amendments came along we thought it better to entirely repeal the 1954 Act. I must explain the reason for all these amendments.

MR. CURTIS: I have before me the amendments proposed to the Bill, covering about two and a half pages. With the consent of the House I move the Bill be sent back to the printer and have these amendments incorporated into the existing Bill, and then have a straight, clean copy before us. I think that would simplify things in the long run.

MR. BROWNE: Why not have that done without making a motion?

MR. CURTIS: Then my honourable friend might well turn around

and say the thing was railroaded because that is not the Bill we read a second time. I think it should be done by motion of the House, that these amendments be put in a printed form.

MR. MURRAY: Could we move them now?

MR. CURTIS: That might be the simpler way.

MR. BROWNE: All right—Why not call these?

On motion Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2:

MR. CURTIS: I move the amendment as set forth in the list here.

On motion carried. Clause 3 carried. Clause 4 carried.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I move the existing Paragraph 5 be stricken out and a new paragraph 5, as set forth in the draft being circulated be inserted.

On motion Clause as amended, carried.

On motion Clauses 6 through 13 carried.

MR. CURTIS: Section 14, Mr. Chairman, I move that Section 14 be renumbered, and that the following be Number 14. That Section 14 be renumbered 16—I move that the existing Section 15 become Section 17 and the following be inserted as Section 15—(1) The insurer, upon making any payment or assuming liability therefor under a contract of fire insurance, shall be subrogated to all rights of recovery of the insured against any person, and may bring action in the name of the insured to enforce such rights.

(2) Where the net amount recovered after deducting the costs of recovery is not sufficient to provide a complete indemnity for the loss or damage suffered, that amount shall be divided between the insurer and the insured in the proportions in which the loss or damage has been borne by them respectively.

MR. MURRAY: The only point I would like to make is that this legislation comes to us from the Association of Superintendents of Fire Insurance, the idea being to bring uniformity throughout Canada, and I would be reluctant to make any changes, it would require different forms be printed or something written in with regard to Newfoundland policies. Actually it is not to come into effect until the date it be proclaimed. It is supposed to come into effect across Canada simultaneously.

On motion Clause 15 carried. Clauses 16 through 18 carried.

Statutory Conditions carried.

MR. BROWNE: I expect very soon we will have other amendments coming along from the Superintendents.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill with some amendments, carried:

A Bill, "An Act to Provide Assistance for Teachers by Way of Loans for Certain Purposes."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the definition "teacher" was allowed to stand.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I overlooked that. I did mention it to the drafter of the Bill and asked him to get in touch with the printers. Perhaps in view of that we might rise on that Bill, Mr. Chairman—Let it stand—

On motion, that the Committee, report progress on this Bill and ask leave to sit again, carried:

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act."

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried:

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the James M. Boylen (Confirmation of Agreement Act, 1955.)"

On motion Clauses 1 through 4 carried; Clause 5:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I have only one observation to make on that section. It seems Governments are all the same. The present Government is doing what Governments did twenty-five and thirty and forty year ago—a company comes along and comes in here and is doing a favour by starting a mine, and whatever concessions they want they can get—Here they go back and make it retroactive in effect for what they have done before the legislation is introduced. No one else can go in there.

On motion Clause 5 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendments, carried.

Motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, carried.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to it referred and have directed me to report passing Bills No. 30 and Bill No. 40, without amendment.

On motion report received, Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Chairman, the Committee of the Whole have directed me to report they have considered Bill, "An Act Respecting Policies of Accident and Sickness Insurance," and Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act," and Bill, "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance and directs me to report same with some amendment.

On motion report received, Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Chairman, the Committee of the Whole have considered the other matters to them referred and directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received, Committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on notice to adjourn I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Finance if he could take notice of QUESTION No. 85 and No. 29 directed to the Premier. In his absence perhaps he might be in a position to give the answers tomorrow.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

TUESDAY, May 7, 1957

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. J. McGRATH (Minister of Health): I have here, Mr. Speaker, the report of the select committee on a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Dental Act." The Select Committee appointed to hear evidence and report on the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Dental Act," have considered the matters to them referred, have held public hearings on the provisions of the said Bill and recommend unanimously that the said Bill be not proceeded with.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member will forgive me—I notice no members of the press are here. I wonder if the honourable member would present this report and then make his speech later. I think that would give it fuller publicity.

On motion report received.

Notices of Motion

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Issue of a Grant of a Piece of Land to the Reid Newfoundland Company, Limited, in Exchange for a part of Read Lot 97."

Notice of Questions

Notice of Questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett.

Answers to Questions

QUESTION No. 92: Stand.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Highways): There was none to my knowledge.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the reply to QUESTION No. 93. (See appendix)

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table the reply to QUESTION No. 86. I may say the second part of No. 86 is still in preparation.

I also beg leave to lay on the Table of the House a reply to QUESTION No. 91, (See appendix)

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, during the afternoon session yesterday the honourable and learned member for St. John's South called my attention to a question on the Order Paper of the 29th. of April. I have endeavoured to obtain the answers to that question, and I have the information for QUESTION No. 85 (1) and have copies to be tabled. (See appendix)

For the information of the House I will read the question and merely give the totals. The details are all in here. I do not propose to delay the House to cover these details.

For these six loans the amount is \$4,586,102.

QUESTION No. 85 (2) the answer is that this transaction has not yet been finalized and I am not in a position to give the answers. They are in course of negotiations.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this loan of four million now on the market and bankers are sounding around to prospective customers. There is notice they have them for sale, and I should think by this time the cost to

the Government and the proceeds to the Government should be known.

MR. SPENCER: In answer to the public statement regarding one of the loans which was, I understand, placed in the Dominion of Canada. Actually the second part of the question is in reference to a loan to be placed in the United States. The answer given by me is the correct one. That transaction is not finalized and we are not in a position to give the final figures at this moment. The reference the honourable gentleman has made may or may not be correct. I am not responsible for what he referred to as being either in the press or stated by somebody outside this House. I say my answer is correct—the transaction, as far as we in the Department of Finance are concerned is not yet finalized.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before we enter upon the Orders of the Day I would like to ask the Attorney General if he has any further information to give on the question I asked yesterday regarding an investigation conducted by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police at Whitbourne.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): In reply, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend I might say that I have an interim report which was received yesterday. There are still some further enquiries to be made, but I would anticipate that the matter would come to a head within the course of a very, very short time.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to avail of this opportunity to say a word particularly to the radio reporters. As honourable members will realize this is a week known as "Radio Week." That is a week that is a very important week in

so far as Newfoundland is concerned because radio has taken away isolation from most of our country and particularly in the constituencies of most of us on this side of the House. Radio is a means of communication and knowledge as to what is going on in the capital. It must be about twenty-six or twenty-seven years ago now, Mr. Speaker, since radio came to Newfoundland, and only those who live outside St. John's can realize what a good thing it has been. By means of radio our people are able to keep informed as to what is going on here. I must say, Mr. Speaker, although sometimes we turn on the reporters and rail at them and sometimes we wish the mischief has everyone of them nevertheless that is only a phase. In our hearts we know they are doing a great service, and that they are attending here every afternoon. Really, Mr. Speaker, when you come to consider that when we go home to sit down to our suppers we can sit down and listen to the report of debates that took place that same afternoon. It seems that while we are slipping home after cleaning up our chores here they have been hard at work writing out their reports. It is easily understandable that now and then they misquote us. That may not be entirely their fault. Perhaps we do not always make ourselves clear. On the other hand we do not like to have them say, as sometimes they do say, that so and so also spoke, so they do try and put in some words. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, when I hear some of the Opposition speeches over the radio I do not recognize them, they are so much better than what we have heard here. They seem to have a way of finding out the various points they try to make and they have anticipated them, they have enlarged upon them,

they have improved them. I only wish they would do us the same courtesy because here on the Government side what we say is factual and therefore they do not get the same scope to criticize them. In other words the scope of the critic is much easier scope to have.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government and on behalf of the House we would like to say welcome to the reporters. I must say they chose a bad day to suggest I do that because they were all late. When the House opened if I had made my few remarks there would not have been one of them here to hear them. But I deferred the statement, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the reporters will learn a lesson and be here when the House opens.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this side of the House I would like to join the Attorney General and Acting Premier in the word of praise given to the radio reporters. I am glad that he acknowledged the fact that at least they can make some intelligence out of remarks made on this side of the House, whereas the Honourable the Attorney General admits it is not always easy, in the dark spots I will say, on the other side sometimes. At any rate I will say this for the radio reporters and I can say it knowing what I say is correct because I was at one time part-time radio reporter. It takes all ones time to follow what is being said. The acoustics in this building are not too wonderful and some of us sometimes are not too, shall I say, intelligent—put it that way. That applies to the opposite side of the House, of course. They make a good job of it, Sir, and I am very, very happy to join with

the Attorney General in a word of praise to all the reporters.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, we certainly do our best to get replies and get as much information of interest for the radio and press to broadcast so that they can know what is going on in the Government.

Without appearing to be too importunate may I ask the Attorney General when he expects to have a final report and if it will be released to the House, on the Whitbourne situation.

MR. CURTIS: No, Mr. Speaker, it will not. That report is a police report and it is not the practice to release police reports. But there will be other means whereby my honourable friend will be able to hear.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have been given to understand it is a very grave matter and one which should be dealt with very quickly. I would like the Attorney General to keep that in mind.

MR. CURTIS: I appreciate that, but many of the parties involved are not immediately available.

MR. SPEAKER: I think as Speaker of the House, if the House will allow me, I would like to add my voice to those who have paid tribute to the press, and on behalf of the House I would like to say that we do appreciate their reports and we do understand the importance of radio in Newfoundland today.

I would also like to say this: On occasions I have spoken of noise in the House and sometimes I have said there is noise in the gallery, but at no time did I mean that any noise came from the reporters. They have been

most orderly at all times, and I have hopes honourable members will follow their example.

Orders of the Day

On motion a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Legislative Disabilities Act" be now read a third time.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill which we opposed when it was read a second time and which we oppose now. We do think this is a backward step. We do not believe it is an advisable thing for the Government to take the power to find jobs for its supporters in the Federal Governments as this Bill will do. We do not think it is a good thing for the Government to take the power to themselves to call, issue a writ for a by-election. We think that matter should be left in the hands of the Governor. We do not think it is a good thing the Government should have power to enlarge the Cabinet without any restriction. We believe there are quite enough Cabinet Ministers. And although we have the assurance of the Premier there is no intention of increasing the number of the Cabinet, it might be possible at the same time—the power is there and who knows how he might succumb to the pressure that might be put on him. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, we oppose the third reading of this Bill, and I now propose this Bill be not now read a third time but six months hence.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved and seconded that the word "now" be deleted and the words "six months hence" be inserted.

I declare the motion lost on division, to be entered on the records.

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

On Motion a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Policies of Accident and Sickness Insurance," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

On motion A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

On motion a Bill, "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

On motion a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

On motion a Bill, "An Act to Amend the M. James Boylen (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1955," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Dental Act."

MR. MCGRATH: Mr. Speaker, this Act was referred to a Select Committee of the House who unanimously report that it be not proceeded with. I therefore wish to move that the Bill be withdrawn. However, it is a matter of public interest, I think, and I should like to say a word of explanation.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the honourable member proceeds I might say this motion is usually made at second reading, but this Bill has been read a second time. So by leave of the

House I shall allow this motion that the Bill be withdrawn. This motion can only be carried if carried unanimously by leave of the House. The Honourable member will please proceed.

MR. MCGRATH: This Bill was originally brought forward, I am quite satisfied, in good faith, and represented to me as being unanimously supported by the dental profession. The Bill was drafted with the assent and the approval of the dental board and brought to me by two members of the Dental Board and introduced by me to the House. I thought it was at the time an uncontroversial Bill. I can only say that was the optimism of inexperience because no sooner had the Bill been brought to the House than a number of objections were made first by local dental mechanics, and on their petition the House appointed a Select Committee. But when the select committee sat it turned out that not only the dental mechanics disapproved of certain portions of the Bill but a number of dentists themselves, whether they had not considered the Bill fully beforehand or if this had come up since then or they had not seen it before, but a number of senior dentists appeared before the committee objecting to certain parts of the Act. The peculiar thing is that there was unanimity on neither side. One group of dental mechanics, I believe the big majority, were against certain provisions of the Bill but a minority were in favour. In the same way a majority of the dentists seemed to me in favour of the Bill but representative and senior minority were definitely against it. At the hearing we all felt that under these circumstances the Bill should not be recommended and following that it should be withdrawn

and the interested parties be advised that they should prepare another Bill for another session of the House when we hope the matter would be studied fully and some degree of unanimity arrived at by a majority of the people whom it will effect.

Motion the order be discharged and this Bill be withdrawn, carried:

MR. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent of the House this Bill will be withdrawn and the order hereby discharged.

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting Notaries Public."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would move that this order be discharged and that the Bill, "An Act Respecting Notaries Public" be recommitted and that the House now go into the Committee on the said Bill and on Order No. 9.

Motion that this Bill be recommitted to a committee of the Whole House now, carried.

Motion that the House also go into Committee of the Whole on Order No. 9—A Bill, "An Act to Amend the St. John's Housing Corporation Act," carried.

On motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Clarke Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, we are on Bill No. 9 "An Act Respecting Notaries Public," and I would ask that we reconsider Clause 10, I might say that for years and years and years we operated without a Notaries Act, and I think in view of that we can continue to operate without a scale of fees. If any future House wants to use

a scale of fees then bring them in, but I do not think the Bill is improved by this Clause 10, and I think my honourable friend, the Minister of Provincial Affairs, has a motion to make in this respect.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I move that Clause 10 be deleted and Clause 11 of the Bill become Clause 10.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, does this then mean that a notary public can charge anything that he feels the traffic can bear. It seems to me almost like highwaymen.

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Chairman, that is a matter which can be readily settled. At the moment nobody seems to know what the fair fee is.

MR. HIGGINS: I am not a notary public anyway.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, how did the section get into this Bill?

MR. CURTIS: Copied from Ontario.

MR. BROWNE: Copied from Ontario—Well, how do fees charged compare with there?

MR. CURTIS: We can't find out.

MR. HIGGINS: A trade secret.

MR. BROWNE: Well, I have never done any of the business and don't know anything about it myself.

MR. CURTIS: I know it is five dollars for a notary public. It seems very small.

MR. BROWNE: I do not know what it involves. Would it be advisable to leave it to the rules Committee? Could they not handle that?

MR. CURTIS: I think they have no jurisdiction. I think the best thing to do, Mr. Chairman, is leave it out for the moment.

On motion, Clause 10 deleted. (Mr. Higgins voted Nay).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill with some amendments, carried.

A Bill, "An Act To Amend the St. John's Housing Corporation Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, when we were last in Committee objection was raised to subsection 6 of section 2. I suggest my honourable friend, the Minister of Provincial Affairs, move this clause be deleted. I have cleared this matter with the mayor.

MR. HIGGINS: I hope you have.

MR. CURTIS: And with the engineer. I do not like the clause anyway. I never did. If he moves the amendment the Government will be glad to support it.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I move that sub-clause 6 of Clause 2 be deleted.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: There is no doubt about that. We have already started fixing it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see the Government will respond to reason occasionally.

Motion, is that sub-clause 6 of clause 2—"Neither the City of St. John's nor the Corporation shall be or become liable in any way by reasons of any default or defect in the design, construction or installation by or on behalf of the Corporation of any of the said works vested in the City of St. John's under this section," be deleted.

Motion carried—Mr. Higgins voted Nay.

Motion, that the Committee rise and report having passed this Bill as amended, carried.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed a Bill, "An Act Respecting Notaries Public" and "An Act to Amend the St. John's Housing Corporation Act," with some amendment and have directed me to report same.

On motion report received.

On motion Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Suvivorship Act."

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, this question of suvivorship, as we know, is one of increasing importance due to the fact there are airplane accidents and automobile accidents where members of a family are wiped out in the one accident and the question of suvivorship becomes of extreme and practical importance as far as the disposal of property is involved.

The Bill deals with two proposed amendments of the Act. The first amendment is to bring the Act in line with the sickness and insurance Act, the Accident and Sickness Act we passed yesterday and Section 2 of the Act deals with that to include accident and sickness as well as life insurance within the scope of the Act. The other amendment, Mr. Speaker, is one which comes to us from the Uniformity Commission. It is self-explanatory. We are amending the Bill to bring us in line with the legislation across Canada

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 Act, 1956."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, there are quite a number of amendments to this particular Bill. I do not know if they introduce any new principle as much as the main principle is of course Local Government as we know it and which has existed for the last number of years in Newfoundland. It does introduce, Sir, what we call the better working of the Local Government System. Many of these things can be dealt with better in Committee stage rather than at this particular stage.

Clause 2 and 3 are more or less tied in together. We have a situation during the last two or three years where municipal councils have taken actions against certain parties and have lost that action because of part of cargoes being unloaded in harbours, for instance. Clauses 2 and 3 amendments are intended to take care of that, as far as we can see. First of all Clause 2 makes sure that our law does not infringe upon the Federal Rights and Jurisdiction of the Government of Canada. On the other hand Clause 3 does provide for the inclusion of docks and wharves within the boundaries of a municipality for the purpose of levying taxes and exercising certain controls. We feel that is necessary because, of course, the boundaries of most incorporated seaport towns are usually described as the foreshore or shoreline. So that this clause is inserted so that it is taxable to have a wharf or shed built on the shoreline.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the Minister explain a little more clearly what is meant by this section here, and what sort of taxation is envisaged that a municipality can impose on ships tied up to a wharf?

MR. HEFFERTON. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, if a ship is discharging cargo tied up to a wharf down on the shoreline we are unable to levy for instance a tax per ton on coal. This was the specific cargo in question because since the shed might be outside of the shoreline it was beyond the jurisdiction of the municipality. As of now this amendment makes it possible, of course, so that that does come within the boundary of the municipality and so whatever taxes may be of general application for a thing of that kind may be applied to this particular case.

Then we give authority to a town clerk to administer oath and take and receive affidavits. This is necessary for the efficient conduct of the towns business. Several of our municipalities have the responsibility for the administration of public utilities, and in the past they have been in the habit of including what may be called operative budgets into the general budget they submit to the Department of Municipal Affairs for approval. We feel these two things should be kept separate, at least, as far as budgeting is concerned.

Then it has come to be normal now to accept lithographed signatures on documents and bonds instead of having them done by hand as was the practice up to two or three years ago, so that, that amendment is included.

A further clause makes some amendment to the existing law which re-

quires the Local Government improved area to have a population of twelve hundred and fifty people before it can have a town council. We have one particular place in mind where some representation has been made to us—the place of LaScie where we have a local improvement council.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, may I ask, to clarify, does that mean twelve hundred and fifty persons or twelve hundred and fifty voters?

MR. HEFFERTON: Population not voters—people—We feel the limit should be lower in order that it might become a municipality.

There is a further clause which provides the municipality shall be able to take over and control and manage all the roads in the municipality except those which are definitely placed under the Highways Act. By vesting this ownership and control and management in municipalities it will enable them to take care of its own repairs as well as ordinary maintenance and repairs of the roads.

Now a further clause gives control authority to make regulations to protect its water and sewer lines in places where water and sewer lines have been installed, and to charge a service fee for that particular work for maintenance which is necessary.

A rather important one comes up in Clause 12: We have had one or two instances where for various reasons the council has imposed its taxes even as late as the mid-part of the year. We feel that the rate should be set by the council and publicity given thereon not later than the end of March in any one year. So that we say the rate should be given out during the first three months so that householders and taxpayers would

know just what they would be called upon to pay during that particular year. Provision is also made so that taxes imposed after March 31st or rather taxes imposed during the latter part of the year shall be in proportion to the calendar year and not the full, as if it were twelve months.

Clause 13 provides that where the operator of a business is not the owner of the real property yet the operator, he shall be given notice of the assessed value of the property which is occupied by him for business purposes. Then, of course, the real property tax is fixed at the price of the assessed value of the real property. Then of course, there is provision for assessors to carry out that work.

Clauses 16 and 17—Section 10—provides that a water rate may be levied upon buildings which are not directly connected to the water service but which buildings do derive benefits from the installation of water systems nearby. That tax under the authority of the council, of course, would vary.

Clause 17 provides the imposition of a sewerage tax on buildings, connected to municipal services. That particular request came to us from a town council which does not possess a water service but does possess a sewerage system and plans on extending that and wants authority to impose taxes on that particular sewerage.

Then there is a provision whereby a council can impose a tax on motor vehicles which are operated for hire and also authorizes the council to enforce a sticker to be placed on motor vehicles in operation.

In Clause 20 the Councils are given authority to make regulations dealing with the erection and maintenance of

telegraph poles, electric poles and so on.

Then the following Clause makes provision whereby the Councils are authorized to adopt any or all of the Canadian Electric Code. The number of fires prevailing during the past few years makes it necessary that Councils should have some authority to adopt some electric code and to see that that electric code is carried out in the building and construction of houses.

Then a further Clause gives the council authority to make a loan or grant for the purpose of creating public parks or amusement parks within their area.

Finally the last Clause gives authority to a Council to make agreements with the Provincial Government and with the Federal Government or both on matters of housing projects.

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

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, quite truthfully there does not appear to be very much to object to in this Bill, but one cannot help remarking that last year, very late in the session, we had a Local Government Bill to end all Local Government Bills, to cover every imaginary situation arising. Now we have another Bill comes in with something like twenty-odd amendments. I can appreciate the reasoning that wants to protect every small council make sure of every bit of revenue they are able to get, but where are we going to stop, Sir? If we do not watch out this thing will be like the Dog Act. Every year a new Dog Act comes in.

MR. CURTIS: There are new dogs every year.

MR. HIGGINS: Yes, Sir, but not new councils. The provision here, Sir, in Section 3 is the one I believe stems from an incident which arose, I think, in Channel or Port aux Basques. Whether that should be of general application is a rather difficult thing to say, because actually it is not a tax that is going to be paid by ships that are bringing cargoes—that is all my eye—it is the consumer pays in the final analysis. If they stick a tax on their cargoes the importers certainly are going to compute that tax and add it in when making up the amount to charge to the consumer. I am just wondering if that is to be of general application. It does not affect the City of St. John's nor I presume the City of Corner Brook. But I can foresee, Sir, there may be certain objections in certain areas of the country. As I said it does not concern us on this side so much from the directly local angle but it is a provision, Sir, which might be worth some consideration before we go much further on.

As I said, the rest of the Act is perfectly understandable. I can hardly see it is going to be a matter for immediate concern to give the councils rights for building parks. We are a good many years in St. John's trying to get parks started. So I do not think that is very much to concern the smaller places. But I do feel, Sir, that the question of including ships tied at docks at taxable sources might have implications not readily discernible.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak in this matter at this time, but my honourable friend from St. John's East does not really mean at St. John's, at the present time all jurisdiction goes to the end of the Cove. St. John's will have a beautiful streamlined harbour, and when the Federal Government builds

the new wharf anything anybody builds on that wharf the Federal Government owns. I don't believe the City nor any City ought to control it. If the Federal Government builds the wharf we will have no control of the buildings that go on it. So we will still be where we were before, at the end of Job's and Bowrings' coves.

MR. HIGGINS: It is outside St. John's altogether.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I know, but that is what I see needs some enquiry into. If the thing goes through the Federal Government proposes I would like to know what right the City of St. John's is going to have on the wharf.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the only provision in the Bill which seems to raise any controversy is Section 3 which states that all docks, quays, wharves, slips and structures touching the boundaries of the municipality and all ships attached either permanently or temporarily to any docks, quays, wharves, slips or structures shall be deemed to be within a part of the municipality. Now I was careful to ask the Minister when speaking if he would explain that provision, and I confess which gives the Local Government power to impose a tax on coal and fuel, which is paid by the consumer, I am still further at a loss as to why this Section 3 is inserted. I remember we had not long ago another Bill in connection with Corner Brook if I am not mistaken, where it was the boundary of the city was the ships at the quays. I don't see how it can be made, anything in connection with ships can be made taxable. From time immemorial ships come into port here and import from every country, if I am not mistaken, and have never been subject to any taxes of that kind. The

Minister, as I understand, is dealing with the question of the sales of articles from a ship, directly from the ship. Now I do not know if that is an unusual practice. It seems to be an unusual practice here in St. John's because I have never heard of it, and I do not know to what extent it prevails outside St. John's. Apparently it did occur at Port aux Basques. I think it happened that somebody brought in a cargo of coal and sold the coal from the ship's side. But if the Bill contains provisions whereby the consumer pays the tax on that coal does not that cover it, or is there another tax payable by the person who sells the coal, maybe what is called a business tax. Maybe that is what is in mind. But it seems to me to be a sort of clumsy provision to get that kind of thing.

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the only comment I have to make is that it is strange that after one year the Government should come forward with a new Bill which has twenty-two provisions in it, when last year we had a comprehensive Bill adopted of about forty or fifty pages.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word—I agree wholeheartedly with the remarks made by my learned friend and I agree in that I think a tax on ships coming into port such as Lewisporte or Burin or any other port a tax on ships coming in and tying up to a wharf is not necessary nor in the best interest of that port. I am quite sure there ought to be some way to get around that, if the Government would reconsider it. It is all very well to put taxes on commodities which have been landed and are to be sold to the public—yes, that is how taxes are raised—but to tax a ship as well I think it is highly unfair.

It is very unwise, and I think it should be stricken out.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition laid a great deal of stress on the fact that we brought in a Bill last year and this year we have to bring in twenty-two amendments. Well, Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that local Government is fast developing in Newfoundland, and I would not be surprised if next year the Honourable Minister has to bring back another amendment. This work is not static. The draftsmen who drafted this Bill do not claim to be perfect. The persons who administer the Bill and who ask for these amendments are asking for them in the light of their own experiences—and it is very necessary to change your thinking, to change your rules, to change your by-laws—Even in this House we have to change our rules now and then. This shows that the Act is being administered. It shows it is really a living Act, when these mistakes are becoming apparent so soon after the Bill has been in operation. My honourable friends will remember the other day I had occasion to ask for an amendment to a section which was in the 1916 Consolidated Statutes and nobody knew the error occurred because that Act was never used. Now here is an Act so much used that after one year of operation defects have become apparent and the Minister properly comes in and asks this House to make certain amendments. What are we here for?

MR. BROWNE: Yesterday we even had amendments to Bills before passing.

MR. CURTIS: Which just shows we do not come here with any fixed, preconceived ideas. We come here

with open minds and we take suggestions from any one.

MR. HOLLETT: What about Section 3?

MR. CURTIS: Section 3 is a very simple section. It just means that when a ship comes into port and is tied up to the wharf it becomes part of the municipality for the sake of the municipal rules and regulations and taxes, not that there is any idea of taxing the ship nor any idea of taxing anything on the ship, but if sales take place from a ship they are deemed to take place in the municipality. Suppose for instance we had a municipal sales tax in St. John's, I think that my honourable friend from St. John's Centre would be the first one to object if the sales tax in St. John's City could be avoided by going outside the Road DeLuxe and putting up a business stand and having all the people to go out there by car to buy their stuff and evade the tax.

MR. HIGGINS: Where do they buy the flippers?

MR. CURTIS: My honourable friend cannot get his mind off his stomach. In the midst of debate he talks about flippers. However, Mr. Speaker, we have to be realistic here. There town councils are trying to survive, and trying to do a job for themselves, and they want to make a good job of their administration they have certain taxes; they find that certain people try to evade these taxes by doing business from the side of a ship—Now my honourable friend from St. John's South says, well, why not put a tax on the consumer. But look at the problem that would create at a ship coming into the harbour and discharging coal. Every individual person who buys a coal, according to him,

would have to pay that tax. Is it not much better to have the tax collected by the person on the ship in one amount for the whole shipment and not go around to every person and collect twenty cents and fifty cents whatever the tax may be? I think, Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to this section—In fact I can see no objection to making the docks, the quays, the wharves, the slips and structures wholly within part of the municipality.

Now then my honourable friend referred to another section where the council may impose on the consumer a tax of not more than one dollar a ton on coal and one cent a gallon on fuel oil, etc., by the consumer for consumption within the municipality. I draw attention to the fact that the tax is on the items sold for consumption in the municipality.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, if I may interrupt the Attorney General—If a ship comes to a wharf and sells coal the consumer is bound to pay the tax on the coal. Where does the point come in to have the tax on the ship?

MR. CURTIS: Is it not a fact the tax imposed on the consumer can be collected from the retailer—I presume that is the idea. Yes, the consumer pays the tax but the pay is collected by the vendor. The idea of this section is to enable the council to collect it from the vendor—It is not a tax on the ship at all. My honourable friend may go down as a notary public and execute documents on the ship, if so he is within the municipality when the ship is tied on. I think if there is any serious objections we can discuss it when we get into Committee, but I think the principle of treat-

ing a ship or a wharf as part of the municipality is a good one.

MR. SHEPPARD: There is one thing I notice there which probably the Minister when he is closing the debate will clarify for me, i.e., the section dealing with sewerage tax.

MR. SPEAKER: I think perhaps that might be dealt with in Committee. I may say at this time, only the principle of the Bill should be discussed at second reading, and strictly speaking there should not be mention made of clause this or clause that. That should be done in Committee.

MR. BROWNE: Except, Mr. Speaker, with deference, usually one or two sections carry the principle we are debating.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the clause mentioned by the honourable member can be dealt with in Committee. I think the clauses might be mentioned without referring to them as clause 2 and clause 3.

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 after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Second reading of a Bill, "An Act to Confirm to United Towns Electric Company Limited Certain Rights and Powers."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill—"An Act to Confirm to United Towns Electric Company Limited Certain Rights and Powers." If Honourable members will turn first to the schedule attached to this Bill they will find there a list of companies. They will find there the Public Service Electric Company, which is a company in-

corporated to develop water power over in Victoria Village near Carbonear. When they put through the Bill I think it was Victoria Village. It is Victoria Town now. The Public Service Electric Company was designed to develop electricity over there for consumption in Carbonear and Harbour Grace. Then you will find there the Wabana Light and Power Company Limited. That, as honourable members will know, was a company incorporated for the purpose of distributing on Bell Island electric power which was brought over to Bell Island from the Mainland via Broad Cove, I think it is. Then they will find there another Bill, a Bill respecting the West Coast Power Company Limited in the Electrification of St. George's-Port au Port. Now these three companies have all been wholly acquired by the United Towns Electric Company, and the United Towns Electric Company owns all the common stock of all three of these companies. I think one of the companies may have either preferred shares or bond issues outstanding. I believe that perhaps the Public Services Company has a bond issue or preferred shares outstanding. But all the voting stock in all these three companies has been acquired by the United Towns.

In Newfoundland at the present time, Mr. Speaker, there is the greatest possible need for expansion particularly the expansion of our power supply. Indeed I hear that two members of our House are at the moment in Burin checking up on certain expansions, probably at the moment, telephone, but probably at the same time they will be considering the power situation down there. These three companies acting separately would not get anywhere if they went to the money markets of the world. Who in the

money market would lend money to the Public Services Electric Company? Who would lend money to the Wabana Electric and Power Company? Who would lend money to the West Coast Power Company? These three small companies operating separately would not have credit rating with financiers. Having therefore been acquired by the United Towns Electric Company, which is a very, very substantial company, they propose, these three companies incorporated with their parent company, the United Towns Electric Company to jointly go to the market and raise two million dollars.

Previously, in a debate to which I should not refer, they asked us for permission to have the Public Utilities Act amended so that they might, as a bait to investors, give share warrants. These two Bills might in that respect almost be tied together. The United Towns Electric Company proposes to go to the market and raise a loan of two million dollars offering as bait share warrants, I think probably of the nature of twenty share warrants for every thousand dollar bond that is to be offered, or some such amount. I am not a shareholder nor am I an investor so I am not interested in the details. But in addition as security they will have to pledge their holdings.

The object of this Act is to declare the United Towns Electric Company shall have and shall be deemed to have power to deal with all the assets of these subsidiary companies. Now when I say to deal with all of them I mean, not to deal with them directly but to have them assigned first from the subsidiary to the parent company and then mortgaged by the parent company, either that or mortgaged

perhaps jointly with the other companies.

In other words the whole principle of the Act is to make, to declare, that when they are raising this bond issue the United Towns Electric Company can pledge both its own assets and the assets of each of these subsidiaries. Before the assets of the subsidiary companies can be pledged obviously it is necessary that they should be declared to be capable of transfer. So that the franchises of these companies are hereby in this Bill declared to be transferable and to be capable of being transferred by way of mortgage to a trustee as security for the proposed loan.

I think Mr. Speaker, I have made the object of this Bill clear. The object of the Bill is to declare these items I have referred to as capable of assignment or transfer by way of mortgage. It is because of this that the Government has consented to introduce this Bill, and I would move its second reading.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the Attorney General has said about the desirability of these junior companies having the right to join with the parent company, United Towns Electric Company, for the purpose of going to the bond market—They are then in a much stronger position than they would be individually. I thought that this Bill might deal with other rights of the company, or whether they are rights or not, and that is the question of the areas to which they cater.

The United Towns at one time used to supply light to the Newfoundland Light and Power Company, and I believe, I am not sure about this, it was the Newfoundland Light and Power

Company used to supply the Wabana Light and Power Company with their electricity for sale by retail on Bell Island. Now a situation has arisen with the United Towns and the Newfoundland Light and Power which is very unsatisfactory. The Newfoundland Light and Power Company can produce electricity at a much cheaper rate than United Towns. United Towns has a plant at Petty Harbour. It has a plant at Tor's Cove or two plants at Tors Cove and a couple of plants at Cape Broyle and brings electricity into the city and supplies the city. But it is not allowed, apparently, to sell electricity outside the city, at least not beyond half a mile or a mile—I don't think it has ever been determined properly what is the jurisdiction of the United Towns—This is a great disadvantage to the people who see the Newfoundland Light and Power Company poles and wires pass over their heads and they are not entitled to join up with it.

MR. MURRAY: Where does the right arise? I never could figure out.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think there was ever any legal right. I think it was an understanding at one time when United Towns supplied Newfoundland Light and Power with electricity. I think that time is passed and the Newfoundland Light and Power are in a very strong position as vendors of electricity and can cater to a much larger market than available. Since it produces electricity at such a cheap rate which compares with the best electricity in places on this side, certainly less than Montreal, Toronto or Hamilton. It is a pity the Newfoundland Light and Power Company is not allowed greater latitude. It seems to me to be wrong. The Commission of Public Utilities ought to take the matter up as quickly as pos-

sible so that customers outside the city may get the benefit of these cheaper rates.

Now when I looked at this Bill and saw what it was, I looked through it quickly to see if it gave any particular areas where they might sell electricity. But it does not deal with that at all. It deals with something entirely different.

I am not a shareholder in any of these companies and do not know what the shareholders think, but it seems to me to be a matter for the shareholders themselves, and if they are satisfied to do it I don't see we could put up an opposition. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney General who is responsible for these matters should take up with his Commission of Public Utilities and the desirability of extending the area over which the Newfoundland Light and Power may distribute, because it would be very beneficial to the public.

MR. CURTIS: I would just like to say in reply to my honourable friend that the matter has been causing me very considerable concern. I believe the situation is as my honourable friend for Provincial Affairs, said. I do not think that there is any legal franchise. It is just a case of having two companies competing, and goodness knows how far we are justified in butting into such competition. I do not think two electric companies ought to be operating in the same area. Obviously it would be impossible for both of them to make a success if they had just half the business. I would say this, just on the general subject, really there is nothing before the House. Under this Bill we give the people nothing except confirming the right to transfer and assign their franchise. But it would be well if we

did look into the position and see just how far we should go. The United Towns, as my honourable friend knows has to serve a long stretch of territory with very few customers. The Newfoundland Light and Power, on the other hand, can dump all their electricity into St. John's, which might be considered a big pool. Obviously it is much cheaper to supply a city than it is a rural area.

I suppose the Newfoundland Light and Power would supply more and sell more electricity on one street in St. John's than the United Towns would sell in all Conception Bay, and yet in the one case they have a couple of miles of wire and in the other case probably a couple of hundred miles of wire. So that the costs in the case of a rural electrification programme are much heavier, much greater than they are in an urban area such as we have here in St. John's. One has got to look sympathetically on the United Towns for that reason.

MR. BROWNE: Then of course the question is, once you encourage Newfoundland Light and Power to go outside St. John's where are you going to stop because if you stop here the people there say, let us in, and it keeps growing. Obviously the logical thing would be for all the companies to unite, and that is what we should work for.

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 Assistance Act, 1954."

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, the existing legislation, Section 6, Sub-section 2 of the Social As-

sistance Act makes no provision for granting assistance to a widow who resides outside of the Province of Newfoundland at the time of her husband's death and who subsequently returns to Newfoundland. Now this amendment is proposed for the granting of assistance to such widows.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable Minister must be making a mistake because this refers to a person who was resident in Newfoundland when she became a widow.

MR. ABBOTT: I will cite an instance, Mr. Speaker. She and her husband go to North Sydney. Her husband dies. She becomes a widow. Well she does not get any social assistance. The present legislation is that she must be a resident of Newfoundland at the time she became a widow, or lived in Newfoundland for a period of fifteen years. If she became a widow in Nova Scotia she is not entitled to social assistance.

MR. BROWNE: I cannot see that, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see that this is a very well thought out section because it seems to me that it is substituting there. Have you got the 1954 Act there so that we can read it properly? Then we can see where there is an explanation or what it is.

MR. CURTIS: Chapter 37, Paragraph B Sub-paragraph 2. I am speaking now, Mr. Speaker, just quoting to help my honourable friend. The section now presently reads—"Was resident in Newfoundland at the time she became a widow." Then this new thing is added.

MR. BROWNE: Yes. Well it does not say whether the husband dies in Newfoundland nor where he dies.

MR. MURRAY: In either event.

MR. BROWNE: It does not matter where he dies. This is a very generous provision. It does not consider whether he is a Newfoundlander or not.

MR. MURRAY: She has to have previous residence and then come back here to live again.

MR. BROWNE: It apparently qualifies if she is resident in Newfoundland at the time she is a widow, or who had lived in Newfoundland for a period of at least fifteen years in the aggregate. In other words a person who did not belong to Newfoundland came here and married and lived here fifteen years and went back to her husband's home. He dies. She decides to come back to Newfoundland. I do not think there is any objection to a charitable provision of that kind.

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 Consolidate the Law Relating to the Raising of Local Taxes for Schools."

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the debate was adjourned.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to alter the law in regard to the raising of local taxes for schools. We have the assurance of the Attorney General that there is no new principle involved from what the law was in the main Act, which is repealed, namely, the 1954 School Tax Act. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a provision here in this that we must oppose. That is the provision that is contained in Section 6 that sets up the school tax authority. It is our feeling that it is a backward step to give to individuals in any com-

munity the right to impose taxes when they are not elected by the people, when they are not representatives in the true sense of the word. Under the system of Responsible Government the idea is that the people elect representatives whether as a town council, city council, and these people then are given the right by the people to impose taxes. Here we have a different principle. The Government appoints a school tax authority and that school tax authority is vested with complete powers of taxation for school purposes.

Now it is true that the object is worthy, but the means that are imposed are retrograde. It is a retrograde step. What is the matter with, if you want to collect taxes for school purposes, giving the municipal council of Corner Brook the power to do it or letting the people elect those who would be responsible for levying taxes and for the expenditure of the money. The persons who collect the taxes are responsible to the people who pay them. That is the usual policy. That is the usual principle. But here we have appointees with no responsibility to the people who pay the people who pay the taxes at all, because they are not elected by them and they are not appointed by them, they are being appointed by the Government. We feel they should be elected. We feel they should be elected, no matter how fine the first members of such a school tax authority might be it is conceivable that having been given power of that kind they might develop into quite arbitrary persons who would not feel under any compunction towards those from whom the taxes are collected, as they do not fear any adverse vote in any election. It is like the Commission of Government over again, the

Commission of Government being imposed in these modern times in a municipality like Corner Brook.

I cannot understand why the Government undertook to impose the school tax authority of this kind. Now in this Bill it seems to speak of other places besides Corner Brook, but I am not sure there are any other places where this school tax authority has been appointed. It speaks of Corner Brook and Deer Lake Areas as of one school area.

MR. CURTIS: No. They are two.

MR. BROWNE: They are joined by a hyphen "Corner Brook-Deer Lake Areas." Whether this is coming up this year or whether it has already come up I am not sure. It speaks of the confirmation of this Act, 1957.

However, Mr. Speaker, in a nut-shell here is our position: We feel that is a bad principle to follow, and we are opposed to it. Therefore, I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, that this Bill be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time six months hence.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): I am sure that I cannot go along with the honourable member's amendment to postpone this legislation for another six months nor for any period of time. It would deal a cruel blow to education in the Humber District.

The honourable member states that he cannot agree with the setting up of the school tax authority. I may say that the membership of the authority is approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council only when the names are submitted to us by all of the denominations concerned. All of

the denominations in the Humber Area are part of this school tax authority, and it has the approval and the sanction of all denominations concerned. The School Tax Authority sets up a position whereby the people are taxed to educate the children and thereby do away with school fees. The position is that the school fees were done away with, and certain people in the area objected to the school tax. It was found that a great number of people were neither paying their school fees nor the school tax and consequently practically all of the schools in the area are broke or just about. That creates a very serious situation.

The idea of this legislation is to correct the errors that have been made and not to add to them, and to try to find a solution to a problem which has been a nasty one for everybody in the area. I cannot understand my honourable friend's idea in trying to delay this legislation further. We have had a couple of years now of a situation that is bothersome and serious and damaging to the education of our children in that district, and for anybody to try and retard it further is in my opinion an obstructionist to the welfare of education of our children in this Province, in any community, not only for the Corner Brook Area. This also affects the Humber Area or the Deer Lake Area where they also have a school tax authority. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that rather than to obstruct this piece of legislation it would be more to the credit of my honourable friend to support it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I think it is out of order to use such expressions as my honourable friend is using now.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The honourable member is quite within his rights

to make a motion, and he cannot be attacked for his reasons for making the motion nor be called an obstructionist. I think the point is well raised.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, might I rise to a point of order—What is the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: That this legislation be given a six months hoist.

MR. BROWNE: My honourable friend was attacking the notice of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The debate must not become personal.

MR. BALLAM: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I did not intend that this debate of mine become personal. Far be it from me to be personal with anybody, that is an insulting manner. I certainly would not attempt it. I am only justifying or speaking for what in my opinion is something which we should all support with the greatest of vigor, rather than to delay the passage of this legislation.

The set up of the school authority is, as I have said, by the different denominations concerned. The personnel are, I am sure of the finest character. They would not be recommended by the different denominations if they were not. To set back this piece of legislation, as I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, would cause the most serious and most damaging situation for the welfare of our children in the Corner Brook Area. They are now in very great difficulties. As I mentioned before, the situation is more serious than we can ever realize. When you know there are some four or five thousand children attending school, and more than that I should imagine and there are very little funds coming in from any source. You can imagine how terrible the con-

sequence must be. Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to even attempt to let this opportunity go without urgently requesting not only the members on this side of the House but my honourable friends opposite rather than to retard or to set back this piece of very desirable and worthy legislation we should all without any question give it our full support.

MR. HUGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment. I have every understanding, every sympathy for the thinking of the Honourable Minister of Labour, as it is a matter that quite obviously is close to his heart and to his district. I am prepared to accept his statement when he says it is a piece of admirable legislation. That may well be, Sir. The point that seems to me to have escaped the attention is that the mere fact that the intention of the legislation is good and is admirable and will achieve a good purpose does not justify what my learned colleague from St. John's South very properly described as a retrograde step in the matter of the appointment of the tax authority. It is not sufficient to say that the denominational authorities have been consulted and that before any appointments, original appointments or successive appointments, that they will be consulted. No one has questioned the integrity of any prospective appointees to this board. That is not the principle at stake, Sir. The principle at stake is this. It is not proper and it is not right that any authority should have the power to impose taxes on the people of this country without that authority being responsible to the people. It is not sufficient for the Government nor for any Department of Government nor for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to designate half a dozen people

and say: you are fine people, we have every confidence in you; you go out and impose taxes in Corner Brook, in Deer Lake, in St. John's and the people in these areas not have the right to, if they do not like it, kick them out in the next election. That is a fundamental principle. I am quite prepared to accept the position that has been stated here, that the authorities of the various churches have been considered and approve of the idea of the Bill. Nobody is objecting to that. Our objection is, and it is not an objection but really a statement of a fundamental principle enumerated many years before any of us were born; that you should not have taxes without the people who are being taxed, having some ability to control the people who are imposing the taxes. On this side of the House we have been for the last eight years from time to time being told we are reactionary; we are behind the times; we are trying to take away the peoples' rights. This time, Sir, we are protecting the peoples' rights. For that reason I support this amendment.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise just to say a few words. To us the principle, and there is only one principle in the Bill that we are opposed to. We are not opposed to the tax authority nor the benefit of school children. We are not opposed to the tax authority for the benefit of the people in any way. But we are, as my learned friend just pointed out, opposed to taxation without representation, which is exactly what we have in this Bill irrespective of who recommended it. You are setting up an authority which has the right to tax not less than five dollars on any piece of property; to tax any person not less than five dollars; and if such person does not pay or fails to pay you give under

this Act the right to impose on the person fourteen days or put a fine on him up to twenty dollars. As a matter of fact he can be fined up to one hundred dollars, simply if he refused to pay a tax which has been put on him without his having the right to say yea or nay as to the justice or otherwise of it.

Now, Sir, I want you to understand the principle at stake, as far as the Opposition is concerned, is not the tax itself; it is not the tax, it is the principle. It is the matter of taxation without representation. Why not give the municipality authority in Corner Brook or anywhere else, as the case might be, why not give them the authority to tax there and elect bodies. But this authority is set up; and mind you, Sir, even though they are set up they are still controlled by the Government. The manner of imposing taxes and the rates thereof shall be subject to the approval of the Minister. In other words the Minister will have complete control for the carrying out of the Act, even though the authority would be given what it pretends to give them.

MR. MURRAY: The Minister is elected.

MR. HOLLETT: The Minister would then have authority he was never meant to have, the authority which is supposed to be given through this so-called tax authority, and if the Minister were outright given the right to collect, or the Government, the right to collect and pass over the money to whatever school area they might desire. But the people can kick the Government out, and I hope they will do it some day, and I feel quite sure they will. I assure you they will be kicked out much quicker if they

do things like they are doing here now.

I want to say we are in favour of the imposition of taxes for educational purposes, we want the schools for school-children and are prepared to do almost anything so that our children might be properly educated. But, Sir, we are not prepared to concede the principle of this matter. We are here setting up a body to go out and collect a tax and if the people don't pay put them in jail for ten days; without the people having any right whatsoever to have one word to say in the matter. The principle we are against. Where there are taxes there must be representation. I think, Sir, you will agree and the Government ought to agree that we ought to consider that we do not break that principle in passing that Act. I am asking the Government on behalf of this side of the House to reconsider it. We do realize the schools in certain areas and probably the area to which the Honourable Minister of Labour referred—and I must say he spoke very gravely and very seriously, and I appreciate very much the remarks which he made, and they were well taken, but if the situation regarding education is bad in Corner Brook Area it is certainly worse in other parts of the island. Simply to pass a piece of legislation like this, because it will serve the purpose in an area like Corner Brook or an area like Grand Falls, for instance, and avoid sticking to that principle, I say, Sir, we ought to consider well before we break into, to consider well before we break that principle. Yes, get the money—tax the people for education, but do not do it in that way.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there is a great deal of

fuss about nothing as far as this principle of taxation without representation is concerned. Now all of us know the worthiness of the object of the tax. That is without question. No one disputes it. The matter in dispute seems to be the principle of taxation without representation. As I see it that principle does not arise in this case. The tax is imposed by elected people, namely by the people who presumably act on the authority of the Government. I don't suppose that anybody will argue that the Government of Newfoundland has not the authority to impose such a tax. The function of the school authority is something quite different. It is an advisory body, I would say, in the first place and secondly a collection agency. The actual tax is not imposed by the authority but is imposed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, acting through the Minister concerned.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members on the opposite side are having a grand time fighting what? The air—purely the air. The issues that they are fighting are not issues in this Bill. If this Bill is given a six months hoist the school tax authority still continues in Corner Brook and in Deer Lake and anywhere else. The legislation that is before us still continues. This Act does not introduce a School Tax Authority. It is simply a consolidation. If you wrote that consolidation out you have exactly the same conditions of affairs as you have if we put through the Bill. The only object of this Bill is to tidy up the legislation so as to improve it, so as to make it more easily understood by the people who are to administer it. The main feature of this Bill is to incorporate into the School Tax Authority Act some sections of

the Local Government Act which otherwise they have to read into the Act by having the two Acts before them. If you vote against this you will still have your school tax authority. Vote against it and you will still have your tax. As my honourable friend said, why discuss a question which is not an issue in this Act. It is not an issue. This Act is purely a consolidation of the existing Act and whether you pass it or not you still have the condition of affairs to which they object.

MR. HOLLETT: A lot of people are objecting.

MR. CURTIS: People are objecting, yes. Everybody objects to paying taxes. They were glad enough to raise the money but waited until the money was raised to object. My honourable friends talked about — and though it is realized it is not an issue I will answer. They talked about how the school tax authority is not elected, and we are returning, as my honourable and learned friend says, to Commission of Government—no elections. Frequently the City of St. John's has had to be operated by a Commission every time local representation fell down on the job and got the city in a mess, and the Government had to appoint a Commission to take over and administer the city of St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER: This is getting away from the main motion.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, however, Sir, in all seriousness, there is no change in this legislation to call for the very fine arguments of my honourable friends. There is nothing to it, and consequently the Government cannot accept the amendment.

On motion amendment declared lost.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on division.

MR. SPEAKER: On division—

Motion, that this Bill be now read a second time, carried.

Motion, that the House will now go into Committee of the Whole on various Bills, carried.

On motion, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Clarke, Chairman of Committee of the Whole House.

"An Act Further to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act."

On motion Clauses 1 and 2 carried.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I feel that the reduction of the civil jurisdiction of the magistrate courts in St. John's and Corner Brook to the amount of twenty dollars is too drastic. We know that today, Sir, that twenty dollars is a ridiculously pitifully small amount. You might as well say that the magistrates courts have no civil jurisdiction at all. I would move an amendment that the amount of twenty dollars be deleted and the amount of one hundred dollars be substituted.

MR. CURTIS: That amendment, Mr. Chairman, would have the effect of just making the Bill valueless, the Government cannot accept it.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I drew the attention of the Attorney General before to how it was going to arise not because we have to split up in some instances between one place and another. Why not take it out altogether, and still have jurisdiction. There is an appeal. If they can only serve summons under twenty dollars the thing is useless, and he

won't make any money out of that. That is another thing. His living has to be considered, and the Government will have to compensate him for the loss. I remember a case taking place many years ago. The jurisdiction of, I think, the judge or clerk of the Central District Court had jurisdiction so he lost the fees and brought a claim against the Government. The claim was upheld I think the bailiff in this case will be entitled to compensation for the loss he is going to sustain as a result of changes in this jurisdiction.

MR. CURTIS: I think the point raised a good point. We must take the jurisdiction out of the magistrates court altogether and put it in the hands of the Civil courts and move the bailiff. I would think we would move the bailiff anyway. I presume the number of cases under twenty dollars would be so small as to be infinitesimal. Therefore I think we might well consider removing the twenty dollars and just say—no civil summonses issued. Certainly practically all solicitors will go to the District Court for all civil cases.

MR. HIGGINS: If I may, Mr. Chairman. Can we anticipate some more satisfactory system may be obtained for the uses of writs? At the present time, one has to go down to the registry and trot them up to the District Court have the thing issued and then have to go down and find the bailiff of the Supreme Court.

MR. CURTIS: That matter will be fully gone into and cleared, Mr. Chairman, before this Bill is brought into force. It is not the Government's intention to handicap in anyway; in fact we want to if possible make litigation more pleasant, if we can use the word "pleasant." We seriously feel that it is a better place for civil

cases to be handled. We will not bring in this Act until the facilities are ready to provide for stamps. Where they will be sold I don't know. I remember when we were studying law we used to buy our stamps. Every law office had its own stamp holder. We always bought stamps, five or ten dollars worth at a time, and got a commission of five per cent. Now you do not get any commission at all, I don't think. These points have now been finally disposed of and we are not asking the Lieutenant-Governor to bring the Act in immediately. In fact we may never bring it in if we find we can't advantageously do it. Until it is to the benefit of the progression. I may say we eventually expect to have the civil court moved to the court house. That is where it should be. On the other hand where it is now is more convenient to everyone. There is more space available to park and you are away from some of the clients of my honourable friend.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in Ontario, they have what we call a Provincial Court. I do not know whether they have this in other provinces where civil summonses like this are heard and where judges do not gown and lawyers are not expected to gown. It is a very grave inconvenience if you have to gown.

MR. CURTIS: I agree. It is crazy.

MR. BROWNE: We take the promises of the Attorney General that the matter will be given consideration before it comes into effect.

MR. CURTIS: There is a motion. Will my honourable friend withdraw? We will take it into consideration. In fact under third reading I may discuss the feasibility of wiping it out altogether.

MR. HIGGINS: I agree.

Motion, that the Committee pass the Bill without amendment, carried.

A Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Government of Newfoundland to enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Exploration Limited."

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act."

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I would move an amendment to Section 4. In subsection (1) the words "Another Company" — "other Company" and "Purchasing Company" means any company included under this Act—Scratch out the word "Means" and write in the words "includes any other company registered whether or not this company was registered under this Act." The object of the amendment will be to include any company which might be registered whether or not it is incorporated locally.

On motion Clause as amended carried:

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill with some amendment, carried.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Assessment Act, 1957."

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried:

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Judicature Act."

Motion, that Section eleven stand, carried.

Motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole considered

Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act" and Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Government of Newfoundland to Enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Exploration Limited" and Bill, "An Act to Amend the Assessment Act," and directed me to report same without amendment.

On motion report received. Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Chairman, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and considered Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act," and directed me to report same with some amendment.

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, and considered a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Judicature Act" and directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received—Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that all further 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, May 8th, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Speaker, I am presenting a petition for St.

John's North. I will say, I wish the Premier had been here today as it is partly addressed to him.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy-Leader of the Government, the Deputy-Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me! The honourable gentleman just addressed Mr. Speaker.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I like to do it well

MR. SPEAKER: Only address Mr. Speaker, that will include all.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I like to include the Opposition.

The Honourable the Premier requested a five year plan having been economically sound, the basic needs for St. John's North, which I have the honour to represent are contained in this paper for all my district. I may say it is a big district in regard to roads, and my petition only petitions this House to examine the matter in regard to roads. In future roads must have priority. (Mr. Nightingale read petition).

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable gentleman would excuse me—an honourable member introducing a petition and supporting it is allowed five minutes. But in view of the importance of the petition the honourable member is presenting to the House and supporting I think that the House would be agreeable to allow him to continue.

By leave of the House the honourable member continued.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I will not be long, Mr. Speaker. That, Mr. Speaker, is the summary—now for the details, beginning with the Kenmount Road.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this petition be placed in the particular Department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for reference to the Department to which it relates.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, although I believe the petition is a little different from the ordinary one, the matters it contains, as you say, are very important, and they certainly have my strongest endorsement, especially with regard to the improvement of the areas around Mundy Pond, Empire Avenue West and Kenmount Road from Freshwater Road in. These places are certainly in need of attention.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): What about Heferton's Line?

MR. BROWNE: That has already received such wide attention from the honourable gentleman that it needs no attention for the next twenty-five years. But in regard to the roads that are spoken of by the honourable member for St. John's North, especially those roads which are in the Federal District of St. John's West, I can say that I support everything he said, and hope they will receive attention.

HON. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word too in praise of the honourable gentleman, the honourable member for St. John's North for the masterly way in which he presented the petition and for bearing out our contention on this side of the House in this terrible indictment which he has made in connection with the Government's treatment of the people's needs in St. John's North, and other parts of the St. John's Area. I am whole heartedly

in accordance with the honourable gentleman, and I am quite sure the petition, having come from the source it has, we shall have some improvement in the roads in this area in the near future.

Motion, that the petition be received and referred to the Department to which it relates, carried.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices of Motion

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Grant By the Crown to Dominion Wabana Ore Ltd. of the Revisionary Interest of the Crown in Certain Lands Now Held Under Lease by that Company."

I also give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Land Development Act."

Notice of Questions

None.

Answers to Questions

QUESTION No. 94.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Welfare): The answer is not quite ready, Sir, and will probably be up tomorrow.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply promised an answer to the second part of QUESTION 86. He is not here yet.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): He is at a funeral.

Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to address a question to the Minister of Highways, which I addressed to the Premier in his absence the other day. Would the Minister inform the House whether his statement that there was very little paving going to be done in Newfoundland this year means that there will be no resurfacing of the Topsail Highway? I brought to his attention the very bad state of the highway at the end of Cornwall Avenue, the end of Road De Luxe.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honourable gentleman I would like to say that the matter of maintenance of paved highways is under consideration, and I am getting views from people who I believe know what they are talking about, with the object of creating a mobile unit sort of thing to maintain paved roads in the Conception Bay Area and in the Portugal Cove Area and about other roads that the Government are responsible for. At the present time the old system is still in operation, and does not seem to be adequate because the traffic on Topsail Road is ever increasing with the result that we need quicker methods of maintenance, which must be utilized. This we are trying to do.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I add a further question to that—I don't know if the Minister is familiar with this place where the accident happened the other day. I went over it afterwards and I notice in places all the asphalt is gone and it is down to the base, and it seems to me to be in a dangerous condition.

MR. POWER: That particular pot-hole has been filled twice this year because of the wet weather. This holds true all over the city.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a note here standing in the name of the Honourable the Premier to move for the appointment of certain members of the House namely: the Honourable Leader of the Opposition; the honourable member for Placentia West the honourable member for Bonavista South; the honourable member for Burin; and the honourable member for White Bay North to be Chairman of a Select Committee to consider the question of the unit of measurement or weight of salt codfish and report their findings and recommendations to the House.

Does the Honourable the Attorney General wish to make this motion at this time?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would make that motion.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House—

MR. CURTIS: But there are no Private Bills, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: But there is a public Bill there in the name of the Honourable the Minister for Provincial Affairs which should be read first.

MR. CURTIS: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that is not a Private Bill. If there are Private Bills they take precedence. If there are no Private Bills the orders will be in the order in which the Government decides to call them.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think there are any Private Bills. I do not see any at this time.

MR. CURTIS: I make this motion, Mr. Speaker, and in doing so it is not my intention to deliver an address because the wording of the motion contains the object of the motion. The idea is that these gentleman, including the Leader of the Opposition, should constitute themselves a Committee under the Chairmanship of the honourable member for White Bay North, to consider what should be the unit of measurement for salt codfish. Now I believe, Mr. Speaker, myself, that weights and measures are Federal matters. I am not quite sure. I have not a copy of the Act, but I believe weights and measures are a Federal responsibility. However there will certainly be no harm in having a Select Committee of this House look into the whole matter. If they find that the matter is one of Federal jurisdiction then of course in that event they would decide what recommendations might be made to the Federal Government in the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I move that this Committee be appointed so that at least the air will be cleared and we will know just where we stand in this matter.

MR. BROWNE: I presume, Mr. Speaker, the meaning of that is to consider the desirability of changing, because in Select Committees they usually ask each other—what is our power—Is it definitely understood they have power to consider the question of making a change and recommendations along that line.

MR. CURTIS: I think the wording is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, the Committee will understand, I am sure, and I am sure my honourable friend, the Chairman there and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, these two at least who are ex-magistrates, I think

we can depend on them that they will know how to tackle that question, and we do not need to tell them.

Motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee will be set up as provided for in the motion.

Honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Bills of Sales Act, 1955."

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 to Authorize the Issue of a Grant of a Picce of Land to Reid Newfoundland Company Limited in Exchange for a Part of Reid Lot 97."

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

Third Readings:

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Notaries Public."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the St. John's Housing Corporation Act."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Government of Newfoundland to En-

ter Into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Exploration Limited."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Assessment Act."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Expropriation of Land."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill, which is a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Expropriation of Land," Bill No. 44. At the present quite a few of our Newfoundland Statutes, refer to provisions under which land can be expropriated for public purposes. All these provisions while not similar in drafting are to the like effect, and some Acts contain more extensive provisions than others.

It is felt that it would be better to have an Expropriation Act under which one Minister would be given authority to expropriate land on behalf of the Crown or any public body. This would not include the Board of Public Utilities Commissioners, which expropriate land on behalf of private utility companies or of course any private company whose agreement contains expropriation provisions—After consultation with the Minister of Public Affairs it was decided in this Act not to interfere with the expropriation

procedures under the Local Government Act, 1956 nor to bring towns or councils within this Bill.

The provisions for this Bill now before the House empowers the Minister of Public Works to expropriate land, as defined in Clause 2(l) (g) on behalf of the Crown or any authority to define this Clause 2(l) (b) for any of the purposes set out in Clause (4) where the land is expropriated on behalf of an authority, the authority takes all steps that the Minister is empowered to take after the Minister issues the notice of expropriation, and the Minister is then no longer concerned in the matter. But the main effect of this legislation is to consolidate under one statute, under one Minister, all the powers of expropriation now vested in various Departments of the Government. In other words, there will be no such case as the Minister of Highways making an expropriation. That expropriation in future will be done under this one Act and by this one Minister.

MR. BROWNE: It will all be the same anyhow.

MR. CURTIS: Well, I do not know what my honourable friend means—but the operation will be the same, but there will be one definite Act covering all expropriations, which will be the Law of the Country, and every Department will come under that expropriation. It will all be done under the name of the Minister of Public Works. What we have now and what we never had before is a registry of expropriations whereby the Minister of Public Works will set up in his Department an expropriation registry, and the registry will be there, and all will be necessary will be to go to this Department to get the records of expropriation.

MR. BROWNE: That is all is needed now.

MR. CURTIS: Except the terms and provisions in every Act are slightly different—For instance if my honourable friend would look up the Slum Clearance Act he would find there that the Government appoints all three arbitrators. If he looked up the Industries Act he would find the Government appoints two and the affected person appoints one. If he looked up still a third Act, he would find that each party appoints one and get together and appoint a third. There is no uniformity, and the main object of this Act is to provide uniformity. The uniformity recommended to the House is the appointment by the Government of two and the person affected one, and the board will no longer be as they are now, a board of assessors, they will be a board of arbitrators. Arbitrators, as the House may well know, differ from assessors. Under the present Act a board of assessors is set up. The object, Mr. Speaker, of the board of assessors is to assess. They assess the compensation to be paid for pieces of land or that piece of land that may be expropriated. Now under the present Bill there won't be a board of assessors, there will be a board of arbitrators. The board of arbitrators will, it is true, Mr. Speaker, assess the amount to be paid, but the arbitrators as arbitrators will determine questions of law, as to who is to be paid the money, and if they cannot find who the money will be paid to then they have authority to pay the money into court, and that will dispose of the matter insofar as they are concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Act has provisions for appeal. If any person is

not satisfied with the findings of the board of arbitrators on a question of fact or on a question of law there is an appeal to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, provided that appeal is entered within thirty days.

As I said, the Bill contains the procedure to be followed in expropriation, the setting up of a central registry in the Department of Public Works to obtain information as to expropriations by other Departments.

I think I have covered the main features of the Bill. I think it is a step in the right direction. If land is expropriated there will be just this one Act to go on. I think I will have the support of the House when I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this Bill does what the Attorney General says, consolidating the different provisions regarding expropriations under various Bills such as the Loan Development Act and the Slum Clearance Act and Central Mortgage and Housing Act and Fisheries Development Authority Act, and the Industries Development Act, etc. He says that the system of making compensations to the owners whose lands have been taken is now made uniform, whereas under the Slum Clearance Act there will be three persons appointed, and under another Act only one, now there are going to be two persons appointed by the Minister, and the owner of the land is going to have the privilege of appointing the third.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, my objection to this Bill is that this is not arbitration at all, it is no use calling this arbitration. Mr. Speaker, it is a misnomer—Arbitration implies serious consideration by an impartial authority and judgment based on the evidence that is brought before that au-

thority and on the law. If the Minister of Public Works is given power to appoint a Chairman and appoint another member of the board of three then that board is weighed in advance. It is just hypocrisy to call it negotiation. It is only a Government board. It is a board in which assessment will be made by two Government officials and the third person appointed.

MR. CURTIS: Not officials.

MR. BROWNE: Representing the owner is very likely not to have his case given any consideration. The theory of the law is that a person is supposed to be the owner of land of which he is in possession before the world. He is the owner. But under this law and under the laws passed a couple of years ago the Government can come in and say—"you got to prove to me you are the owner"—a complete reversal of the common law for a thousand years. That is what is involved in this. This is the Liberal Government we got today, Mr. Speaker, this Liberal Government is so liberal to its people that it comes and takes its land then says to the people—"you have to prove that you own this"—and if the man can prove he owns it then the Government says—"now I am going to appoint two people to arbitrate. You can appoint a third one if you like—but hurry up or I am going to appoint a third one."

Now let us distinguish between assessment and arbitration: If a man has his house damaged by fire the fire insurance company will ask a fire insurance appraiser to appraise and say what damage is done and the compensation is paid — an assessor goes up and looks it over and says—"I think five hundred dollars will compensate the owner"—the owner says "No, I am not satisfied to that.

I will get my own man to go up." He gets his own man to go up and appraise the value and that man says—"there is a thousand dollars needed to replace the damage that is done"—Here they are then, one saying five hundred and another a thousand. Who resolves that problem? The way they resolve that is that the two agree upon a third who becomes an umpire, an arbitrator, to decide between the two. One man puts forward his argument and then the other and the arbitrator sits between and will—in the case of arbitration I am coming to in a moment—in that particular illustration of assessment of damage by fire it is comparatively simple—But in arbitration, Mr. Speaker, the practice has been that where St. John's as a Municipality of St. John's uses arbitration in its functions, where the St. John's Municipal Council expropriates property it is in its true legal sense. If it cannot agree with the owner of the land as to the compensation which he will accept for the land and buildings that have been taken, the Municipal Council will take the land and then it will appoint an arbitrator and between the two of them they can appoint an umpire, a man to sit between them to hear and have the final word—But they are all three sworn men, sworn to do justice in the matter that is placed before them, they being like a court.

Now under the Judicature Act the provisions of the Arbitration Act in England in 1889 have been introduced into Newfoundland and these provisions govern arbitration. Let us make a comparison between the provisions under the Judicature Act regarding arbitration and the provision in this particular Bill now before us. He reads from the Judicature Act—down

to—"The court may stand the proceedings in any of the following cases."

A number of cases are set out governing the appointment of arbitrators. In other words one part appoints an arbitrator and the other and if they want an umpire they can agree, and if they do not do it the court can appoint that umpire. Then again it goes on—"if one refuses to act or is incapable of acting the party may appoint another one in his place." In any case, Mr. Speaker, here are the provisions regarding arbitration that involves, as I say, a party having the right to appoint an arbitrator and then have an umpire appointed as well.

Now take that Bill we are dealing with here we have a board of arbitrators consisting of a Chairman and two other arbitrators. The Minister shall appoint the Chairman of the board and one other arbitrator. Now there is the difference under the Judicature Act and under the Arbitration Act of 1898, and I would say, without having examined the arbitration acts of all of the other Provinces of Canada their rules taken from the Arbitration Act of 1898 prevail. I have had the opportunity of looking up the Arbitration Acts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and of Manitoba, and these three Provinces have arbitrations in the true sense. Here I believe that the Government is deliberately departing from this principle of arbitration because it is afraid that the arbitration board will award too heavy compensations in favour of the owners against the Government, and they do not want to pay it, they want to get out of it as cheap as they can. What other reason could they have? Now in a couple of the Bills dealing with the Department of Public Works they were called assessors, and that is their true name.

They are not arbitrators and should not be called arbitrators.

That is the principle feature of this Bill today, which seems to me is obnoxious and objectionable. I think the Government should give serious consideration to going back to the provisions of arbitration as they are commonly understood. Certainly, Sir, these words certainly cannot be allowed to remain there because a board such as that cannot be considered as a board of arbitrators.

Now there are many provisions in this Bill that corroborate what I have stated regarding the Liberal attitude of the Government and the methods by which it exercises a predominant right over everybody's property. They can go right in and take the land and put the burden of proof of ownership on the people occupying the land—Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, where there are old estates where there have not been taken out and probate taken out and proper transfer made—every lawyer on the other hand knows there are many difficulties about property which an occupier may not be in a position to answer at a moment's notice and indeed over a considerable period of time. There does not seem to be justification for the departure from the common law principles in regard to such cases as arise in these circumstances.

In regard to the sections dealing with the purpose of expropriations these have all been provided for before with the exception, I think, of Paragraph (J). The reason I mention that, Mr. Speaker, is because it is a general section, and I would like to know, when the Attorney General replies at the end of this debate, what is meant by it—Section 4 (J) Land may be expropriated for the use of

Her Majesty in Right of Newfoundland or of the public for any other purpose—That is a very broad section. Why not say “Land may be expropriated for the use of Her Majesty in Right of Newfoundland or of the public for any purpose—because if these three are given specifically and then “any other purpose” is added it means that the Government may take land for any purpose. I would like to know from the Minister what he means by that expression.

There are some other provisions in this Bill that seem to introduce new matters. I refer to Section 12—an error in a notice of expropriation does not invalidate the expropriation of land—For example, if they make mistakes, the Minister, apparently, is not responsible.

Now there are some other provisions, for example, I realize that public interest may sometimes warrant expropriation of land even where the owners may be infants, may be minors of very tender age or not in themselves able to make decisions. Under Section 6 provision is given here for appointment of guardians. I do not suppose the matter arises very frequently, but that is provided for at any rate. Then again there is the question of the time I do not know if that was in all the other Acts, but no claim for compensation can be made after three years from the date of payment into court. Now I am not sure that is a good provision to have here because we all know of people who leave the country and go away to the States and go away to other parts of the world and leave their relatives in possession of land, and are well occupied and making good money away and did not bother about their land, but the persons who remain here die and then those who have gone away inherit the

land and they are the only persons who are entitled to the land. Well, it seems to me they may not hear about that for several years—and under this provision here they won't be able to claim it at all. I know of a case within the last few weeks. I got a letter from a gentleman in the United States regarding his father's estate. The father died forty years ago, and there is a considerable estate—There must be other lawyers here who had experiences where people residing out of the country have written them regarding property in this country. Now if after three years the owner does not hear about it these people have no rights. Why is it necessary to take away the rights of people like that? Why not leave it there for longer than three years? There are funds in the Supreme Court for twenty years, and there does not seem to be any great inconvenience to anybody that it should lodge there for the statutory length of time. Why make an arbitrary time of three years? But that point is a detail and we can deal with that in Committee. But the principle involved in this question of the appointment by the Government of two of the three men on the board of arbitrators seems to me to be unfair, and that we ought to go back to the true principle of arbitration and allow the Government to appoint one, the other party to appoint one and if they cannot agree between the two of them they could appoint a third. It seems to me that justice demands that a provision of that sort should be inserted in this Bill.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, like my learned colleague from St. John's South certain aspects of this legislation are a bit difficult to quite understand. For instance the Minister is given sweeping powers to do certain

things but is also given complete amnesty for anything he may do. You have this provision where the land that is being expropriated is the subject of alien or mortgage that the person holds the lien or the mortgage is the person to whom, on whom, notice shall be served and the person to whom the compensation shall be payable. But when having said that the legislation goes on to provide that if the Minister does not do that, if he does not notify this person, this mortgagee or lien-holder and this person as a result suffers loss that is perfectly all right. No action shall lie against the Minister. Now, Sir, that seems to me a complete negation of the rights of private citizens. You have got the other point, that the Act says quite simply that an error in notice of expropriation does not invalidate the expropriation of land. Now I do not know if that could be taken in its literal sense—it obviously must be a technical error—the Minister could notify the owner of the land on one side of the land and come over and take land on the opposite side, and discover that is a mistake—It does not matter the land is gone anyway. That is something probably that can be explained to us later. But you have the further provision, Sir, that when the land is being expropriated the notice is served and the owner of the land is required to file his claim. He does not file his claim. That often happens. It can happen in the case of owners or interested parties who are out of the country. This legislation provides not that the Board of Arbitrators shall consider the claim or that the Minister shall appoint somebody to represent the claimant or claimants more or less as devil's advocates, if you like, and the arbitration board thereupon fixes the amount payable. Now this Act, provides that if

a claim is not filed within the time set by the Minister the amount of compensation is not fixed by the arbitrators but by the Minister. Then it goes on, Sir, and adds insult to injury by providing that there shall be no appeal from the decision of the Minister. Now irrespective of who the Minister may be, I do suggest, Sir, this legislation is giving him very sweeping powers, powers that could certainly be in certain circumstances used to disadvantage of the land owners.

Then it comes, Sir, further along, to what appears to be a contradiction in terms. There are provisions made in the Act as to the rules for assessing compensation, and the Act says that compensation shall be in an amount based on the fair market value of the land and the existing use value of the land at the time of the commencement of the expropriation—that is fine, that is—I think anybody who has had an experience in expropriation proceedings would say that—But then it goes on, Sir, and provides that no account shall be taken of the compulsory acquisition of the land, the disturbance of the owner or occupier or any other injurious affection I submit, Sir, that is one of the basic principles in computations of compensation, the disturbance. My honourable and learned friend from Harbour Main, perhaps, who has more experience in compensation proceedings insofar as the representation of claimants is concerned than anybody in this House will, I am sure agree with me when I say that in the awards made at the time of the acquisition of property at Argentina disturbance was one of the basic factors the board considered—This says "no account shall be taken." It does not say "may be taken." It says "shall be taken." Hav-

ing set out that proposition, Mr. Speaker, the Act goes on and in the second section of the same section it provides that where in the opinion of the Board it is proper to make an award in respect of the expropriation of land, the disturbance to the owner or occupier or any other injurious affection properly the subject of compensation, the board may in addition to the amount awarded in accordance with subsection (1) make an award of such sum as it may fix.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not confused drafting I would like to know what it is. In the first instance there is not any discretion at all—The Act says quite frankly and quite definitely that no account shall be taken of the compulsory acquisition of the land, disturbance of the owner or occupier or any other injurious affection. There is not discretion—Then having said that—Well, there may be some cases where the board may decide—That, Sir, is something which I think the Attorney General will explain to us when he closes the debate. It may be that there is some new form of drafting that makes yes mean no and no mean yes. I would be interested to hear it.

Then you have a further provision, Sir—Where land is expropriated and compensation has not actually been paid or even where the award has not been made—but take the case where compensation has not been paid—the Minister may decide, look we don't want this piece of land at all. Then all he has to do is notify the person whose land is taken he does not want it, and that is all that he is entitled to. Now, Sir, there is a section here which provides the time for payment of compensation, and it sets out quite specifically that subject to this Act the Minister shall pay the compen-

sation awarded by a board within six months after the date on which the award was made, and if the compensation is not paid within thirty days after that date, in other words, after seven months, it shall thereafter bear interest at a rate of three per cent per annum until it is paid. Now can you envisage, Sir, the situation could occur where a man has, let us say, a fishing property that is expropriated. The board sets the award of a certain sum—six months elapses and the money is not paid—seven months elapse and the money is not paid still—Well, he says, I am getting interest—eight months and then ten months elapse and he suddenly gets notice from the Minister that he does not want the land at all. But what is going to be done for that man? It seems to me, Sir, that six months is an extraordinary long time to hold up a man's land—and you are not limited to six months because, as this Act reads, the Minister does not have to pay it at all as long as he continues to pay interest—he can drag it out for twelve months. There is nothing as to whom he must pay, as long as he pays three per cent—It is just as well for the poor fellow to put the money in the savings bank—and it might be safer—Unless, Sir, there is some definite time limit in which the Minister must pay to the owner of the land the amount of compensation awarded the legislation has no effect at all—and, as I say, where you have this position, Sir, there is a provision that even when an award has been made, at any time prior to payment of compensation the Minister can say to a man—I don't want your land at all now—There is no provision for compensating that man for loss of his property, the loss of business he might have been developing on that property during that interval—It does not seem, Sir, to be quite proper. There may be

some reasonable explanation for it—I trust that the Attorney General will be able to provide that explanation.

In so far as the other sections are concerned, to which reference has been made by my learned friend, I do not see any particular purpose in belabouring that—He has quite concisely covered the points that have been made—But I do say, Sir, that to set out the rules for the basis of compensation and take no account of any disturbance is an absolute denial of one of the fundamental principles of expropriation proceedings.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should make a few comments in connection with this Bill, partially because I have had a certain amount of experience with cases of this kind during my connection with the Department of Public Works. I realize that at this moment I have no particular responsibility in this connection other than that I owe to the public in general and to the House in particular any information that I may possess.

I listened very carefully to the comments of my learned friends on the opposite side of the House, and I may say, any comment I make, needless to say does not bear any attempt to say anything which might have any legal standing, because I know nothing whatever about the law, at least what I know about it is such as that I do not presume to argue from a legal point of view. Consequently, my comments will be from that of a layman's point of view, but I feel they might still be made to contribute something to this discussion regarding this Bill.

I note in connection with the comment by the honourable and learned member for St. John's South, he made

reference to several sections, and I took a few notes as he went along, with a view to trying to perhaps make some explanations, if I was capable of doing it—He referred to subsection (J), Section 4, which is on page 2 or page 4 actually of the Bill. The notice of expropriation means a notice of expropriation served or posted under this Act. But (4) is the one I am looking for—The expropriation for use of Her Majesty in right of Newfoundland or of the public for any other purpose whether of any of the foregoing kinds or not. I do know that in the main part that expropriations have occurred, at least since I have been associated with the Department, that they have been in the main for road purposes and for some other very specific public purpose, but in the main, I would say, for road purposes. In that connection I would like to point out the difficulties that have been experienced—Honourable members will recall that in this country, in fact it has been referred to by the speaker, we have had such things arising as squatters rights, squatters claims, and in my knowledge, I want to say that these claims in all cases that I know of, have been set down and it has been the policy of this administration to recognize these claims equally as well as those who claim land and who have grants existing covering that land in the more recent years. I have very specific knowledge on that point. The Government has laid down that policy, in no case would they attempt to take lands from a person because he was merely a squatter, without giving him the same rights, the same privileges, as had been given to people who hold grants for their land.

Now the matter of compensation has been referred to, and my honourable and learned friend opposite made ref-

erence to the treatment which might be meted out by a partial board. He made reference to the board of arbitration: I would like to say in this connection that in this Province it has been the policy of the Government and/or Department of Government responsible for the expropriation procedure in recent years that they have been paying a sum equivalent to four times at least and in many cases six times as much as has been paid throughout many of the Mainland Provinces of Canada. I know particularly, and I have discussed this with Ministers of the Crown in other Provinces where they look upon it as being most unusual if they are expected to pay more than a hundred dollars an acre for expropriated land for road purposes. I would like to say, and not in the case of justifying anything that goes on, except to say we in Newfoundland because perhaps of our scarcity of good farmland so on we realize the great importance of setting the prices beginning at a hundred dollars an acre for ordinary bush land or swamp land and we go up to cultivated land and have set standard prices as much as four hundred dollars an acre and in many cases six hundred dollars an acre and in numerous cases I could recall if necessary we paid as much as fifteen hundred and two thousand dollars an acre for land, depending on the importance of the owner. I think, Mr. Speaker, in that connection it does show that there is no tendency whatever to endeavour to take land from people just for the purpose of taking it, certainly without giving them proper compensation. These figures that I have mentioned have been the figures set by the Department, with a view to try and arrange for amicable settlement with the owner—if the owner will not accept

then the board of arbitration comes in to make the necessary arbitration, and on the basis of that we have in some cases, I will admit, paid very much higher than a thousand dollars an acre as compared to a hundred or a hundred and fifty or at the top two hundred dollars an acre which is paid in many provinces in Canada. Consequently I feel our people have not been unduly injured.

Now I want to say too I have as much personal regard and respect and interest as a Newfoundlander in land owned by any individual in this country as any of my honourable friends opposite, and I am sure we are all in that—we do not want to injure anybody but public purchase, particularly for highways has become essential. Nobody will deny that. I think, Mr. Speaker, that nobody will deny that our land owners all the way down through in the past fifty years or so, which is in living memory, a good many of us know what happened when it came to squatters' rights—a person went in and just took up a piece of land and built on it without any authority as far as the Crown is concerned.

In some cases that was done before regulations for granted land were laid down. Still squatting has gone on even in more recent years, and we have example of that right here within the city limits or mighty close, in connection with Signal Hill where at the present time in order to clear that land and give people some consideration for the expenses they have been put to where they have gone in on squatters claims it is going to cost the Government of the country scores upon scores of thousands of dollars. I could give you the actual figures but have not got them actually at my finger tips.

I could say that in one particular instance the expropriation authorities proceeded to remove a certain man and the figures are set down to the extent of fifteen thousand dollars or more. Now these same squatters, not necessarily in St. John's but around the country and even our owners of granted land have unfortunately taken on to themselves of setting up their boundary fences without reference nor application to the actual boundaries which they are entitled to. Nobody knows that better than my honourable friends opposite, particularly of the legal profession, they had opportunity to deal with things of that kind. We know what happens—John Jones has his piece of land on this side of the street, the left-hand side, if you like, and Bill Smith is on the right-hand side, although their boundaries have been set by grant they pay no attention to that but come and put up fences as near to the existing road-side as they possibly can, and frequently when that fence is discarded and they have to replace it John Jones steps outside on his side and Bill Smith on his side and they keep coming towards each other until there is nothing but a track between the two fences. That is so true that in scores of communities throughout this Province we have lanes of eighteen, twelve, fourteen and twenty feet wide when they think they have a pretty fair lane. Because of these conditions and because of the fact that our people have been encroaching on Crown property from time to time, when the Department has to try and improve matters for all concerned, all citizens of the country, not for any particular individual but for all citizens of the country, in this modern age they have to try and get what rightfully belongs to the Crown. So a few years ago the

Act, as referred to today as coming into existence a couple of years ago, was made to try and give the Crown, if you like, some standing in endeavouring to recover what was rightfully belonging to it.

Now I want to say in passing, before I forget it, that even in cases where these people have encroached on property of this kind, and there are very, very many indeed, even in these cases where they have had to be displaced, if you like, or removed back off what actually was Crown property yet if these particular individuals had been encroaching in any degree there have also, to my knowledge, been compensations paid them even for Crown Land. I could cite individual cases if necessary, but I can assure you, and I believe the House will accept my statement on that point, I know positively it has happened in roads in Bonavista Bay and Conception Bay and elsewhere.

MR. BROWNE: Can I say positively I know cases where it did not happen they were paid in Torbay.

MR. SPENCER: I don't doubt the honourable gentleman's word. I am not sure what he is referring to. Wherever there has been a case where the Department of Public Works had authority to expropriate, wherever they knew of such cases they arranged for compensation on a standard basis and if that was not acceptable there was expropriation. The expropriation board, of course, sets it then. We have no further say in that case. I will repeat what I said earlier, the expropriation board has in several cases awarded a very much higher fee than would be normally the case and in some cases, Mr. Speaker, they have awarded a fee much less than the Department had agreed to pay. I had a

case in my office a few years ago when we actually settled with a gentleman. He himself had come into the office and accepted the arrangement we made and because of the fact that he was included amongst a group of citizens that went through actual arbitration he had to abide by the board and was awarded figures much less than we were prepared to give him. I am merely trying to show, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion these things have been reasonably treated. My honourable friends may know of cases where they think people have been aggrieved. Certainly I do not know of very many. I know of a number who have caused no end of inconvenience, and you will find today around any section of Newfoundland you care to go, any section you like where the owners of land kept doing this kind of thing, with their fences moved out, as I said just now, until the road was closed up and became merely a lane. Not so long ago, Mr. Speaker, I was sent out as an ordinary individual employed by the Government of that time to endeavour to open up some of these lands and give people right of ways to the foreshore where these lanes had been closed in because of no control over these fences, because of private individuals taking what they knew positively belonged to the public or belonged to the Crown. Now whether it was done deliberately or not it does not behove me to say, Mr. Speaker, but I know it is done—and that is the main purpose for this expropriation here. Am I limited, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is limited to ninety minutes.

MR. SPENCER: As long as they can bear with me I am going on with this little comment here, as best I

can, and I am going to refer to some of the points. If I overdo it I can be brought to order. I can sit down too and stand up again in a minute.

One of the honourable gentlemen of the legal profession made reference to where there were three arbitrators appointed in some cases and that they were honourable gentlemen and they had to take oath of office. Exactly the same condition applies today, Mr. Speaker, as far as the oath of office is concerned. No arbitrator could be appointed and go in and sit in on discussions without taking the oath of office, and he is bound by legal oath in behalf of the individual citizen in the same manner as the arbitrators my honourable friend referred to was concerned.

Now the matter of time has been referred to—three years for an absentee landlord. In some cases, Mr. Speaker, there are many people in this House and throughout this city and throughout Newfoundland who knows just how many—we in Newfoundland have been neglected in allowing such things as absentee landlords or such individuals. I might say I do not mean to classify these people as things—they are men, as far as I am concerned. These things happen whereby absentee landlords have thousands of acres throughout Newfoundland today tied up, and we have people of the younger generation who cannot find a piece of land to build a house on—I merely say, it is time, in my opinion, and it is long overdue when some method of arranging to dispossess these people, particularly if they happen to be people who cannot be gotten in touch with, and are not using the land. I think the time has come when we in Newfoundland need to make it available to thousands still

living here—and God knows I do not own an inch of Crown land in this country today. I have been a Crown Land Surveyor for forty years, and I have never taken one acre of Crown Land into my possession up to this minute. However I am entitled to it as others are—but I want to make that point clear—

MR. BROWNE: The point is the three years not being long enough.

MR. SPENCER: Yes—in my opinion—in fact I think that twenty years ago we should have begun to set this thing down to three years. Unfortunately the administration of these days did not see fit to protect the people of Newfoundland. They were more inclined to protect absentee landlords who were in Australia or somewhere. However, I hold no grudge against people who go out of this country and make a living elsewhere. I am merely saying that in my opinion they should not hold title to land and deprive people in Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: That is not the point. The point is that the Government takes the land, passes the money into court and the people cannot claim it after three years although the money is in the courts.

MR. SPENCER: If that is the point of the honourable gentleman, I say, what else are you going to do. If the Government cannot find the owner they put it in a safe place in the courts. Three years is long enough—if they cannot be found by then. It is long enough, in my opinion.

I want to go on to another two remarks made by my honourable friend. He said: "Why is it necessary to take away these peoples' rights." It is not a case for argument, I don't think, except in the sense that we all want

to do what is best for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. Why it is necessary to take away rights which in some cases they never did possess.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Minister has really properly interpreted anything I said. I did not say—"Why is it necessary to take away rights"—I was referring to something specifically.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member yield?

MR. SPENCER: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not yielding yet for the simple reason I wrote down the words of the honourable gentleman as he said them. If I misquote I should be accused like the press. I don't want that—I read: "Why is it necessary to take away these peoples' rights."

MR. BROWNE: Yes, that is regard to people who have rights. The Government takes the land and pays the compensation into the Courts. Why do you make an arbitrary time of three years? Why not make it three, four, five, six or ten years. The Government has the land—that is where I say the rights are altered.

MR. SPENCER: I am not going to argue this point. As I said at the outset the honourable gentleman's legal opinion is worth more than mine. In my opinion I think it is long enough. Why take away these rights? In my opinion people are treated over-generously in some cases and there is room for improvement. I can name cases if you want. I am not going to bring in individual cases here to create a fuss—that is not my idea. I am only speaking generally.

Now I want to refer, if I may—I regret my honourable friend the member for St. John's East has left the

Chamber, but there is nothing very much I have to say except to say he referred to Section 7 (1) with regard to the Minister's powers. Section 7 (1) says the Minister "shall" not "may"—The Minister shall serve a written notice on the owner of the land to be expropriated and on any other person who is known by the Minister at the time when the notice is served to have an interest in the land—and so it goes on. The point is the Minister shall—and what is more, speaking from personal knowledge I can tell that the Minister does and is always very anxious to do and to be sure to contact the owner or relative or somebody in possession of land of that kind.

Now reference was made to Section 11 (2)—payment to mortgagee or lien holder. That is a legal term and I am not quite sure that I got the point the honourable gentleman referred to.

MR. BROWNE: It is the next paragraph.

MR. SPENCER: I will be very happy to read it at the honourable gentleman's insistence—" (3) No action lies against the Minister"—Fine No action, as far as I know has ever been taken, and I suppose the people drafting that drafted it in accordance with most of the Acts across the Dominion of Canada. I do not know of any reason why they should not protect the Minister of the Crown in that matter, more particularly when in my opinion the people are being particularly fairly dealt with. There may be cases where they may assume that they are not being fairly dealt with, and to that extent I would refer the House, Mr. Speaker, to section 32 (5).

MR. BROWNE: Why not read 11 first?

MR. SPENCER: The thing the honourable gentleman is worried about is that no action lies against the Minister for any loss or damage suffered by the mortgagee or lien-holder because of the failure of the Minister. Well, I am not particularly strong on the legality or legal phrases and I am not too capable to discuss that. But I want to go on to point out that in Section 32, subsection (5), it refers to an appeal. The honourable member for St. John's East said it might be bad drafting, I do not know. I am not capable of discussing that—but here in subsection (5) there is an appeal: "The Minister or an owner of land which has been expropriated may within thirty days after the date of an award give to the other party notice of an appeal to the Supreme Court against the findings of the board upon any question of law or fact in connection with the expropriation or upon the question of the amount of compensation awarded by the board."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully suggest to the Honourable Minister to read paragraph 3 of the same clause 32.

MR. SPENCER: I would be glad to. Before coming to that, if it has any bearing, and I presume it has, I want to say first, right there the appeal lies so that any owner has the right to appeal. Now the paragraph that my honourable friend referred to: Clause 32 (3): "The award of any two arbitrators shall be deemed to be the award of the board and, subject to this Act, is final." Which is exactly "subject to appeal" and that is my point. Again I am not quite capable nor do I want to take too much time of the House to labour that point except to

say there is an appeal—the citizens' right is protected in that regard, irrespective, in my opinion, of 32 (3). The honourable member for St. John's East stated it was poor drafting or something of that kind—perhaps it is. I am not going to take the part of the fellows down in the Attorney General's Department, that is the Attorney General's (Acting Premier) jurisdiction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have pretty well come to the end of my comment. Somebody may say "Amen." That does not bother me. That is O.K. with me. It does not bother me whether people want to hear or not as long as I know I am within my rights.

There is a section here where it says "No account for disturbance". Yet I would point out that the board may make compensation in that connection. Mr. Speaker, I realize it is a very good point and could very well be that a citizen would be dispossessed of land through expropriation for public purpose and could be put to some very considerable inconvenience and hence the reason for the "disturbance" clause being put in. The point is that the board may make compensation in such cases where an individual may have been inconvenienced by disturbance. Then the board on considering that, on their oath, mind you, just as though they were a Supreme Court or a court of lesser jurisdiction—they have the right to consider the owner's disturbance and make compensation accordingly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having made these few comments I feel that I may have contributed to this discussion. I have not even read this Act in toto, but I merely took note of the points raised by my honourable friends opposite and from my personal knowledge of it I do know of cases in this

country where people are being compensated for land expropriated from four to six hundred and up to a thousand dollars an acre and even higher where the real value of property might necessitate it. I contend that they are being most fairly treated and I think they deserve to be. Because I have the knowledge—I admit we do not have the great acreage of land they have, say in Ontario or in New Brunswick or even Nova Scotia and certainly not in the Prairie Provinces, and I realize that our land here when a man clears an acre is of far more value to him. Because of that the Department, acting for the Crown, have set rates which compensate people at a fairly higher rate. I repeat as I said before, from four to six times higher than is paid for land in other Provinces throughout Canada, and in a great majority of cases much higher than that.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could expropriate a cup of tea before we go on?

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, having the eloquent addresses of my honourable friends here on the Opposition side of the House and having heard the oratorical outburst of the Minister of Finance I feel there is very little need for me to add anything further except to say this. I cannot understand why there is need for this legislation if the Government has been so liberal in its handouts to all expropriated land owners, as has been suggested by the Minister. He says that they have been accused by the other Provinces of overpaying our people, paying them too much for land which is expropriated from them

and in some cases, he said, the Government paid as high as four to six times as much as they pay on the Mainland. That is something I ask myself, as a common individual, not having a legal mind, not being a Minister of the Crown, but just a common, ordinary sort of person, I ask myself why the need for this legislation? Is it liberal legislation? I read it carefully. It does not sound liberal to me. It puts all power in the hands of one man in various instances, and if that Minister makes a mistake and causes damage by that mistake, I have no redress whatsoever and I shall refer to that section. Yes, an error in the note of expropriation does not invalidate the expropriation of land and no action lies against the Minister or any person for loss or damage arising out of or in connection with an error in notice of expropriation or any claim for loss or damage so arising shall for the purpose of injurious affection (whatever that might be—some sort of loss, I suppose). But it seems to me, and I have been here about four years now, in this House, every year, I believe, there has been an expropriation Bill passed for one Department or another, and each year the Bill is getting more severe, is getting more like Communism. I say it—and I say it loud—it is getting more like they do it in Russia.

MR. CURTIS: No. They would not have an arbitration board in Russia.

MR. HOLLETT: Not like we have it here. We in the Western World, Sir, have won down through the ages certain common law rights relative to the ownership of property, the ownership of land. These rights, I suppose, at one time existed in Russia as well but they no longer exist there because of the act that Communist

Russia has passed legislation such as we have here.

There are certain sections in this Bill which are terrible, to say the least, and I am quite sure that when we go into committee stage the Honourable the Attorney General or the Acting Premier will be quite happy to allow some amendments. Before this thing passes, I would like to hear from some of the other legal minds in this House, and I am quite sure this Bill is a question for the legal intelligence of this House to make some comment on. We heard the two honourable members of this side of the House. They have brought out points quite clear to most of us, and I am quite sure honourable members on the other side of the House also could point out some errors in this Bill.

This is called a Bill to bring together all the Bills and make expropriation and the handling of expropriations general in all its aspects.

There are just one or two things I would like to point out. "Whenever in the opinion of the Minister it is necessary to acquire land for any of the purposes described in Section 4 the owner of the land or any person having an interest in it refuses to accept such sums of money as the Minister or any authority, etc—and no agreement can be reached or the owner of the land is not known to the Minister or if the owner of the land is incapable of conveying the land or interest or if for any other reason the Minister deems advisable to expropriate the land the Minister may, without the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, for any of the purposes described in Section 4, and that is in connection with taking land for roads and ferries and wharves

and that sort of thing, in other words the Minister can go in and expropriate land without the concurrence of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. He is set up as a judge of all things—he is given Bolshevik powers, I would say. He can do exactly as he pleases. There are some ways he may be gotten at, I understand, but as yet I have not been able to see it. I will read Section 12 in connection with it. No action lies against the Minister in connection with errors. Most of the other parts have been referred to by my learned friends and particularly this one in connection with a board of arbitrators consisting of a Chairman and two other arbitrators—and the Minister shall appoint the Chairman of the board and one other arbitrator, and the owner may appoint the third arbitrator, and if he does not do it the Minister goes ahead and appoints the third arbitrator—in other words all three who will sit down as appointees of the Minister and decide just what shall be paid John Jones for his piece of land. Of course we have been told by the Honourable Minister of Finance that we have nothing to fear, we will get anything from six times as much as we would if living on the Mainland, so there is nothing to fear—But I ask myself, why do we need legislation of this kind? I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, it is not in the best interest of Newfoundland for the Government to bring forward legislation of this kind. I do not wish to say anything further on the point because there are legal minds here, and I am prepared to stand by their good judgement when they say there are certain aspects of this legislation ought to be reconsidered.

That is all I have to say, Sir. Thank you very much!

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government I am forced to say, and I am forced to make this remark because of the speeches of my friends opposite, the Liberal Government is the Government of the people—and when I say "the Government of the people" I mean all the people. We on this side of the House and the principles we represent do not kowtow to private ownership if that private ownership interferes with the proper living conditions of the rest of the people.

Now we have got so much land in this country that is being held up by private interests who do not care a "damn," Mr. Speaker, about this country. They got thousands and thousands and thousands of acres of land.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that is "dam"—"D-A-M."

MR. HOLLETT: What is that?

MR. CURTIS: They got thousands and thousands of acres of land in this country owned by people, I venture to say, who have never seen it, and may want it and other people in the country may want it and people in the country may need it, and these land grants were given away back in 1900 and some away back in 1866.

MR. HOLLETT: And a whole lot last year.

MR. CURTIS: There was not a bit of land given away, Mr. Speaker. There was land given away in 1866 and owned by people, and although we have had two World Wars since then which cost Newfoundland millions of dollars these people sat down and without any respect for the Treasury of Newfoundland kept that land intact for themselves, and they just

sit down and say—"Oh, we got lots of land in Newfoundland. One of these days someone is going to pay us for it. One of these days we will get whatever price we ask." The farmers in St. John's East can die of starvation for want of a piece of land, which they cannot touch because some people have been sitting on it, metaphorically for a hundred years—and these are the kind of people they worship, Sir, the Conservatives worship—these are the supporters—these people who sit down—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, does the Attorney General know what he is talking about?

MR. CURTIS: I hope I do. Who brought up these questions? We say we intend to get land when the country needs it.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, and give it away yourselves.

MR. CURTIS: For the sake of the people of the country and for the sake of developing.

MR. BROWNE: That is on several years—Land Development Act.

MR. CURTIS: We are not talking about Land Development. My honourable friend is deliberately trying to twist it, trying to twist the beautiful sunshine of this day to a cloudy day. My honourable friend may not have known they are trying to make clouds, but they are certainly seeing clouds and they are seeing fog and they are seeing things in this Bill that are not in this Bill. This Bill is purely a consolidation of existing legislation. They have incorporated some items from some Bills and other items from other Bills. There is nothing new under the sun in this Bill that is not already in the various Acts that have

been passed by this Legislature and by the legislation of the past eight years, not a thing—Yet my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, talks about Bolshevism, Communism, just because we dare to suggest that the rights of the people come first.

MR. HOLLETT: That is just what you are not doing.

MR. CURTIS: We are protecting the people's rights, the rights of the people of the country against having to pay unreasonable amounts for land that is being held here and not being used. Now then you would think, according to my honourable friend, the member for St. John's East or St. John's Centre, whatever they call that little bit of the country here.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. John's Centre has not spoken.

MR. CURTIS: St. John's East—I cannot keep them apart. He talked about how the Government is going to take land, the Minister is going to take land and he is going to appoint two officials—we are going down to the civil service.

MR. HIGGINS: To a point of Order—I never referred to two officials.

MR. CURTIS: He did, Mr. Speaker, refer to them as two officials.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I claim credit for that observation—It may be two members of the House of Assembly.

MR. CURTIS: Maybe! Would they be officials? I am sorry to accuse the honourable member for St. John's East—I will not do it if the other honourable member takes the blame for calling them two officials. Do you mean to say if my two honourable

friends were appointed to be arbitrators they would be two officials? That is the trouble, Mr. Speaker, they think because we become members of the House we can't do anything else—we got to go to lesser intelligent people to do things—They are not officials—If the Minister appoints two arbitrators they are two arbitrators and not officials. If my honourable friend would turn his mind back to when the biggest arbitration ever took place in St. John's, when we took the land for the American Base, he will remember that the Government of the day appointed all three of the arbitrators or all three of the assessors. I have yet to hear any suggestion that those people whose property was taken were injuriously injured in any way. Call them what you like—a rose by any other name can smell as sweet—call them arbitrators or assessors—if my honourable friends would be happier we can make the change I have yet to find out any real reason why we should not. I have tried to examine the difference between an arbitrator and an assessor—an assessor assesses only the value and assessors have not right to say who get it or in what proportion the money should be divided, an assessor assesses the value, as the name applies.

MR. BROWNE: May I remind the Attorney General it is called assessors under the Public Works Act.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, but we enlarge on that, Mr. Speaker, and we call them now arbitrators. An arbitrator includes an assessor, but an assessor does not include an arbitrator—An arbitrator has to assess but what is more he has to assess and apportion, and he has to decide who gets such an amount and how much goes on to each of two claimants or a dozen claimants. I do

not see my honourable friend's objection to the word "arbitrator." Then as my honourable friend the former Minister of Public Works said, these men are sworn in. The present Act provides that all arbitrators must be sworn in, as my honourable friend from St. John's East has already admitted. I think he did raise the point.

MR. HIGGINS: I am not completely responsible all the time.

MR. CURTIS: I would be the last one to accuse my honourable friend of everything that emanates from that side of the House—if I did I apologize because it would be an insult to his intelligence.

The rules of compensation, Mr. Speaker, are set forth in the Act—and one of my honourable friends opposite kept speaking about the technical errors—Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is to take advantage of an error it must be a purely nominal, technical error, which might differentiate as to one foot in the measurement or one in his senses would expect a piece of the road and the honourable Minister take the place on the other side. However the points my honourable friend made will be noted.

Then there was another point raised (I am afraid to say who raised it) I believe by the honourable member for St. John's East, when he referred to clause 27. Of course it is improper at this stage to refer to sections in the Bill. Therefore I will say that provision is made that the compensation shall be an amount based on the fair market value and on the existing use value at the time of compensation or of the arbitration—In other words, Mr. Speaker, if the value to be placed on the land as the land is before the

proposed expansion or improvement is to take place—Everybody knows when anything desirable takes place in a community the land suddenly becomes more valuable—“and no account shall be taken of the compulsory acquisition of the land, the disturbance of the owner or occupier, or any other injurious affection.” Then there is an apparent contradiction in subsection (2) where it says “(2) Where, in the opinion of the board, it is proper to make an award in respect of the expropriation of land, the disturbance to the owner or occupier or any other injurious affection properly the subject of compensation, the board may in addition to the amount awarded in accordance with subsection (1) make an award of such sums as it may fix.”

These sections do not seem to jibe, and I will be glad to have them looked into again. I think the honourable member for drawing my attention to them. I think the explanation may be that the board cannot be obliged to do so but may. I think that is probably the effect of the (2) which apparently contradicts the previous section—I think the honourable member for drawing attention to that. I want to assure the House that as far as the Government is concerned we want good and fair legislation, and if we felt there was anything unfair in this legislation you can be quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that we would not bring it in. You have never heard in the past, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, you never will in the future hear of any unfairness on the part of any Government, not only the present Government but any Government in enforcing the provisions of these expropriations Acts. As far as possible and before anything else is done the parties get together and see if they can agree upon the price.

MR. BROWNE: That is not quite right.

MR. CURTIS: I don't know of any cases, perhaps my honourable friend does.

Mr. Speaker, we always try to clear the title first. I know when they came up my way a couple of years ago and wanted a piece of land to build a sidewalk I gave it to them because it improved the value of my property to have a decent piece of road—and in many cases land is improved by this building of roads. Instead of that people want to be compensated in addition—but in most cases the property is improved. This provides simply that if they cannot agree upon compensation in a friendly way this board is appointed. But the point I would stress, Mr. Speaker, is that the board is appointed, the board is sworn, the board is given certain rules, the board makes the findings. It is true two of them are appointed by the Government and only one by the owner. But it is a sworn board, and what is more than that, Mr. Speaker, it is subject to appeal to the Supreme Court. You cannot have any more protection to the individual than that.

MR. BROWNE: The arbitration is final.

MR. CURTIS: I am not so sure, Mr. Speaker, I speak subject to correction. Under the Adjudature Act it is subject to appeal before the Court. I think my honourable friend will find that is so if he would look it up between now and the next sitting. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary to detain the House anymore. All the various points made by the other side have been noted though I may have lost track

of the people who made them, and we will try to get together when we get in Committee on the Bill, and the House will emerge with a Bill satisfactory to everybody on each side.

MR. HOLETT: Hear! Hear!

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

HON. DR. J. MCGRATH (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like with the leave of the House to give a short explanation with regard to a misapprehension which came up in regard to the Dental Bill. I notice it is reported in the press that in presenting the report I said that the Bill was being withdrawn because only a minority of the dentists were in favour of it. Now that was absolutely incorrect. The actual facts were that a majority of the dentists were in favour of the Bill and a majority of the mechanics, incidentally, against it. But it was not because of the majority nor minority but because of the unanimity of all persons concerned with it. I would like to have this understood. The majority of the dentists themselves were in favour of the Bill and not against it.

Committee of the Whole on various Bills.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Judicature Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, this Bill was allowed to stand just because one of my honourable friends opposite wanted to know what the position was. Frankly I did not have time to find out. In any event I do not think it makes any difference. We feel it is the proper thing to limit the use of attachments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section (11) was the only section allowed to stand.

On motion Section (11) carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Survivorship Act."

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried.

A Bill, "An Act to Consolidate and Amend the Law Relating to the Raising of Local Taxes for Schools."

On motion Clauses 1 through 3 carried.

Clause 4.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister in charge of the Bill tell us how many areas, apart from Corner Brook are affected by this? Another question I wish to ask is: is this the section which gives the power to collect taxes, presently declared by the magistrate to be illegally imposed?

MR. CURTIS: This Act, as I explained at the beginning, Mr. Chairman, is purely a consolidation of the existing legislation. It does not attempt to validate anything that was done out of order. It is purely an enabling Act to enable any school tax authority to be set up anywhere should it be requested.

MR. BROWNE: In any other places besides Corner Brook?

MR. CURTIS: I only know of Deer Lake and Corner Brook.

MR. HOLLETT: "All debts including without limiting the generality of the foregoing, taxes due to any

Authority under the Local School Tax Act, 1954 or under the Corner Brook-Deer Lake School Tax Areas (Confirmation of Tax) Act, 1957. And all liabilities assumed by the Authority shall, subject to the last mentioned Act, be collected and discharged in accordance with this Act." Does not that infer that this makes it possible for the Authority there in Corner Brook to collect taxes which the magistrate declared illegal?

MR. CURTIS: This does not make a debt legal the magistrate held was not legal. This does not legitimize a debt, it just provide if there is a debt it can be collected. It does not create a debt. It says: "If there is a debt" it should be collected, but it does not make it a debt.

MR. HOLLETT: That is quite clear, thank you

On motion Clauses 4 through 5 carried.

Clause 6:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chariman, that means that the Minister shall give three months notice, post a notice for three months declaring his intention to set up a School Tax Authority in a certain area, and the people in that area have no right whatsoever to say whether they agree or not that their area shall be made a school tax authority area. Is that what it means?

MR. HEFFERTON: Any application must come from the people of that area. The Government then makes an announcement that within three months they will set up an area in accordance with the application they received, and during that three months the people may make any recommendations they want.

MR. HOLLETT: In what form?

MR. HEFFERTON: In whatever form the people may desire to make it.

MR. HOLLETT: What recourse have they, Mr. Chairman? What does the Minister do if they make some suggestion? Does he give them a chance to vote on the matter?

MR. HEFFERTON: They have three months.

MR. HOLLETT: What procedure do they take up?

MR. HEFFERTON: They might very well circulate a petition in the place and bring it in to the department, and naturally that petition whether largely signed or not would be taken into consideration before the area was designated as a School Tax Area.

MR. HOLLETT: There is nothing in the Act to say you would do that; that you would consider a petition.

MR. HEFFERTON: I don't know if we have to spell out everything in the Act if you give time in which to make recommendations.

MR. HOLLETT: I maintain the people of this country should know just what this Act means—I am trying to get the answer from the Minister so that the people of the country would know exactly what the School Tax means.

MR. HEFFERTON: Again, Mr. Chairman, this is a Consolidation Act, taking and putting into one Act something done now for the last three years, and procedure definitely laid down—As I pointed out, it comes as a result of agitation and a request of the people concerned in the area. Then there is three months notice, and the people concerned can make what representa-

tions they wish, and on their representations will depend whether the Government will decide to go ahead with the intention of declaring a school tax area or whether they should change their minds—That seems to me perfectly clear, Mr. Chairman, and I cannot make it any clearer.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister says that when a request from the people in the area comes to the Minister what does he mean? Is it a general request from all voters or from certain sections of the people?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, I am only quoting from experience—and that is going back again to Corner Brook Area and Deer Lake—For two or three years we have received representations from various categories of people in the Corner Brook Area not only the public at large but school boards of all or various denominations, and naturally a request of that nature with that measure of acceptance calls for a certain amount of consideration—and on that the action was taken to declare Corner Brook to be a School Tax Area and three months notice was given in which the people were privileged to make any representation they wished—and since there was no representation against it we went ahead and declared it a School Tax Area, and a School Tax Authority was set up. The same procedure was followed in Deer Lake. This Act, as I see it, does not envisage any departure from that principle.

MR. HOLLETT: The Honourable Minister has helped me—I still maintain the people have no recourse whatever under this Act—The Honourable Minister says they may make representations—But there is nothing in the Act to declare that the people may

be allowed to vote on the question or that they will be referred to a Committee appointed by the people or some other way—There is nothing to declare that—

MR. CURTIS: In that respect, Mr. Chairman, the Act is exactly the same as the existing Act.

MR. HOLLETT: I know that.

MR. CURTIS: It does not pretend to differentiate.

MR. HOLLETT: There was lots of trouble with the original Act. Why not put something in to protect yourselves?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, I think most members will agree that where we have school boards, which are required to be elected under the Education Act, that these school boards represent the people of the denominations concerned—If people in any area, and I am not referring to any specific area—

MR. HOLLETT: Do you mean elected or appointed?

MR. SHEPPARD: School boards under the Education Act, as I understand it, are supposed to be elected.

MR. HOLLETT: Are they?

MR. SHEPPARD: In practice I would say, most of them have not been elected, but over the past ten years in my experience it has become the practice to have school boards elected at the various annual meetings of the various denominations concerned. Now I think most honourable members who have had any experience with such meetings will agree that in very few places do you get a majority of the people of the congregation to attend these meetings—But they have

the right to attend and if they do not attend these meetings and exercise their right to elect their school boards they cannot complain afterwards about the existence of the school boards—Now carrying it through to what I consider a logical conclusion; if the school boards are elected, as by law prescribed, then the school boards, a particular school board would represent a particular congregation and if they represent a particular congregation it naturally follows that school boards have the right and have the authority to represent the congregation to the Government—and if the people do not make their wishes known to the school board or if the school board takes an action with the Government with which the congregation disagrees if they do not make their disagreement known how can the school board, acting in good faith, know about their disagreement. Now I had some little experience in this matter in Corner Brook, and what happened in Corner Brook was this, if I may be permitted to speak; all of the schools boards without exception in Corner Brook were pressing and demanding that some legislation of this nature be brought into force, and not only the school boards but the Federation of Municipalities—in other words the people who had education in mind and were trying to think seriously about education and had given some thought to this matter asked the Government to consider bringing in some type of legislation introducing school taxes. These, I think, Mr. Charman, are facts. Then what happened? After that the Government put these notices, brought in legislation, the statutory notices which we are now considering here in this section—The Government published these notices to which there was not one

objection. There were public meetings called, and this is a matter of record, there were public meetings called and there were no protests whatsoever to the legislation. But immediately an enforcement of the legislation was attempted then the trouble began.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it will be fair to say that the majority of the objections in that particular area came from people who (a) probably never attended a school board meeting in their lives, (b) never attended a church meeting in their lives and (c) had sent their children to school and never visited the school the children attended in their lives and (d) in my opinion in a good many cases had absolutely no interest in the educational programme of Corner Brook. Now that is where the kick came from—The people who had had something to do with education, people who had served on school boards for years and years and years and people who had spent years and years on parent-teacher associations, people who had spent years and years teaching, people who had taken an active part in church and school affairs these were the people in Corner Brook who saw the necessity of legislation of this nature, and these were the people who asked the Government to bring it in. But the Government, as I said in the Throne Speech Debate, if I may refer to it, with wisdom included this provision for a statutory notice. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if you publish a statutory notice, if you make the thing known publicly, if you ask the people to make any objections and there are not any objections, is it not reasonable to assume there are not objections? Now that is exactly what happened there, and this whole business of a school tax problem in a certain area was nothing more than a tempest in a tea pot

—and I think the quotation of the year was at the end of the hearing of the commission, on which I had the privilege to serve. It was made not within a public session but when we had finished our hearing, when a certain gentleman approached (I do not know how many of the members were there, probably the other two, at least there was one other) and he said "Look, you finished your hearing—I had nothing at all to say about it, but I think myself that as far as a majority of the people you have here is concerned this school tax is going to be just another unpaid bill because they have not paid any school fees, they have not supported their schools, a good many of them not all of them and now they are howling about this school tax because they are not going to be required to help in the education of their people and thus to make a better Corner Brook." That is the attitude, Mr. Speaker, I submit, on this whole school tax question, right around the country. We have no objection to paying a vehicle tax in our minds, we have no objections to paying a twenty-five dollar licence for a female dog, we have no objections to a tax on certain other things, but let us introduce a tax for the most vital thing as far as this country is concerned, the education of our children, and we have howls, howls, howls—and I am sorry to see, Mr. Chairman, that this howling is continuing in this House and has been fairly well represented by certain members in this House.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, this might be a good time for the Committee to rise and report having passed two Bills and made progress on a third.

On motion the Committee rose to report progress.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair:

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Judicature Act," and Bill, "An Act to Amend the Survivorship Act" and directed me to report same without amendment.

On motion report received, Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered matters to them referred, reports progress and asks leave to sit again.

On motion report received, Committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday at 3:00 of the Clock.

THURSDAY, May 9th, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. STRANGE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from the residents of Cupids, which is part of my district that I represent, praying that the road from the cross roads down into Cupids be given some attention by gravelling or using dump trucks or mechanical loaders. The road is practically impassable at the present time, and this is only one road of five or six leading from the

highroads into very important settlements.

I might say that last year there was not one dollar spent on the highroad work in my district, which means that the roads, trunk roads leading down into the principle settlements have become so deteriorated that they need immediate attention.

This petition is signed by a number of truck and car owners belonging to Cupids. The road is travelled considerably—and this petition has my fullest support. I would ask that the petition be received by this House and be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by the honourable member for Port De Grave. I know the area very well, and I am often there, and I know the conditions of the road is not very good, but I am surprised to learn that no money, not one cent, was spent on the road last year—terrible! terrible! I am quite sure the Government must have neglected one of their most important districts. I am sorry to hear that, and in joining my honourable friend I do hope he will get some money spent on the road immediately.

On motion petition received for reference to the Department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices of Motion

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (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 (Teachers' Pensions) Act."

Notice of Questions

Notice of Questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Duffy.

Answers to Questions

MR. HOLLETT: I was to get an answer, I understand, from the Honourable Minister. I take it he is not in the House at the present time.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General promised to let me have some information in regard to the investigation into the affair at Whitbourne.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): The situation is unchanged from yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Do I understand from the Attorney General that the investigation is proceeding?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, they are not quite through.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I may ask the new Minister of Finance, who has a way of disappearing and reappearing so quickly, I was about to ask if he could inform the House what day the budget will be brought down. I am quite sure I must have seen him today there.

MR. CURTIS: He will be back in a minute.

MR. BROWNE: I did intend asking the Minister of Welfare a question. He is not in the House. I wonder could the Attorney General answer. I have been asked by my honourable and learned colleague from St. John's East to ask the question. He is unavoidably absent. He tells me the man who has been engaged to demolish the houses in Hunt's Lane

has held up the work because in one of the houses there is an expectant mother, and he does not feel like going ahead and destroying the house over her head until there is some arrangement by the Department of Welfare to find her some accommodations.

MR. CURTIS: I am sorry; that matter has not been drawn to my attention. It is one of the few matters that has not been during the past few days. As soon as the Minister comes perhaps there might be time between the Orders to get both these questions asked.

MR. SPEAKER: These questions may be asked at any time by leave of the House or they may be asked on the motion to adjourn.

Orders of the Day

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Judicature Act."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Survivorship Act."

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, reverting to the question I spoke of last, I wonder if I could have the leave of the House to ask the Honourable Minister of Finance to inform the House what day the budget will be brought down?

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition I would like to say it is our hope we can produce the budget during the coming week. Ten-

tatively, we are planning that we might be ready for Wednesday, but it is not definitely set—That is as close as I can go to it.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you very much!

First reading of Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Grant by the Crown to Dominion Wabana Ore Limited of the Revisionary Interest of the Crown in Certain Lands Now Held under Lease by the Company."

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

First reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Land Development Act."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask if that is a money Bill? Is any money to be expended under this Bill—If there is it should be brought under the resolutions.

MR. CURTIS: No, Mr. Speaker, there is no money involved in this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister says there is no money to be spent under this Bill, therefore it would not be a money Bill.

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

Second reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Penitentiary Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is not a very important Bill, but it is a Bill which my Department feels should be brought in, not so much for all it contains but so that when the Penitentiary is full up we may be able to use as a stop-gap the jail at Harbour Grace.

I might say the jail at Harbour Grace, Mr. Speaker, has been all refitted and it is now in excellent condition. I have not been there myself but I am told that it would well serve the purpose of acting as an overflow for the few days or few weeks when the other penitentiary may be crowded. I might say we have accommodations in the penitentiary for one hundred and thirty-four males and twenty-five females, prisoners, roughly a hundred and sixty in all. That is the accommodations of the penitentiary at the present time. At the Prison Camp we have room for sixty-three. At Harbour Grace jail, which would just be purely a stop-gap, we could accommodate another fifteen.

Our hope, Mr. Speaker, and the Bill also has that in mind, is that we might eventually establish another prison camp, this one for our friends on the West Coast who don't care to feel their people are mixing with the people from St. John's in the Penitentiary.

I have never been particularly proud of the penitentiary, and I have never said I was proud of the penitentiary, although some people seem to think I did make such an observation. But I am proud of the prison camp. The prison camp, I am happy to say, is a model to which other parts of Canada are looking and of which we have received the highest possible commendations. Indeed I understand that New Brunswick recently was contemplating some form of prison reform, and they were told by the authorities that if they wanted to see the modern type of prison camp to visit the prison camp at Salmonier.

So my hope would be, Mr. Speaker, that we would have a second prison

camp somewhere perhaps between Grand Falls and Corner Brook, if we could find a suitable location where the residents of those towns might find accommodations should they land in jail.

I might say we have had a lot of people from the West Coast in the penitentiary here, and they are a long distance from home, and it is an expensive job moving them back and forth, whereas if we could have a place half way, say between Grand Falls and Corner Brook, it would be within a couple of hours run for both places.

This Bill authorizes the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to designate any such place as a prison camp.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, the prison camp is largely self-supporting—the men there raise their own crops, their own beef, they supply their own eggs, have their own cattle, and on the whole the more we could use prison camps the better, because there are only certain types of prisoners we can put there. We can only put these prisoners who can be trusted there. There are a class of prisoners, of course, who will never see the prison camps, because they simply cannot be trusted to the extent that it is the practice to trust them in the prison camps. In the prison camps the people are largely on the honour system—Indeed we have the irony of a story told of a warden out with two prisoners, the warden suffered a heart attack. One prisoner stayed by and looked after him while the other got help. Well now you would not hear of a thing like that anywhere except in places like Newfoundland. It shows the type of men we have at the prison camp and the

effect the prison camp routine is having on these men.

I do not think there is anything else in the Act I need refer to, Mr. Speaker, and I move the second reading.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the story told by the Attorney General and his reference to the West Coast reminds me of another one—I believe it was when Sergeant Goodridge was in charge of the jail in St. George's. One prisoner used to be allowed to go out during the day and was supposed to be in at nightfall. He came in late and he was told if he came in late again he would be locked out all night. That is supposed to be a true story.

The one thing I would like to make reference to in connection with this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is in connection with the women being kept in the penitentiary down there. I believe it would give the Attorney General the opportunity of providing accommodations for another twenty-five males if he had some kind of a cottage type of confinement place for the women, instead of keeping the women in the penitentiary. If they were given a woman's version of the prison camp at Salmonier, I may say this is not an original idea of mine. I have been reading about an experiment of that kind that has been tried elsewhere and has proven to be very good, to have very good results—The women get more fresh air and take an interest in gardening and industries that are usually associated with cottage camps. So I would suggest that the Attorney General give consideration to the establishment of some place in the country so that the women prisoners of the penitentiary could be confined there.

I am surprised at the large number of persons going to the penitentiary

these days, so that the prison is full and extra accommodations have to be found in Harbour Grace jail. The Attorney General ought to give consideration to finding out what is the cause of this in all these good years, the best eight years we ever had, there are more people in jail than ever before. It seems strange and novel, and I think it might be well worth while perhaps if not to appoint a Royal Commission at least a Committee of the House to investigate why the penitentiary is so crowded. Perhaps the Attorney General knows the answer, but it is disquieting to hear not only of the prison being filled but that there is a lot of wanted prisoners at large—It is very serious—just the number of burglaries that have been taking place in recent weeks and there does not appear to be any clue to who is responsible. I do not know what the answer is to that, but certainly conditions don't seem to be very good when we have a prison full and a lot of prisoners at large who have not as yet been confined.

In regard to the idea of establishing a prison camp on the West Coast, I believe that is a good one because not only from the point of view of the expense of bringing prisoners back and forth but from the point of view of their being near their friends so that they can be visited. I think it may be a helpful thing to a prisoner to soften the harsh months of monotony of his prison existence if occasionally he is visited by those who care for him—So if the Government were to bring in a Bill to provide for accommodations of that kind in another part of the country I believe it would have our united support.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in reply to my honourable and learned friend, first, that the mat-

ter of a women's wing outside the penitentiary has been under consideration for some, for many years. Indeed some years ago I arranged with the Federal Government to have released to us a building on the Bay Bulls Road, and with the help of Mr. Pickersgill, I was able to get the property made available to us. But when we looked into the situation we found first that the place would cost a lot of money to fix up. I think the estimated cost was about thirty-five thousand dollars, just to fix it up. Then we began to look into it further and we found we had no prisoners—There were no female prisoners at the time—and we cannot bank on female prisoners. I can remember when the Grand Jury came in and told the court that they needed more female prisoners for the penitentiary to do the washing. I do not know whether my honourable friend remembers that, but I do remember the Grand Jury coming back and reporting how unfortunate the position was in the penitentiary where there were no woman prisoners to do the wash.

As I say you cannot depend on women prisoners—You might have ten today and none tomorrow. Roughly I would guess there are now about a half dozen, but very few for a long time. They are mostly short term prisoners. While there is considerable merit in the remarks made by the honourable and learned gentleman I am afraid that we would not be justified at the moment in going to the expense of fitting up a site for prisoners who will be there for a short while. But it is a matter which has been considered. I might say we have a women's wing in the penitentiary now. It is a very fine wing, and we are taking all the steps we can to segregate the female quarters, which is

always a problem in institutions like that. But we have the situation under control. Should there be an increasing tendency of women prisoners the point raised by my honourable and learned friend, I assure him again, will be considered. At the moment we have sort of just given it up.

As to the number of prisoners I don't think, Mr. Speaker, the number at the moment is abnormal. My honourable friend must remember that during the past eight years the population of Newfoundland has increased very greatly. He must also remember, Mr. Speaker, that we are getting a lot of juvenile delinquents and senior delinquents. So I do not think there is anything at all abnormal, nothing at the moment to worry about. We must remember the institution was built a long time ago, and the prison camp is there a long time. We must remember we send people now for offences they did not go to jail for before, for instance, drunken driving, for which a jail sentence is now mandatory. So that increases the number of prisoners there, and I think the law enforcement has gotten a lot better than ever it was. It is true there are some undiscovered crimes, and it is true the perpetrators have not been apprehended, but I would also go so far as to say they are not known they are suspected. But no one knows better than my honourable and learned friend, and the magistrates, it is one thing to suspect a person and another to have enough proof to convict. So that it is not always easy to get a conviction. For that reason a large number of people will remain at large and a large number of crimes go unpublished. As a matter of fact I often wonder why the legislation always makes it so hard for the Department of Justice to get convictions. I

mean that everything seems to be weighed in favour of the accused. That is British Justice. I remember that Adams case in England, where the problem was not whether the man was guilty or not but who was the best lawyer, and whether the Attorney General could beat the other lawyers. However, that is all aside, Mr. Speaker. I do not think there is anything else my honourable friend said that I have not answered. If there is I would be glad to answer 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 to Amend the Bills of Sales Act, 1955."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs, who is supposed to sponsor this Bill, I would move the second reading.

It is a non-important Bill, as those members of the House who are also members of the legal profession will know. Under the recent Bills of Sales Act certain documents must be registered in the Registry of Deeds. The object of this Bill is to provide that where a document is registered under the Registry of Deeds, where a Bill of Sale is already registered as a Deed in the Registry of Deeds there will no longer be any need to register the same document the second time as a Bill of Sale. In other words as the Act reads now it is possible there might be some interpretation to require registration twice, one in the Registration of Deeds as a deed and another time registered as a Bill of Sale, whereas under this amendment it is made quite clear—the document is registered as a deed in the Registry

of Deeds and needs not be registered as a Bill of Sale.

I would 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 a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Issue of A Grant of a Piece of Land to Reid Newfoundland Company Limited in Exchange for a Part of Reid Lot 97."

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, amongst the parcels of land the Government arranged to acquire to round out the area that it wished to transfer to the Government of Canada for the purpose of establishing a National Park was a certain portion of Reid Lot 97. The portion has a sea front on the Charlottetown side of Clode Sound.

The Government indicated that it would like to acquire that portion of Reid Lot 97 by way of exchange for another area of Crown Land located on the South West Arm in Trinity Bay. I have here three maps, one showing the position of Reid Lot 97 that the Government decided to acquire, the second showing the South West Arm Area, that it is proposed to transfer to the Reids and the third map showing the geographic relation of one piece to the other. I would like to have these passed to the members of the Opposition, so that they may be able to follow my explanation, more readily.

With regard to both these areas of land they have these characteristics in common, both have sea frontage and the elevation of the height of the land is in both cases approximately the

same, and there is the same acreage. There is no known mineralization in either area. There is very little timber on either area and as far as water power is concerned there is no water power of any account on either area. In correspondence the company indicated to the Government that the exchange proposed was quite acceptable to it, provided that the company was vested with the same rights and the same title to the land to be transferred as it had in the required part of Reid Lot 97. In other words: the company desired to have the South West Arm Area transferred to it in fee simple, subject to the Transportation of Timber Act. I should perhaps elaborate a bit on these conditions involved. In 1904 the Government issued to Reid Newfoundland Company a hundred and forty-five fee simple grants describing tracts of Crown Land scattered throughout the Island, and these grants constituted a total area of three thousand nine hundred and ten square miles. The grants conveyed all the rights to the various surface woods, the water powers and minerals of every kind, and the lands were granted to the company in consideration of the purchase, formation and fulfillment of certain work by the company in connection with the construction of the Trans-Island Railway System. Having made the grants the Government subsequently became aware that certain of the granted areas infringed upon the traditional rights of fishermen and cutters of firewood in the coastal areas. So the company and the Government got their heads together and in consequence of an agreement they arrived at legislation was again enacted in 1904 making certain modifications in respect of certain coastal areas of the Reid Lands, making it lawful amongst other things for any person to enter

upon these coastal areas for the purpose of obtaining timber or wood for ship building, for repairs to vessels, for use in the fishery and for firewood. No change was made by this legislation in the position with regard to fee simple title given to the company in respect to these coastal areas. The general public merely acquired limited rights to cut timber on the areas for fishery purposes and for firewood.

The Transportation of Timber Act, 1904, was then in essence merely to provide amongst other things for the right of the general public to cut wood for fishery purposes and firewood in certain areas of the Reid Lots abutting on the coastline, and in general the portions of the Reid Lots co-effected covered areas extending back from the shoreline for about three miles. The Transportation of Timber Act of 1904 included the rights of timber growing on these areas, since the company held no authority to control cutting on the areas on the one hand and on the other hand the property rights to timber were not clearly established as being in the Crown, so for fifty years uncertainty existed in regard to the Crown's position to deal with the timber on these areas. To clarify the situation the Transportation of Timber Act was amended in 1954 and this amendment established the Crown's right to all the trees growing or situated on the Reid's Lands covered by the Transportation of Timber Act, 1904; and made these trees subject to the same care and control as trees growing on Crown Lands. The timber growing on about six hundred and fifty square miles of the coast holdings were affected. Today when the Reid Newfoundland Company wishes to sell any part of these areas covered by the Transportation of Timber Act for other than settlement or

mining purposes it has now to request the Government to dispose of the timber, if any, growing on the area it wishes to sell.

What the Reid Newfoundland Company wishes then is to have the South West Arm Area transferred to it in simple fee, subject to the Transportation of Timber Act. However no authority to effect such a transfer exists in any legislation now in force. So that in order to give the company the same rights of title in the South West Arm it has in the required portions of Reid Lot 97 this special legislation is necessary. I should add that the South West Arm Area that is proposed to be transferred to Reid Newfoundland Company was within the Brinco Concession Area. At the request of the Government and in order to facilitate the transfer BRINCO has surrendered that area in advance. It is part of the three thousand square miles of Newfoundland that BRINCO must in any case surrender by December 31st, 1958.

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

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have not very much to say on this because I see from the Bill it looks like a fair deal. I am only concerned about one matter, and that is the people living in the area in South West Arm, living near or on that particular parcel of land. I notice it is bound on one side by Hillview and on the other by Hatchet Cove. There does not seem to be any settlements in between. I take it the Government has taken steps to find out that no infringement would be made upon the rights of people living in that area and I trust the Minister will be able to advise us on that when he replies.

I was rather amused at the Bill because only yesterday we were talking about something which is very dear to the Government's heart, i.e. expropriation. They are prepared to expropriate land from all and sundry, and the "damn" landlords were spoken of as not caring about the people's rights. I thought the Government might find it possible and relevant to expropriate than pay proper compensation. It might be a very good way to try out this new Act. I do not think that the Act will apply there—Actually I see very little wrong with the Bill, because if the Reids have a right and proper interest in a piece of land and you are going to take it away from them it is right you should compensate them fairly. The only matter that concerns me at the moment is how it will affect the people in the area at South West Arm.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, it is true the Government might have expropriated this land from the Reids—It is true we might have expropriated this land under the terms of the Bill we were discussing yesterday, which was a very good Bill, which provided for the Government to appoint two arbitrators and the owner a third, with an appeal to the Supreme Court in the event of any dissatisfaction. I know I am discussing a former Bill, but my honourable friend asked why we did not expropriate the land under this Bill. If we were going to expropriate land surely it is no crime to discuss how—I am going to suggest to the House we might have expropriated this land under legislation passed by the Monroe Government in 1925, when my honourable friend was a member of that party of that day. In fact if he would look up the records he will see that in 1925 he seconded the motion for an Address in Reply and at

that session they passed an expropriation Bill, one of these terrible expropriation Bills. The Tory Government of that day was at the helm and the Tory Government declared the terms and conditions under which that land would be expropriated—and what were these terms and conditions? The Chief Commissioner of Highroads was one of the assessors—He appointed the second assessor and the third one, if there was a third one, was appointed by them and whose property was effected. But in that case, Mr. Speaker, there was no appeal to the Supreme Court, and the decision of the two Government appointed appraisers was held to be final.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I suggest the Attorney General is distinctly out of order now.

MR. CURTIS: I know he is out of order—I got my point over, and I support this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I just say one word?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member has spoken.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not speaking. I hope we be granted the same privilege as the Honourable the Attorney General.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Attorney General in part of his remarks was distinctly out of order.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, I think there is possibly one point to be dealt with. My Department has assured me that the title to this land is vested fully in the Crown and no other title is involved. The only thing I can think of that might possibly be involved is if some persons we are not aware of have established

squatters' rights in the area. I think in that case we can assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition such claims will be dealt with justly.

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

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, might I have the permission of the House to revert to questions—There is a matter that I am given to understand is of some importance. It is a question that I directed to the Minister of Welfare, verbally, a couple of days ago, and upon which I would like some clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed the honourable member be allowed to ask a question at this time? I would like to make it clear because we cannot have question periods all over the place. It is agreed.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I think it was Monday I asked the Honourable Minister of Welfare whether his Department was aware of or had taken any steps to look after certain residents of Hunt's Lane whose homes were being demolished. The House was informed at that time that the Department was taking certain steps and that those people in the homes affected who come within the ambit of the Welfare Department would be looked after. I had this afternoon at about 2.30 P.M. a telephone call from a gentleman named Kenneth Keats. He informed me he was the person engaged to demolish the houses. He had done some work and halted work today because of the fact that two of the houses that were next in line for demolition contained people who had no means of getting accommodations anywhere, and amongst them being a lady whom I mentioned

the other day, who is an expectant mother. He said that he felt that he could not as a human being tear down the house with the people still in them. In the light of that I wonder if the Minister could say whether or not in fact his department has done anything?

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I can add nothing to what I said the other day. It has been referred to the City Welfare Department and the City Welfare Department has said there would be no one on the street that night.

MR. HIGGINS: That is right, there was not that night.

MR. HEFFERTON: I checked up next morning. Further than that I know nothing about the demolition order. I heard since I came here the demolition was ordered stopped.

MR. HIGGINS: I appreciate the Honourable Minister may be labouring under some difficulty if those people to whom he has issued certain directives have not carried out their work. But the man who stopped the demolition today did it out of purely human consideration—and he has a job to do and in effect the position is that if he does not do it someone else will. What is the position to be in respect of these people? Is the City Welfare Office going to do something for them or are they simply hoping the owners of the property will stay their hand ad infinitum?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, may I rise to draw attention to the legislation to which the Attorney General referred a few moments ago and which he said I seconded the Address. In

Reply in 1925 and an Act was introduced at that time constituting a highroads commission, which gave expropriation powers. This shows the danger of going from one debate to another and reviving a debate, because I can show here that although they were given power to expropriate and take property the ambits were not assessed by a board of arbitrators but by a board of assessors, as I was saying yesterday.

MR. CURTIS: But there was no appeal.

MR. SPEAKER: I had of course to allow the honourable member to make an explanation, I think any further debate at this time on that particular Bill will have to be ruled out of order.

On motion the House went into Committee of the Whole on various Bills.

On motion, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Clarke Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I presume we are going to start on No. 41 first. I might say here, during the reading of the Bill there will be a motion to amend 43 and 44. I distribute the amendments now so that members of the House may have lots of time to look at them.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Consolidate and Amend the Law Relating to the Raising of Local Taxes for Schools."

On motion sections 5 through 6 read and carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister of Education if he is in charge of the Bill today?

MR. CURTIS: I will take charge.

MR. BROWNE: I ask the Attorney General why consideration has not been given by the Government to the question of electing the school tax authority instead of appointing them? I am sure all honourable members in the House realize the position in our age—this authority is appointed and not elected. I would like to know why consideration has not been given to electing the authority?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of the principle of the Bill adopted in second reading. There are times when it is not possible to have elected boards. If you elect them you will have to elect school boards. We seem to hear an awful lot about electing a tax authority. All they got to do, Mr. Chairman, is collect the money, the people who ought to be elected are the people spending the money, the school boards. Does my honourable friend advocate that? I am perfectly agreeable.

MR. HOLLETT: This situation touches upon the principle we were talking about yesterday, of course, and I would like to move a amendment to Section 6, and have it read as follows: I would like to make the amendment read: Following upon the recommendations of the Minister of Education and subject to this section arrangements for the election of an authority to be known as such and such an area. The reason I move that amendment, Mr. Chairman, is, as I pointed out yesterday on the principle of taxation without representation. There should be no taxation without representation. If the people of Corner Brook Area or any other Area in Newfoundland choose to elect a school tax authority and give them the right to put taxes on them than that is

quite in order. This is a well-known principle which has been handed down to us from our forefathers, and I see nothing wrong with making this amendment. It takes the sting out of the Bill and puts the onus of collection the taxes of any school area upon an elected body and not upon a body appointed by one Minister.

MR. CURTIS: Will you go further and move that the school board be elected too?

MR. HEFFERTON: There is one serious objection to the amendment just moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, in both areas in question you are dealing with areas where you have different denominations for representatives of this school tax authority. It is not difficult to foresee under elections you might have all appointed and one or more denominations not represented at all.

MR. BROWNE: That could be easily gotten over, as each denomination would elect a representative.

MR. CURTIS: That is what they do now in effect. Who do you think appoints them?

Mr. Chairman, of course we cannot accept that amendment. In the first place this section is exactly as the law stands today, there is nothing changed in it—If my honourable friends would read the Act of 1954 they will find that this Act is just a revision of the existing legislation, and I notice that in this present Act they have split into two sections what was in one section in the old Act. In other words the old Act says school tax areas may be established and school tax authorities may be appointed. In this Act we have one section for school tax areas and another section for school

tax authorities. There is absolutely no change. Of course, obviously, Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not acceptable—to talk about electing an inter-denominational board is quite impossible. In the first place when this Bill was brought in it was brought in with the approval of the educational authorities and the various churches approved. How can you have an election? Are you going to say to the electors: this school tax authority is to be made up of the representatives of the following churches and list them, and in voting you must vote for only one from each denomination. You cannot do that. It is true that the appointments are made, but I believe, it is equally true to say the persons appointed are the persons elected by the various boards. I think in effect that is true—How you can elect a mixed body by such an election I do not know—Therefore the amendment is not acceptable.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I see no reason, in the first place the Government is violating a sacred right, a sacred principle, you are putting taxes without representation from the people—The Honourable the Attorney General would be the first one to agree we were violating a sacred right handed down to us from our forefathers—we are asking for trouble and we are going to get trouble and that is exactly what you did when you passed the Act a year or so ago—you broke a cardinal principle of justice and put taxes on without having people represented on the board then. It was wrong and it caused all the trouble—and I do not think any one of my learned friends has any brief for any particular body of people in this country on the school tax question whatsoever, I am speaking from the point of view of this important

principle—You cannot tax people unless they are represented on the body. The Government itself represents the people; they have to be elected. You could not put any taxes on the people in any shape or form if you had not been elected—It is true the Commission of Government did—That is another question—The Commission of Government was appointed by the British Government who had supreme authority as far as this little dominion was concerned at that time—and apparently by breaking that principle they caused a tot of trouble—and the Commission of Government did exactly as they liked and finally gave us into Confederation with Canada—If the Commission of Government had not been appointed we could have gone into Confederation with Canada on different and much better terms—I do not want to talk about Confederation, I am talking about appointing people in local areas to assess the value of the people's property and then tax them, and if they do not pay the taxes put them in jail. You cannot do it and get away with it—I am just warning you—

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will recall, but I think that the legislation setting up the School Tax Authority had the unanimous approval of the House. I am not too sure but I am almost sure that it did have at that time when it was passed.

MR. HOLLETT: You had better be sure. I am sure that is not so.

MR. BALLAM: Well O.K., you will probably look up Hansard and check and see whether it was or not—However whether it was or not it was passed by this House and it became the law—The setup of the authority

was passed by this House—That is what we are talking about here now in this Section 6. It is nothing new. As the Honourable the Attorney General states it is in effect right now. If we scratch it out, if we do not pass this thing at all it is still in effect. The authority is represented by the denominations concerned, as already mentioned and by the churches concerned, and in the original set-up not only from all of the school boards in all of the denominations, not only did they have representation but all of the municipalities at that time—the city was not then incorporated—and there were four at least municipalities at that time—the city was incorporated and all municipalities requested this legislation. I am sure my honourable friends on the opposite side of the House will recall it was on the floor here for two years before it was finally passed. Because of various things it failed to get through the House the first year and then it was brought in again the next year; and I am sure it had been gone over time and again, and often enough to have the wrinkles ironed out of it—but evidently we did not.

Now this amendment here, as previously mentioned, does nothing except to consolidate what is already the law. The only thing it does is that it adds something to it, and I am sure we should all be happy about it, and that is that it exempts certain people like widows and old age pensioners and people who do not make a sufficient amount of money—I think anybody under six hundred dollars a year is exempted, and it also exempts people who are living outside the area but who may be working in Corner Brook. They were included in the first instance but they are exempted here, and as a matter of fact not only

are they exempted here but were exempted by an amendment, I think, brought in last year or the year before. I think in 1954 an amendment came in which exempted those people working in the area who lived in another part of the Province, or outside of the area concerned. These were exempted as were certain other people mentioned in this amendment.

I personally cannot follow the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's amendment because I cannot see how an election of that type could be held, and I think with the authority of all of the churches and representation from all of the churches and all the municipalities, who were all elected too by the way, I am quite sure that should be representation enough. If that is not representation by election well I do not know what is, because they had all been previously—

MR. HOLLETT: Not that authority. The authority is appointed, appointed by the Minister.

MR. BALLAM: The names of the members of the authority he does not appoint them—They are sent in by different denominations and by the municipality—and there is only one municipality now but previously all of the municipalities had to name persons on this authority and the Minister merely or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council appointed the personnel whose names were sent in by the different denominational authorities and the city council over there—just the same as the school boards—Admittedly always the Minister of Education appoints school boards but he does not appoint them as such and such and say, John Jones you are on the school board. The names of the school boards are sent in to the Minister by the denominations concerned, who under

the Act appoints them. That is what is being done here, and I see no harm in it, and I suggest we should get on—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, what the Honourable the Minister of Labour is saying is simply this—because two years ago there was passed this Bill then we cannot make any amendment—He suggests—How can we when we passed it two years ago. He even went as far as to say it was unanimously agreed to by the House—What if it was? What is Parliament for? What is a House of Assembly for? Is it for to make amendments particularly to such legislation that will cause trouble in various communities? I am not talking about Corner Brook or any particular place, I am talking about any local authority area—and you are going to have trouble if appointed people are allowed to tax John Jones and put him in jail if he does not pay the tax, whereas if voter John Jones elected the people on this local authority to collect taxes—if he has to pay taxes he knows it because he elected that authority. There is no reason why you cannot elect a local authority to impose this tax for schols. I am not against taxes for school purposes at all, because we know we have to get money for schools, we have to educate our children and actually we have to get it out of the wage earners and in various other ways, taxes on property, etc.—But I say it ought to be done in the old established way by people who have been elected by the voters. I make this amendment and I will stand by it, and I think I shall live long enough to be able to come back into this House and say—I told you so—because we are going to have all sorts of trouble—

MR. BALLAM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say when I spoke to

this thing I did not mean to suggest to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition it could not be amended, because an amendment is good any time, but not this particular one—because I still say and stand to my guns, I cannot see how an election of this particular nature could be carried out in a city—I am sure what is being done is right and fair for all concerned. Those in authority and the denominations must certainly know who they want on the authority of that sort.

MR. HOLLETT: You do not believe in the old principle do you?

MR. BALLAM: I believe in the democratic principle of elections, yes, when it can be done.

MR. HOLLETT: When it suits you.

MR. BALLAM: Well it suited me perfectly this last eight years—But an election of this nature, no, I don't think it could be conducted, I do not see how it could be—there may be a way—No, I do not know—I was going to say—

MR. HOLLETT: I would not bother my head about it if I were you.

MR. BALLAM: I am bothering my head, and I am certainly not supporting your amendment.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, the position is this—This Bill was brought in at the request of the people of Corner Brook. They asked for it—This House granted it—Recently the people of Corner Brook had an opportunity to show what their opinion was of this Government, of what we had done and of our policy, and they gave us a huge majority in Corner Brook. We have therefore to presume that the people of Corner Brook agree with the

Government policy both with respect to this Act and in other respects. For that reason we intend to stand by the Act.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, you might consider that the good which the Government has done in other respects might outweigh the wrong thing being done in regard to this particular one.

MR. CURTIS: Do you admit that?

MR. BROWNE: No.

As to the question asked in the first place as to why the Government does not give consideration to the question of having an election I do not think there has been an answer given from either side—If the Government had given much consideration to the question of arranging for an election of a School Tax Authority—I believe it would not be beyond the ability of the legal officers of the Crown to advise a very simple method of electing a similar authority.

HON. B. J. ABBOTT (Minister of Supply): Mr. Chairman, I too believe in the principle of taxation with representation—But in this particular case I cannot see, from my knowledge of the Corner Brook situation, and of the enabling legislation for a school tax authority, I cannot see how an election would really work. Now the leaders of the various churches elect their representatives on this school tax authority, the Government passed the legislation setting up the school tax authority, the churches went to their people and asked them who they wanted on that school tax authority and the churches elected

MR. BROWNE: Elected?

MR. ABBOTT: Selected if you will call it.

MR. HOLLETT: They did not elect.

MR. ABBOTT: If they did not elect that is a matter of their own machinery—they did the same thing with school boards. If you ask a church to elect a school board they do not elect they select, and the school boards will come and tax the people as far as fees are concerned. You know that the school boards set the fees for children, what the parents should pay in schools as school fees. Well you may say too that is taxation without representation; because the members of the school boards are selected by the churches.

MR. BROWNE: I do not think that is the same as taxes.

MR. ABBOTT: Not the same as taxes? You have in Grand Falls one school, in Bay Roberts, in Twillingate another scale of fees. They are set by the respective school boards, and it is really a tax.

MR. CURTIS: We are supposed to have free and compulsory education.

On motion of Mr. Chairman, the motion to amend Clause 6 was lost.

MR. HOLLETT: Divide: On division we know how we are going to stand anyway.

On motion Clause 6 carried.

On motion Clause 7, 8, 9 carried.

Clause 10:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, how many are on the authority, can the Minister tell us?

MR. HEFFERTON: At least five, depending upon the various town councils and the school boards in the area.

On motion Clause 10 carried.

On motion Clauses 11 through 18 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Does the authority then distribute the money to the various denominations?—the various denominational school boards?

DR. ROWE: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Can the Minister make any report to this House on any of these budgets?

DR. ROWE: I don't think we have had any reports—My honourable friend will recall I have not been in the Department a full year yet. In actual practice what happens is they are sent in and immediately referred by the Minister to the Council of Education to study. Again, I might say I was out in Corner Brook this winter, in February, and I met all the four superintendents of education—and I refer to Corner Brook because that is the only area in Newfoundland which as yet the authority is working—and I met there with all the four superintendents of education. I met there with all the Boards of Education, every Board of Education in Bay of Islands Area, and on the whole I had the feeling that this whole thing was going very well except for one or two unfortunate things. It is very impressive to see twelve boards of education coming together for the general good. I met with every board in the area, and we had four or five hours together with them—the superintendents were with me—and we were able to iron out points at issue, points of misunderstanding, etc. I propose to do that every year, to go out to these areas, if we can, for two or three or four days and meet with the boards of education and the tax authorities and other bodies there and try to iron

out at first hand rather than to do things at second hand.

I think a large part of the misunderstandings have occurred in the past due to the lack of contact, first-hand contact. Corner Brook is away over there, and in some respects might just as well be on the other side of Canada. It is very difficult—but as I say, we deliberately went out as a body and sat in with them there; and every person and the Chairman of the Roman Catholic Board had questions—and we had a couple of hours session on the various points at issue. I may say that this thing here was discussed by everyone concerned.

MR. HOLLETT: Does that constitute an authority?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, we met with the Boards of Education as well as the Authority. We met with both bodies, and also had separate meetings with the School Tax Authority.

On motion Clauses 19 through 26 carried.

Clause 27.

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman, with reference to Clause 27, this tax is not less than five dollars. In theory there is no limit to it, which seems to me on the part of a body not elected does not appear to be too sound. It seems to me that might be subject to abuse. It could be there may be communities that have limited material from which to draw a school tax authority, and there could possibly be a lot of damage done there.

MR. HOLLETT: I remember last year the story of one woman who had no children attending school. She was a woman well up in years. She had, it is true, considerable property but a very small income. I forget the tax

but believe it was something in the neighbourhood of sixteen hundred dollars, which this woman was supposed to pay to the school tax authority. I take it the Minister would know that particular case. I also know of other cases where the tax was almost prohibitive, under that particular section, and I do not think that has been amended. It says here, "Not less than five dollars." A person can have, as we all know, quite a bit of property and a very small income, and in this particular case I believe this widow woman had to pay a tax of some sixteen hundred dollars. I am not sure about it, but I can see how unfair the tax can react on different people in different categories. I wonder if someone could give us some information on that.

MR. SHEPPARD: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition seems to be looking at me. I do not want to become spokesman for the Commission. I was on that Commission, but was only one, I do not know the name of the lady to which the honourable member refers, but I do recall one instance where we received evidence from a lady who had property on the West Side of Corner Brook, in the area commonly known as "Broadway", which if my memory serves me right, had been appraised by the Government appraiser at somewhere in the vicinity of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars, three quarters of a million dollars. I do recall that this particular lady was a widow; it just might be the same lady. Two parts of this property was rented and the monthly income derived from the two portions of the property alone was seven hundred and fifty dollars per month; her yearly tax ran somewhere around a thousand dollars. Her income was seven hundred and fifty dol-

lars on the property, appraised value of which was seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. The actual value was much more because we found out a good many things during our investigation. For instance it might surprise the House to know that property was sold on Broadway in Corner Brook at a price greater than the equivalent size piece of land has sold in Times Square, New York. There was one piece of land, we actually got the deed of, sold in Times Square, New York, which was less than the sale price for the same piece of land in Corner Brook.

MR. BROWNE: When was the piece of land sold?

MR. SHEPPARD: About two years previous to this sale which happened at Broadway, Corner Brook.

MR. BALLAM: Some place, boy!

MR. SHEPPARD: That was a surprise to me, I might say.

MR. HOLLETT: The Labour Minister is surprised, I think.

MR. SHEPPARD: Probably he does not own a piece of land. But I tell you that happened in actual fact.

Now the representatives of the various school boards are required to put in their budgets by a certain time each year, to the school tax authority. Then the school tax authority adds them all together, and they say, we will need to finance our schools this year in Corner Brook the sum, of say, sixty thousand dollars. They take the assessment rolls and say, the property out there is valued at something like five million dollars.

MR. BROWNE: The widow has a big share of it.

MR. SHEPPARD: She certainly has. I might be wrong on that five million dollars—but say it is five million dollars—then the appraised value will give them the income. Now it could be one per cent, it could be a half of one per cent or it would be three quarters of one per cent, but subject to correction here again, I think last year the rate of taxation for school tax purposes was one-half per cent—one-half of one per cent on the appraised value. Now it could possibly be that this year, if they require, say, one hundred thousand dollars, and the property value had not increased that they would have to be increased to one per cent. The point I want to make is this—and I am afraid I am making it badly—the authority, as we found out, tried to set the rate of taxation in accordance with the needs which had been submitted by the various school boards to the tax authority—and I don't think it is true, but there might be a possibility that it might be abused, as the honourable member for St. John's Centre mentioned; but from our experience in Corner Brook and Deer Lake it certainly was not being abused there. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if the report of our findings were submitted to this House, but if they were not it was a good report, naturally I would think so. It might be of interest to members if they had a copy of that report, because a lot of the questions which are being raised here were covered fully in that report; and I would draw honourable members' attention to that report.

MR. HOLLETT: Did the honourable member find any cases of hardship?

MR. SHEPPARD: Yes, we did find cases of hardship. Since the Leader of

the Opposition raised the question, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to notice in reading this Act that the hardship cases have been covered and are now taken out of the tax field. We recommended amongst other things that widows and old age pensioners or other persons whose income did not exceed a certain figure should not be taxed for school purposes. We also recommended that single persons should not be taxed unless their income reached a certain figure. I notice that has been incorporated in the Act. We also found hardship in instances to which the honourable member for one part of the district out there referred, people from other parts of Humber Arm, for instance, were supporting their own schools by way of school fees and voluntary contributions and working in Corner Brook and being taxed in Corner Brook to support the Corner Brook Schools. We recommended that exemption be granted these people. I am glad to see that has been incorporated.

Another thing that was not generally known, a person who felt aggrieved in this matter could go, or had the right under the regulations or under the Act, I am not sure which, to go to the school tax authority and claim exemption—and we know that in every instance where a person has gone and claimed exemption he has been exempted; and the school tax authority certainly was not being arbitrary about this thing. But unfortunately the mechanics of the thing, probably because it was new, had not been gotten across to the people, and a lot of the people were coming to us and stating things such as, I should have an exemption because I am a widow; because I have had a lot of hospital expenses; because I have not any children going to school; my property

belongs to my son and so forth. I am glad to see the Chairman of the Commission here — to which the Chairman of the Commission invariably replied: "We suggest now that you go down to the school tax authority office and ask for your exemption." I can remember ten or twelve so advised who came back to us later and said—"Thank you very much—if I had only known that I could have saved myself the trouble of coming down and putting my case before this Commission—I did not know I had the right to be exempted." Mr. Chairman, there certainly were not cases of hardship which could not have been alleviated by the person concerned going to the authority. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that probably a copy of that report might be made available to the House.

MR. CURTIS: Actually, Mr. Chairman, I think the report was not only tabled but it was published, circulated and in fact an amendment last year was brought in covering the recommendations that the Commission made. That Commission did a very fine job, and we were glad to bring in the legislation last year embracing all their recommendations.

On motion Clause 28 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: It says not less than five. How is the amount to be taxed arrived at?

MR. CURTIS: I suppose it is done on a percentage basis, five is the minimum.

MR. DUFFY: There is nothing in the Act to restrict the amount, is there?

MR. HOLLETT: This is actually a poll tax. How much may you impose?

MR. HEFFERTON: Five dollars. We have the same wording in the Local Government Act.

On motion Clauses 29 and 30, carried.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it they have all paid their taxes?

DR. ROWE: I would not care to answer that one off hand.

MR. HOLLETT: I know they have not. That is why I asked.

On motion Clause 30 carried.

Clause 31.

MR. BROWNE: I was just going to say, a widow has an exemption of fifteen hundred dollars, and a married person only an exemption of six hundred dollars, why is that? Is that a discrepancy there? Was that a recommendation of the Commission?

DR. ROWE: I have an idea the exemption for widows is actually lower than that.

MR. BALLAM: Yes, it was extended to fifteen hundred. You see a widow or a pensioner may be a property holder and still be exempt from tax on her property and an income up to fifteen hundred dollars—in another case the six hundred dollars would apply.

MR. BROWNE: In other words a married man with an income of six hundred and one dollars is liable to tax. It seems to me the provisions are not worked out very carefully here, a lot is left to the authority itself, as far as the people are concerned.

MR. HOLLETT: As it reads a man earning fifty dollars a month, just over six hundred dollars may be married and have two or three children and

have to get unemployment insurance or get the dole but is still liable under this section to be taxed. I do not think the Government wants that.

MR. CURTIS: Suppose we let the section stand.

On motion Section 31 stand. Section 32 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, there again we have the same thing, the authority meets, five men or whatever it might be, and decides on that school tax. It has not, according to that, to be approved even by the Minister—an unelected body.

MR. ABBOTT: But, Mr. Chairman, I think the budget has to be approved, and the tax is based on the budget.

MR. HOLLETT: I see. It is then brought back to the authority and they just pass the minutes to that effect, I see.

DR. ROWE: In the first instance it has to be the Minister.

On motion Clauses 32 through 36 carried.

Clause 37.

DR. ROWE: That one answers the question asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition a moment ago.

On motion Clauses 38 through 42 carried:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education would be moving an amendment to Section 43 and 44, and they have been circulated—Perhaps this might be a good place to stop for the day, and tomorrow we could start with these two amendments.

Motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, carried:

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole considered the matters to them referred and directs me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received, committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Friday, at 3:00 of the Clock.

FRIDAY, May 10, 1957.

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. W. SMALLWOOD: (Member for Green Bay): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Nippers Harbour. The prayer of the petitioners is to have a nursing station at Nippers Harbour during the winter months. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that Green Bay has a cottage hospital at Springdale, and this hospital well serves the district during the summer months. However, Mr. Speaker, during the winter months, especially on the North Shore of Green Bay, taking in the settlement of Little Arm, Burlington, Nippers Harbour, Indian Burying Place, it is impossible to get to the hospital at Springdale or to the hospital at Baie Verte. These people during the winter time often have to go out over the ice part of the way and part of the way by snow-

mobile. At certain times during the year it is impossible to use boats and it is impossible to get over the ice. I strongly support the prayer of the petitioners and ask that the petition be referred by this House to the Department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for reference to the Department concerned.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

Notices 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 to Authorize the Government of Newfoundland to Enter into a Tax Rental Agreement with the Government of Canada."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Disabled Persons Act, 1954." Also, "An Act Further to Amend the Blind Persons Allowances Act"; also a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Old Age Assistance Act."

Notice of Questions

HON. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on April 1st. (a bad day) I asked a question of the Honourable the Attorney General, to lay on the table of the House the following information. Were the costs in an Action taken last year by the members of the Cabinet against the Evening Telegram a charge on the Public Treasury? If so, what was the amount of said cost? The Honourable the Attorney General at that date indicated he would later give the answer.

MR. CURTIS: I may say, so far no payments have been made — I may be making a statement during the session.

Answers to Questions

QUESTION No. 95:

MR. CURTIS: The Minister is not here, Mr. Speaker, but I think we can assume that the answer is being prepared.

MR. HOLLETT: QUESTION No. 94. I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Welfare would be able to answer that now?

MR. HEFFERTON: No, Mr. Speaker, I am still unable to answer fully — Until I get the full answer I prefer to wait.

Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on the Orders of the Day I would like to ask the Minister of Mines and Resources if it is correct that the policy of his Department is being changed in regard to clearing of land bounties and no assistance is to be given in the clearing of land in the future?

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, that is news to me. As far as I am aware the land bonus policy is not changed in any way.

MR. BROWNE: Any change in the bonus? .

MR. KEOUGH: There has not been since I have been Minister, last July.

MR. BROWNE: Has there been any reduction in the amount of land the Department will clear for any particular person?

MR. KEOUGH: Not as far as I am aware—There is no limit set on the amount of land.

Honourable the Minister of Education asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act."

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

Second reading of Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Grant by the Crown to Dominion Wabana Ore Limited of the Revisionary Interest of the Crown In Certain Lands Now Held Under Lease by That Company."

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, as the title of this Bill indicates it arises out of a request addressed to the Government by the Dominion Wabana Ore Limited to, what is in effect I suppose, convert a lease into a grant. In 1902, the Dominion Iron and Steel Company were leased by the Crown seven parcels of land on Bell Island for a term of ninety-nine years. The leases covered surface rights only and the title to the mineral rights is held by the company under a different title. Subsequently DOSCO (Dominion Steel and Coal Company) acquired the leasehold interest, and in 1949 DOSCO assigned that leasehold interest to Dominion Wabana. Now Dominion Wabana is asking the Crown for a grant of revisionary interest in the seven parcels of land, for these reasons—and if the House will look at the diagram on the back page of this Bill they will be able to relate the reason to the lots concerned as I give them.

Lot 1 is required because four of the company's six magazines are located on this lease. These magazines, so

we are informed, contain an average of five thousand casks of explosives in each building.

MR. BROWNE Mr. Speaker, before the Minister continues I wonder if he would give us an idea of the direction—That is the back of the Island, I think I notice the area points to the North.

MR. KEOUGH: That area, Lot 1, is required for the protection of magazines.

Lot No. 2 is located within the four thousand foot radius which is required for the construction of proper safety measures for the protection of magazine areas also portions of Lot No. 2 have been transferred to employees for building houses.

Lot No. 3, thirty-one company houses were located on this lease, and they have been sold to employees, and many other lots have been transferred to employees for building purposes. Also on this lease there are two schools, one Church of England and one Roman Catholic, and these lots have been sold to the denominations concerned. The remainder of the lot contains buildings in connection with the operation of No. 4 sundry houses, etc., and also required for garage, pipe lines, and electric lines.

Lot No. 4 contains buildings owned by the company as well as other building lots which have been transferred to employees. The remaining portion of the lot is being used for mining operations and contains fire lines, machinery in connection with concentrating ore, water lines in connection with employees also pass through this property and reservoirs and dams and pump houses are also located on this lot.

Lot No. 6 located along which was formerly known as West Tramway, and is required for the water lines from the west dam for the protection of the town of Wabana. Water from this dam is also used for the plant operations.

Lot No. 7 is located over the old works of the Dominion Mine No. 1 and is used for mining purposes. Apparently the overburden has been stripped and the pillars are left in the mine and are being extracted.

I think that it would be generally agreed that the company should have absolute control of the areas in the vicinity of its magazines in order to institute proper safety measures. I think it will be agreed too that areas required for fire protection and the facility of mining operations may also be properly granted to the company. With respect to the areas that are required in connection with the sale of company houses and lots to employees I think that everybody will agree with the desirability of deeding the land to those with houses so that employees may have a freehold title instead of a leasehold title.

The total area of land required is two hundred and fifty-seven acres, three poles and eight perches. Authority is sought in this Bill to grant the Crown Revisionary Interest in the parcels of land in question on terms and conditions to be determined by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the Minister has not seen fit to include in this Bill the terms and conditions under which these lands are going to be conveyed to the company, or rather the revisionary rights

which the Crown possesses why these are going to be conveyed to the company? I understand in some cases the property is occupied by private persons or by churches and schools and in the other cases they are being occupied by the buildings owned by the company itself. Now is there any reason why the Government could not specify exactly in connection with each lot why it is being transferred—When the Minister makes a reply perhaps he would refer to that, because as it stands now there is no consideration no explanation why it is being done.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask why the Bell Island Municipal Council is not mentioned in this particular deed. Have they no rights on the Island; have they not been asked where the powder magazines and housing and sewerage are going? They are not even mentioned in the Bill. Perhaps the Minister might explain that to me.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, personally I am not against the principle of the Bill, but I would like to ask also a question, why this is being done now only fifty-five years after the grant or lease when they still have some forty years to go? I was wondering if the Minister might say why it is being done now.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this thing, we are considering this matter and have been considering it now for a number of years. I understand, Mr. Speaker, the company wanted to alienate some of these lands to people who have bought company houses off them, and they also want to give title to these two churches. We are considering the terms under which we would make them available. Actually we have not yet finally agreed upon the terms.

MR. BROWNE: What is the rental on them now?

MR. CURTIS: One hundred and ninety-seven dollars or two fifty-seven or some such amount. We are considering that but we have made no final decision yet. It will not be less than twenty years purchase, whatever amount we charge—Those of us practicing law in St. John's have gotten into the habit of assuming a twenty years' purchase is a fair price at which to acquire rental, because in St. John's we are bound by the St. John's Municipal Act. That is the price we are considering but we have not made any final decision.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, replying first of all to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the reason it rises at this time, I believe it arose several years ago for the first time, but within the last several months we were asked to bring the matter forward again, by legal counsel for the company to bring the matter if possible to the attention of the House in this session.

In regard to why the terms and conditions are not set out in the Bill, the Attorney General covered that—they have not as yet been determined.

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 Land Development Act."

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, the Expropriation Act presently being considered by the House under another order repeals or provides for the repeal of Sections (5), (6) and (7) of the Land Development Act. Now Section (5) of the Land Development Act in turn provides that the Crown

may acquire all land not being Crown or land to which the provisions of Clause 21 of the agreement itself of the board apply, and the Crown may acquire all land in land development areas by purchase if conditions of terms of purchase can be agreed on between the Minister and all owners, if not then by expropriation. For the information of the House, the Act defines the land development area as an area, village or community established by the Minister by settling persons on the land for the purpose of clearing and cultivating the soil and promoting rural and fishing industries and shall include, where the context so admits, a land settlement already established and roads leading to or from a land development area.

I believe this Land Development Act was passed by the Commission of Government to facilitate the land development programme that they had in hand in the 1930's and on into the 1940's.

In order to collect up all the expropriation clauses in the various Acts and consolidate them in one Act, which the legislature has been proceeding with under this other order, it was necessary to remove section (5) of the Land Development Act. But in removing Section (5) it also removes the power of the Crown to purchase land in development areas, and it is apparently considered desirable to restore that power to the Crown. As to the desirability of restoring power of the Crown to purchase land in land development areas I can only think of one at the moment—as far as the land settlement programme and land settlement undertaken by the Commission of Government are concerned all of these are completed, all settlers have their grants, I understand, and any administration of these settlements by

the Minister of Mines and Resources has ceased. But because these projects have ceased it does not mean there may not necessarily be such projects in the future. I should say there is no such project under consideration for the immediate future—but I remember too the Government set up a Committee of Cabinet Ministers to look into the whole matter of centralization and it is possible that in carrying out the recommendations of that committee on centralization that it may be desirable to perhaps expand an existing land settlement or to institute some new land development scheme. In that event it would be useful to have the powers contained in the Land Development Act and for the Crown to have the right to purchase land in what may be declared a land development area.

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

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this is an unusual Bill giving the Government power to purchase land. Since when did the Government lose power to purchase land. Everyone has power to purchase land—Why pass a specific Act giving them power to do it. This is an extraordinary measure. The Government does so many things we complain about it, it is now getting so timid it is asking authority from the Legislature to purchase land. We have been dealing with Bills to expropriate. We now come down to getting the sanction of the House of Assembly to be able to purchase it.

However, seriously speaking, Mr. Speaker, the Minister made very little reference to the land of Bowaters. In their agreement in 1938, to which Clause 32 (1) of their agreement applies they are not allowed to purchase that is, not allowed to purchase Crown

Land. Now is that not a wonderful provision in a Bill. The Government is not allowed to purchase its own land.

MR. CURTIS: It does not need to purchase its own land.

MR. BROWNE: No, but why put it in a Bill. I don't understand this—It does not seem to make sense to me. I think the Minister should tell us what the land is it is not allowed to purchase in Bowaters Newfoundland Act 1938.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter—The Minister says it is apparently not desirable now to introduce this amendment. I wonder if the Minister in replying would state the reasons why it is not desirable to do so. He merely says it is apparently not desirable I would like to have some explanation on that. I know very little about this thing, and I certainly take my honourable friend's opinion that it is one worthy of consideration. I notice the Crown may purchase all lands not being Crown Land—I take it that is some land which apparently was granted under the land development scheme which the Government may desire to purchase back. I don't know whether that is correct or not. I wonder if the Minister could clear up both these points for me.

MR. SPEAKER: I might at this time point out again, when a Minister who moves the second reading of a Bill rises and replies no other member can then speak.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, replying first of all as to why I used the word "apparently" it is desirable to restore the power of the Crown to purchase land in land development areas, I used that word—the legislation does not arise in my Department and

I am told by the legal Department of the Government it was desired. I don't know what specific reason other than the one I gave, that at a future date it may be possible the Government may launch upon a land development scheme and it may be useful to have the power there then.

The Crown has the right under the schedule of that Act, 1938, to acquire land from Bowaters at thirty cents an acre subject to certain conditions. If the Government shall at any time be desirous of acquiring any vacant land belonging to the company for the purpose of building, making or erection of railways, roads, bridges or public buildings or for agricultural settlements in pursuance of Government reconstruction policy. This Act was passed, I believe around the time the Commission of Government embarked on a land settlement scheme. "The Company shall (subject to all requisite consents of the trustees of the Company's mortgage bonds and debentures for the time being and others the mortgagees (if any) for the time being of the areas involved having been first obtained) convey such lands to the Government and the Government shall pay therefore in the case of unimproved lands at the rate of thirty cents per acre and in the case of improved lands fair and reasonable compensation to be agreed upon between the parties, and if not agreed upon to be settled by arbitration as hereinafter provided."

MR. BROWNE: Why is it expected in this Bill now?

MR. CURTIS: We can tell you that in Committee.

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

Motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on various Bills, carried.

On motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Clarke, Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

A Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Issue of a Grant of a Piece of Land to Reid Newfoundland Company Limited in Exchange for a Part of Reid Lot 97."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I think there are a couple of amendments to this Bill, because in one of the schedules there are two pieces of land and not one.

On motion clauses 1 and 2 carried.

Clause 3:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the second line of Section 3 should read "pieces of land" make it plural, and there is an amendment on the top of the next page "forming parts of Reid Lot 97," instead of "part."

On motion Clause 3 as amended carried.

Schedule (a) as amended carried.

MR. CURTIS: I don't think I would call them amendments really but corrections.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill with some amendments, carried.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Penitentiary Act."

On motion Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2:

MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman, I would like a little information here—

"for confinement of persons ordered to be imprisoned for debt." Is there any such thing?

MR. CURTIS: That is carried over from the old-time laws. There was a time when they had a man imprisoned for debt.

MR. HOLLETT: Does that apply to the Government going in debt?

MR. CURTIS: No, because the Government is not a person.

On motion Clause 2 carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Expropriation of Land."

On motion Clauses 1 through 3 carried.

Clause 4:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, there was something I wanted to ask about Section 4: Land may be expropriated for construction, repairing and maintenance of public walks and roads, etc. "When in the opinion of the Minister it is necessary to acquire land for any of the purposes described in Section 4, and the owner of the land or any person having an interest in it refuses to accept such sum of money taxes the Minister or the authority on whose behalf the land is to be acquired, offered for the purchase of the land; (b) no agreement can be reached on the amount to be paid for the land or on any other terms of the purchase of the land; (c) the owner of the land is not known to the Minister or cannot be found by the Minister after reasonable enquiry; (d) the owner of the land is incapable of conveying the land or his

interest in it; or (e) for any other reason the Minister deems it advisable to expropriate land the Minister may (f) without the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, etc., and (g) with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, etc., and in accordance with this Act expropriate the land on behalf of Her Majesty in Right of Newfoundland or on behalf of the authority named in the notice of expropriation."

Why in one case do you have the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and not in the other? Then—"Land may be expropriated for (a), (b) and (c) the establishment or development of any industrial enterprise by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council under the Industries Act or for any purpose incidental or related thereto or for the purpose of assisting in or encouraging the establishment or development of any industrial enterprise by any other person for any purpose incidental or related thereto."

"(d) the carrying on of any undertaking under the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority Act, 1954, or for any purpose incidental or related thereto or for the purpose of assisting or encouraging the establishment or development or any fishing enterprise by any person or for any purpose incidental or related thereto; (e) the establishment or development of a land development area under the Land Development Act."

Why there do you not have to have the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

MR. CURTIS: I would think, Mr. Speaker, the reason is very obvious.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not so obvious to me.

MR. CURTIS: If the Minister of Public Works wanted a piece of land to widen a road anywhere in Newfoundland it would certainly be ridiculous to come back and ask for permission to expropriate a hundred feet of land here and another hundred somewhere else; likewise around public buildings. These are so obvious they should not need authority from the Lieutenant-Governor in Council for each item, whereas the other items are items that are other than that. I think it is understood the Minister of Public Works may need land for enlarging a building and may need land anywhere in public works involving roads; but when he goes outside that territory he has to come back and ask the Government—I think that is reasonable.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, I understand now.

MR. CURTIS: Only when a question of policy is involved is the Minister required to come back to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, when it is routine he obviously can handle it on his own.

On motion Clause 4 carried.

Clause 5. On motion Clause 5 carried.

Clause 6 read:

6.—(1) The Minister may be a person duly authorized by him for the purpose ascertain and delimit the land to be expropriated and for that purpose the person so authorized may enter upon any land and do any work necessary in the opinion of that person to ascertain and measure and obtain or prepare a plan and description of the land to be expropriated.

(2) No action lies against the Minister or any other person for any loss or damage suffered by any person arising out of anything done under subsection (1) and any claim for damages arising out of anything done under subsection (1) shall, for purposes of payment of compensation under this Act, be deemed to be a claim for injurious affection.

MR. HOLLETT: I definitely need an explanation on that. In the first place I don't like the section: Under section (1) The Minister may by a person duly authorized by him for the purpose ascertain and delimit the land to be expropriated and for that purpose the person so authorized may enter upon any land and do any work necessary in the opinion of that person to ascertain and measure and obtain or prepare a plan and description of the land to be expropriated—and then in (2) No action lies against the Minister or any other person for any loss or damage suffered by any person arising out of anything done under subsection (1) shall, for purposes of payment of compensation under this Act be deemed to be a claim for injurious affection.

I do not think that is right. I think if the Minister sends somebody in on my land and in the course of the occupancy of the land does me some injury or damage I should have recourse to law or recourse in some way to satisfy me—but this completely absolves the Minister from any damage which may be done by any person whom he sends in on my land. I wonder if I could have an explanation of that and also of the words "injurious affection."

MR. CURTIS: The word "affection" is of course not the usual word my honourable friend understands by affection. That clause is really neces-

sary because my honourable friend knows, Mr. Chairman, that very frequently people make fictitious claims when anybody goes on their land for any purpose; and although the Act does not exonerate the Minister in any event I am absolutely sure no Government would stand by and see anybody injured by anybody who goes on land but any claims that are made are generally of a trifling nature and are more of an obstructionist nature than real. Then again that would only take effect if the Government did not expropriate. If they did expropriate they would take the land. These are identical clauses from existing legislation with no changes at all. I can assure my honourable friend and assure the House there is no change in this. Now as to the second part of this—"No action lies against the Minister or any other person for any loss or damage, etc." When land is taken by anyone the owner loses that portion of land but that land may have such relation to the remaining part of land as to damage other land by reason of it having been taken—In other words the taking of a small piece of land may seriously impair the value of the remaining land—and that is covered by the term "injurious affection"—It is only fair that he should be compensated. For instance you might take only ten feet of land from a man, but it may seriously mar all his property—If you have a building lot of one hundred by one hundred and something and somebody takes twenty feet of it, well twenty feet is only so much but then the other eighty feet may not be sufficient to build the type of house you are planning to build, therefore the damage to the remaining portion would be termed "injurious affection" and you would get compensation for the general damage you sustained.

MR. HOLLETT: As I understand it then there is no point in my claiming for compensation for damage suffered by me by any person the Minister may send on my land but I may claim for injurious affection?

MR. CURTIS: There is no claim for damage just for a person walking on it and measuring it—In other words before you take a piece of land you have to file your regular expropriation notice, and to do that you must have the measurements necessary. This really envisages the survey, going in and measuring it.

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I might ask the Attorney General this—This is entirely a Government Bill but in case of expansion of the city or other municipalities would the expropriation of property still have to go through the long process of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

MR. CURTIS: I think that is covered by the Municipal Act and this Act does not affect it.

On motion Clause 6 carried.

On motion Clauses 7 through 13 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Referring to Section 14, subsection (2), Mr. Chairman, I notice this section gives a magistrate the authority to settle these—Under the Summary Jurisdiction in disputes arising over ownership of land. I was wondering, Sir, what effect this has on the Summary Jurisdiction Act.

MR. CURTIS: A magistrate has certain power under the Act but under any other Act we can extend that, and one provision of this Act is to extend the powers of the magistrate in these particular cases.

In motion Clause 14 through 21 carried.

Clause 22 carried.

On motion the Committee recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Chairman resumed the Chair.

Clause 23 read:

23—(1) A board has the same power to enforce attendance of witnesses and to compel them to give evidence and to produce documents as is vested in a court of law in civil cases.

(2) An arbitrator may for the purpose of this Act administer oaths and take affirmations.

Clause 23 carried.

On motion Clauses 24 through 26 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, the board may in addition to assessing the value of the land expropriated, try all questions of law and fact does that presuppose magistrates or judges on the board?

MR. CURTIS: That, Mr. Chairman, shows what I discussed on second reading when I said this is a board of arbitrators and not of assessors. In the past assessors only assessed the amount. The arbitrators not only assess the amount they decide who is to get it; and, as I said, the court is available to them. They can state their case in the court. Either party can apply to the court—either party can appeal. It provides a way of having intelligent men determine that without the expense of a court case, if at all possible.

MR. HOLLETT: Is it not strange to have ordinary individuals determining matters of law?

MR. CURTIS: It is. But it just means you are going to try to have a higher intellectual standard—perhaps we can use some of the ex-magistrates.

On motion Clauses 27 through 36 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Under Clause 37 there is "(v) under any disability"—I wonder if the Minister could explain that?

MR. CURTIS: That would mean the owner might be under age; he might be in the mental hospital or he might even be in jail or be bankrupt—It just means "not available and competent to act."

MR. HOLLETT: Surely there would be someone to represent him in such case.

MR. CURTIS: Does it not say so?

On motion Clauses 37 through 57 carried.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the schedule there has been a slight error. Might I read some amendment which the Honourable Minister of Welfare is going to move? I think they have gotten the number of the statutes wrong. Provincial Parks is "49." They have "33." The Slum Clearance Act is Chapter 86. They have No. "49." It is just the printers gone haywire. These are just printers' errors, corrections.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill with some amendment, carried.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act, 1956."

On motion Clauses 1 through 12 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I have a question mark there for some reason or another. Oh yes, the estimate by the Council of the value or magnitude as estimated by the council of business done by the operator is

final and the amount of the business tax fixed under this sub-paragraph shall not be more than one thousand dollars—it ends up with a but, but what comes after “but”?

MR. CURTIS: If my honourable friend would refer to the original Act, 1956, he will notice that the subsection (2) has been deleted. In other words by deleting subsection (2) and (1) and then at the end add the word “but,” “the Minister may by order direct that the council shall fix the business tax imposed under this section as a percentage of the assessed value, if any or all of the classes of real property used by every operator in carrying on business trade, etc.”

MR. HOLLETT: It does not make sense—Could we have it stand?

Motion that Clause 13 stand. Carried.

On motion Clauses 14 through 22 carried.

On motion the Committee reverted to Clause 13.

MR. CURTIS: It is a clumsy way of doing it—I would prefer to amend the whole section instead of trying to amend subsection (a). It is all right but it is clumsy.

MR. HOLLETT: Now that that is cleared up a little bit can anybody tell me—is there no recourse whatsoever—It says here—the value or magnitude of the business done is final and the amount of the business tax fixed—In other words there is no appeal.

MR. HEFFERTON: There is no appeal in all of them.

MR. HOLLETT: I am talking about the tax they may impose under this Act, up as high as a thousand

dollars, and there is no appeal whatsoever as far as I can see.

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps we might have that section stand, Mr. Chairman, and see if there is an appeal from that section.

MR. HEFFERTON: I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, the objection raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is covered, as you can see, in the very first part of subsection (1).

MR. CURTIS: Where does the appeal come in? I think we ought to just check up on what clause the appeal lies under.

Motion, that Clause 13 stand, carried.

Motion, that the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again, carried.

A Bill, “An Act to Confirm to United Towns Electric Company Limited Certain Rights and Powers.”

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried.

A Bill, “An Act to Consolidate and Amend the Law Relating to the Raising of Local Taxes for Schools.”

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, we have an amendment to Clauses 43 and 44. Perhaps we could pass on to Clause 45 while waiting for the Minister to come in.

On motion Clauses 45 through 47 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on Clause 48, I rather regret it is there, particularly in view of the fact this is the School Tax Act we are on, in view of the fact that taxes will be im-

posed by an appointed authority rather than an elected one, I think it is rather extreme to put in a section such as Section 48—any person who fails to pay any tax which he is liable to pay in accordance with this Act is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding fourteen days or to both such fine and imprisonment and each day's continuance of the failure to pay constitutes a separate offence. Now I feel quite sure that the Government is going to have all sorts of trouble under that particular section. If, as I say, the tax has been imposed by an elected body rather than an appointed one I could well see why we would have it then, but in view of the fact the tax is imposed by an appointed body to allow the person to be sent to jail due to the fact he is unable to pay the taxes seems to me to be rather terrible.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, that is provided for under another clause—Clause 42—Mr. Chairman, may I revert to Clause 42 for the purpose of explaining. "Whenever an Authority feels that any exemption from the School Tax or of the interest thereon, in whole or in part, is desirable, the Authority may upon the unanimous vote of its members present at a meeting represent to the Minister that the exemption or remission it may be granted but subject to such conditions as the Minister may impose."

MR. HIGGINS: Why unanimous vote—Suppose someone does not like the unfortunate person in question.

DR. ROWE: We are dealing, Mr. Chairman, with a very delicate set up where you have denominational representation and where you have al-

so the municipality represented as well—My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition will be glad to know this, I am sure—I am not referring to my honourable friend's question now—I went this morning, with the Deputy Minister and appropriate Officers in the Department, if I might refer to it again, the six hundred dollar exemption as opposed to sixteen hundred. Now in the previous Act originally everybody came under the six hundred dollar ceiling, that is that everybody who had an income of six hundred dollars had to pay—and representation was made to the authority and to the Department on the score that this imposed a hardship on widows and on pensioners in particular—so with the request of the authority and with the consent of all the parties concerned and approval this amendment was put in exempting widows and pensioners whose income was under fifteen hundred dollars a year. But there was no demand to have the other six hundred dollar ceiling changed for general application. On the other hand this clause to which I refer, Clause 42, does provide the way out because in cases of hardship—and after all those people are made up and they would be the representatives of the Church of England Boards selected by the Church of England in Bay of Islands; the nominees of the Bishop of St. George's; representatives of the Salvation Army etc. I am quite sure they would have to be reasonable persons, and I do not think they would get away with capricious nor arbitrary tactics if hardship was involved. At any rate this section 42 provides the way out. If section 42 was not in there I would myself feel very seriously about it, I would agree with my honourable friend there and his colleague yester-

day, but Section 42 does provide a way out in most cases; and I cannot visualize an authority even if it is not elected taking an arbitrary action against any person because he failed to pay his tax because he did not have the money to pay it—I cannot visualize that—I do not think that authority would last twenty-four hours. I don't think the religious leaders in Bay of Islands would allow such an authority to remain. I can only say; in general terms this matter was gone into most thoroughly, examined from every standpoint and the general consensus was that it would not work, the election could not be made to work.

MR. HOLLETT: I quite understand what the Honourable Minister said, but here you have a school tax authority which is not elected but appointed and has power to assess and to tax up to any amount, I think up to a thousand dollars in one section there, and the only appeal that appeals a person thus taxed is to come back to that authority and say—I cannot pay that—I am a widow or this that and the other thing, the same authority which in the original place imposed the tax and indeed asked for a summons from the magistrate for a person not paying it; and the person has to come back to that tax authority to look for a revision of the said tax. Now the Honourable Minister says he does not think such an authority would get away with it if they did anything which was a hardship on John Jones or Bill Smith—but we have no proof of that whatsoever—What I would like to see in this case or in any case where tax is imposed and the person on whom it is imposed feels he has a grievance or is subject to hardship he ought to be able to appeal to some body such as the Magistrates' Court or the Supreme Court

or a Judge thereof and have the case heard. Now if, as I say, the body were elected by the people I would not be so keen on it, but in this particular case I do think there ought to be some recourse for the people thus taxed before he is sent to jail. I must advise that because I know you are going to have trouble—and I shall not say any more on it.

DR. ROWE: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, and I think the Honourable the Acting Premier agrees, the point raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is one should be gone into a little more—Perhaps we should let that point stand until we have a chance to examine it.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you!

Motion, that Clause 48 stand, carried.

On motion Clauses 49 through 54 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words in Section 55—they can appoint a substitute to represent them in the courts.

MR. CURTIS: That is rather convenient, Mr. Chairman, as long as it is a person who knows the facts. It is not fair to drag the Chairman in—I mean the Chairman may be the Bishop or a leader of one of the churches. I think it is only fair to have it one of the Officers.

On motion 54 through 56 carried.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments to Clause 43, and I will ask the Honourable Minister of Education to explain.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the wording of this is very complicated, it's done by the several lawyers. It seems to be quite a common disability

of lawyers that they cannot write things plainly. I am satisfied however that I can explain the principle at stake here—Under the old arrangement the money had to be distributed according to the enrollment which was made at the end of the school year. The fact of the matter is that last year a regional high school was set up in Corner Brook and that came into being in September, opened its doors in September. That meant that the children who were in some of the elementary schools belonging to the boards making up part of that were counted twice, i.e. in the elementary schools where they had, say in June last year a claim for them, but that left the regional high school, if the elementary board got credit no opportunity to claim on behalf of the children they had in high school in September and who have been there ever since. Now I suppose it was the local arrangement, but when they discovered it the combined boards met and the school tax authority met and they had the lawyers to work on it, and then they contacted the Department of Education and the lawyers in the Attorney General's Department and between them they asked unanimously to have Sections 43 and 44 scrapped completely and to have these new sections 43 and 44 put in. This revision would then make it possible for them to work out at their end an arrangement, an equitable arrangement, whereby both boards concerned would be recompensated from the fund which was collected—That is what these two clauses are designed to do—

MR. SHEPPARD: Mr. Chairman, Clause 44—Subsection (2) that would appear to me to include kindergarten children in schools of less than four classrooms. Is that the intention? If that is the intention I wonder if the

Minister is aware that certain denominations have now changed their policy in respect to elementary schools in that they are building separate schools for children under Grade VI or including Grade VI and under—I know of a particular instance in my district where they have now built the school, they have to take in Grade VI and under, which will only be a three-room school, and in that school they are going to have their elementary pupils including kindergarten—I do not think there is any possibility that area would soon become a tax area, but if it should become a tax area then that school will not receive any payment from the authority for kindergarten children. I was wondering if the Minister was aware of it—I refer to the Church of England where they have now gone into the policy of building separate schools up to Grade VI.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, for that matter I wonder if we could let things stand for the present and if we find there is merit or some practical merit in the suggestion we could revert back after third reading.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, I might point out that that is covered, that under the Education Act there is no provision for payment of children under six years of age, unless certain conditions are fulfilled, and that is kindergarten classes with certified teachers in order to take care of that work.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I do not know the exact details, but it is tied up with the size of the schools. In big schools, let us say like St. Bon's and St. Michael's and Curtis Academy they could have kindergarten classes as such and children under a certain age won't be counted.

On motion Clauses 43 and 44 as amended carried.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, Section 31 was allowed to be held up because of what appeared to be discrimination—I think yesterday none of us knew because we had not come to Section 42 giving the authority the way out. You could visualize a case where a family man in that area had a total income of only six hundred dollars a year and failed to pay the school tax—Then obviously the authority would invoke Section 42, and certainly somebody on his behalf, a clergyman or some friend of his, would certainly request the authority to invoke that section—That is what it is there for.

On motion Clause 31 carried.

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, we could revert now to the Local Government Act, Section 13—As I have already pointed out in conversation with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition the Act for last year, the section immediately preceding takes care of that particular matter, and there is provision made for it.

On motion Clause 13 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

A Bill, "An Act Relating to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association."

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for St. John's East raised the point of the use of the word "negligence" under Section 14—and I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition raised the point there, and I think it was a good one, that it would be a serious matter if a teacher could be expelled for every criminal

offence. I think somebody on this side referred to the matter of a man driving a car along a road and could have an accident, which could be a criminal offence, yet nevertheless would not justify his being expelled. I went into that with the lawyers, and with other people in the Department of Education. However these things were established and they all felt we should not change it for this reason (1) you will notice the council "may." Now we are speaking here of the Council of Newfoundland Teachers' Association—To start with the council would be a very important body comprising certainly the most respected and best known teachers in the Province. For instance on the present council you have the principal of one of the biggest Anglican Schools in the city; you have St. Patrick's Hall principal and the principal of Macpherson Academy and so on. They are highly respected and very sensible people—and notice—the council "may"—It is their discretion—it is not "shall" but "may." Now first of all on serious matters involving discipline the whole council would certainly meet and certainly give very serious deliberations to it—Secondly, here too is another safeguard elsewhere in the Act it provides that all by-laws relating to discipline must be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. So that we have here a second control—I suggested to the lawyers we might put in the word "serious" and they said it might only create complications. They would be up against the matter of defining a serious criminal offence. They said the use of the word "may" and the fact that it has to be referred to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council anyway and the fact that the council itself will be made up of sensible men, we must assume, and men with a high sense

of duty, there seems to be adequate protection there.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied!

On motion Clause 14 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I could refer to Clause 5 in connection with its relationship to Clause 18—Have these clauses been passed? If you will notice, Mr. Chairman, in Clause 5 the Newfoundland Teachers' Association may fix and collect annual fees paid by the members, and if you turn forward to Clause 18 it says the Minister may cause to be deducted from the money payable by the Crown to members of the association whether directly or indirectly, the amount of annual fee payable by that member to the Association and shall cause any amount so deducted to be paid over to the Association—In other words a teacher on becoming a teacher automatically becomes a member of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association.

DR. ROWE: But he can write himself out.

MR. CURTIS: Automatically—but he can contract himself out—

DR. ROWE: All he has to do is state in writing he does not wish to be a member and he is no longer a member.

MR. HOLLETT: What happens to him then?

DR. ROWE: He is a teacher but does not have to pay the dues of the Association.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words it is a way out—Thank you!

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the House I would like to revert to Clause 20.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 20 is still standing in this Bill.

DR. ROWE: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that practice has been in force for many years, that practice of deducting fees. That was at the request of the teachers themselves—A teacher living in White Bay or some place like that, found it an awful nuisance wait to get his check and get a money order sent in; and perhaps would miss an issue of the magazine, or miss out on something—so that it was at the request of the teachers at the Teachers' Convention that membership dues were to be deducted at the source.

MR. HOLLETT: I still don't like it.

MR. HIGGINS: Like it or lump it, it is going through.

On motion Clause 20 carried.

Motion that the Committee report havin passed this Bill without amendment carried.

A Bill, "An Act to Provide Assistance for Teachers by Way of Loans For Certain Purposes."

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 2(e) the honourable and learned member for St. John's South drew our attention to the wording in the definition "teacher" means a person who holds a valid certificate or licence granted by a Board of Examiners constituted under the Education (Teacher Training) Act, Chapter 102 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, and is engaged in teaching a school in the province that is conducted by a Board of Education.

He pointed out there that if a teacher were at the university and he wished to continue on for another year at the university and wished to borrow from this fund, he might be prohibited by virtue of this definition. I agreed with him in fact and I think others agreed too; although some of the legal people we consulted seem to think everything was all right. Nevertheless I was not happy about it, and I do not think the Honourable the Attorney General was happy about it either. We are bringing in a revision of that definition to make absolutely sure a man or woman is not penalized simply because he or she happened to be at the university when he or she makes application for a loan.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment, "and includes any persons who hold such certificates or licences and are attending a course in teachers' training at the Memorial University of Newfoundland or any other institution approved for the purpose by the Minister." That would have the effect of making absolutely sure any teacher who happened to be in a university at the time of making an application for a loan would be protected.

On motion Clauses as amended carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill with some amendment carried.

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Chairman, the Committee rise and report these Bills, and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole considered

Bills, "An Act Relating to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association," A Bill, "An Act to Confirm to United Towns Electric Company Limited Certain Rights and Powers," A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Social Assistance Act, 1954," A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act, 1956," A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Penitentiary Act," A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Bill of Sales Act, 1955," and directs me to report same without amendment.

On motion report received, Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and considered Bills, "An Act to Provide Assistance For Teachers By Way of Loans for Certain Purposes," and A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Expropriation of Land," A Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Issue of a Grant of a Piece of Land to Reid Newfoundland Company Limited in Exchange for a Part of Reid Lot 97," and directed me to report having passed same with some amendment.

On motion report received, Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act."

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, the Government has decided not to proceed any further with this Bill, and I move that the order be discharged and

the Bill removed from the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the unanimous wish of the House that this be allowed. By the unanimous consent of the House the motion that the order be discharged and the Bill be removed from the Order Paper, carried.

MR. CURTIS: I believe, Mr. Speaker, the Orders of the Day have been completed and it is therefore unnecessary to order anything deferred.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the University will be observing the annual convocation; and I am sure many of the members in the House would like to be present on that occasion, and because of that I am moving that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at 3:00 of the clock.

Motion, that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 of the clock, carried.

—
WEDNESDAY, May 15, 1957.

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

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, last Sunday the Honourable the Premier was happily enjoying the company of his family and some close relatives at "Russwood" on Roache's Line. Besides Mrs. Smallwood the party included his son, Ramsey Smallwood, Ramsey's wife, Florence, and their four young children, also Mrs. Morrow, the twin sister of Mrs. Ramsey Smallwood.

During the morning a new helicopter, purchased by Eastern Provincial Airlines, and primarily acquired for

the humane purpose of transporting the sick for hospitalization, was flown from St. John's to Roache's Line so that its suitability for this purpose might be demonstrated to the Premier.

A test flight was arranged and Mr. and Mrs. Ramsey Smallwood and Mrs. Morrow agreed to accompany the pilot for the demonstration. The tragedy that happened is too vivid in all our memories to need recounting here. When it is realized that the Premier and Mrs. Smallwood were destined to witness at close range the destruction of this aircraft carrying their eldest child, and the mother and aunt of their four cherished grandchildren, it can be more readily imagined than described what a terrible shock they received. The fact that the mother perished with the pilot, while their son suffered injuries, which until this morning were listed as "critical," has made life for them during these past few days a hideous nightmare.

I know that the people of Newfoundland, in whose hearts the Premier occupies such a unique place, would wish that we here express their, as our own deepest sympathy with him and with Mrs Smallwood and Mr. and Mrs. Phineas Boone of Botwood, Mrs. Wass, the widow, and the family of the pilot and all other bereaved by this tragedy, and we join with the many thousands of their friends outside of Newfoundland and in prayer that Christ whose mission it was on earth to heal the sick and give sight to the blind will in His Divine Providence comfort the bereaved and bless the efforts being made to restore the injured to health.

I move, Mr. Speaker, that the Clerk be instructed to convey these our feelings to the Honourable the Premier

and Mrs Smallwood and the others bereaved.

HON. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in rising to second and support the motion so sympathically put by the Honourable the Attorney General and Acting Premier, I say it is with a great feeling of sympathy and regret that we on this side of the House join the Government in the deep feeling of sorrow and sadness, which must, undoubtedly, include the whole of Newfoundland, over this terrible tragedy which suddenly came upon our, if you like, political horizon. Times of death, Sir, bring us all closer together but in a tragic death such as witnessed at Roche's Line, "Russwood" Farm, a few days ago it must of necessity demand from us all a feeling of kindness, and a feeling of kindness from everybody in Newfoundland, towards those who have suffered in such a tragic manner. Therefore, Sir, we on this side of the House would wish to join with the Acting Premier, the Attorney General, in conveying to the relatives of the deceased, as well as to the Honourable the Premier and Mrs. Smallwood and their family, our deep-

est regret, our sorrow and to express to them our feeling of kindness in their deep hour of tragedy which has clouded their lives. There is no necessity for me to mention names and places. Not only of them, I believe, but to the whole of Newfoundland will go out a certain sympathy upon this terrible thing which has happened and which undoubtedly must affect the life of the Premier of this Province and his family.

We join wholeheartedly, Sir, with the Acting Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: The Clerk will be instructed to convey the sincere sympathy of this House, as expressed by the Honourable the Attorney General and by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, to the Honourable the Premier and Mrs. Smallwood and to the relatives of the deceased upon this terrible tragedy.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 of the Clock.

On motion the House then adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, May 20th, at 3:00 of the Clock.