

big source of revenue.

**Mr. Newell** There is no need to attempt to refute anything said about the Tourist Board. We are all in perfect agreement about that. What I am concerned about is the subject matter of this report. I feel in some cases it is a bit vague. Apart from registering our indignation at certain things, I find myself listening to this motion that we rise and report progress and I ask myself, how much progress? I feel it is not even open to debate that tourist trade is an economic value to the country. We must assume that everyone knows that. I think it is pertinent to enquire how much money should we spend on it. What do we find in the report? To use their own words, "We are convinced that the travel trade has within it the possibility of becoming one of this country's most profitable and most considerable economic resources." It is too vague. I hope when we consider this report again some consideration will be given to the financial side of it. How much do we want any government to undertake, and how much should we leave for private enterprise? Is it going to be private enterprise or free enterprise or social enterprise? That is the question we have to decide. It is a serious question and we should give it some thought.

Apart from that I have no cause to disagree with anything that has been said, except in this one other instance. The report does not say on whose authority they based their information. I am not trying to compare the attitude of the government as against the attitude of the Tourist Board, but I wondered if the government was asked their viewpoint on the matter. I am not particularly concerned about their viewpoint, but reverting back to something you said, Mr. Chairman, before you became Chairman, about our sitting here as a bench of judges, it seems to me necessary that before we pass judgement on any matter of policy we should get both sides of the story; maybe the Committee satisfied itself on that point, but I would like to know....

I am inclined to disagree with Mr. Smallwood when he says that we should try and get certain things or thoughts across to the people of Newfoundland. I think the presence of microphones may incline him to that thought. What I am concerned is with facts that will aid us in our deliberations a little later on.

**Mr. Smallwood** I hate to disagree with Mr.

Newell on anything because usually I agree with what he says. The point about getting information across to the people — I feel strongly about that. We are 45 men whose job it is to gather all the information we can get and on the basis of that information make up our minds on what kind of government we will recommend. But when we have done that, a much bigger choice has got to be made, and that is by the people of Newfoundland. I feel that the people are even much more entitled to get this information than we are — they need it more than we do.

**Mr. Newell** I was not criticising our putting information over to the public. I am sorry if you misunderstood me there. I understood your remark to be in connection with making the people tourist conscious, and I do not think that is necessary as the people are already tourist conscious.

**Mr. Butt** It must be shown that we have to spend money in order to get money. That is of primary importance. I do not want to put myself in the position of defending the government, but by having Gander, people are getting value in dollars and cents. If we spend \$500,000 as a deficit, we get back \$1 million in wages; therefore the country has benefited by \$500,000.

**Mr. Smallwood** If it costs one million and we get one million, are we then square? Does one cancel out the other?

**Mr. Butt** How much money have we got out and how much do we hope to get back? That is of primary importance. We should find out what money they are going to have to find and what they are going to get back to make themselves more self-supporting.

**Mr. Northcott** I think the amount asked for was \$2 million — \$200,000 a year over a period of ten years. After a year or two if it worked, it would be increased. If they had gotten that when they asked for it, we would have a big tourist trade in Newfoundland.

**Mr. Hollett** I do not see the logic of Mr. Butt's argument with regard to Gander — paying \$1 million to civil servants and going in the hole another million! Getting back to the other point under discussion — the information which Mr. Newell wanted — I do not see how the Committee could have gotten all the facts in regard to possible expenditure; and as to making an estimate as to cost, the most it could have been