

*Inquiries of the Ministry***NAILS****INQUIRY AS TO PRODUCTION AND EXPORTS**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. H. E. Brunelle (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, I gave notice to the Minister of Trade and Commerce of the question I now propose to ask. Is the shortage of nails in Canada due to our exports? If we do export nails, I should like to know in what quantities and to what countries.

**Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce):** The production of nails last year from Canadian steel was 1,656,720 kegs as against 1,546,490 kegs in 1947, an increase of about 110,000 kegs. All these nails were distributed in Canada.

**Mr. Fraser:** Under priorities, most of them.

**Mr. Howe:** Do you want to answer this question? It is difficult for a minister to answer a question about nails when we have a specialist in nails in the house. There was one Canadian operation which was simply a conversion process. A company was given the right to bring in United States wire to be converted into nails, and to export the product. That operation provided 59,940 kegs, part of which were exported, as follows:

|                    | kegs   |
|--------------------|--------|
| Newfoundland ..... | 238    |
| Honduras .....     | 690    |
| Venezuela .....    | 42     |
| U.S.A. ....        | 36,040 |

Therefore of the roughly 60,000 kegs made from United States steel under the conversion agreement, about 20,000 kegs remained in Canada and the remainder were exported under the agreement.

**Mr. Adamson:** Were they all steel nails, or were some of them aluminum nails?

**Mr. Howe:** Steel nails.

**Mr. H. W. Timmins (Parkdale):** If I may ask a supplementary question, the minister has stated that the production of nails will be expedited in much the same fashion it was expedited last year. I should like to ask just when that expedited production will begin. Will it be in March, or April?

**Mr. Howe:** As my hon. friend knows, the production of nails in Canada is limited by the capacity of Canada to produce wire from which nails are made. Last year, during the period June to October, there was a diversion of wire from fencing into the manufacture of nails. That diversion is to be repeated this year, but it will start one month earlier and extend to the same termination date. In other words there will be an extra month during which wire ordinarily used for fencing will be diverted to the manufacture of nails.

[Mr. Pearson.]

**Mr. Timmins:** From May?

**Mr. Howe:** From May 1 to October 31.

**FISHERIES****REGULATIONS WITH RESPECT TO CANNING OF LOBSTERS**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. W. Chester S. McLure (Queens):** I know the Minister of Fisheries is waiting to answer this question, notice of which I sent him this morning. Is it the intention of the department to permit the canning of lobsters at any time of the year, provided that the lobsters are legally taken from any areas open to fishing?

**Hon. R. W. Mayhew (Minister of Fisheries):** The hon. gentleman was kind enough to give me notice of his question. The department now has under consideration the matter of amending the regulations under the Meat and Canned Foods Act to permit the canning of lobsters which may have been legally taken at any time of the year.

**HOUSING****NIAGARA PENINSULA—ADVANCES TO PRIVATE CONTRACTORS**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. N. J. M. Lockhart (Lincoln):** Will the responsible minister or parliamentary assistant try to get me an answer to question No. 14 on the order paper with regard to housing in the Niagara peninsula? When it was called the other day it was allowed to stand. I am anxious to get the information.

**NEWFOUNDLAND****TERMS OF UNION WITH CANADA—ADDRESS TO HIS MAJESTY THE KING**

The house resumed from Monday, February 14, consideration of the motion of Mr. St. Laurent for an address to His Majesty the King respecting the terms of union of Newfoundland with Canada, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Drew.

(Translation):

**Mr. Maxime Raymond (Beauharnois-Laprairie):** Mr. Speaker, having already expressed my views on the constitutional aspect of this question, I would probably not have spoken a second time in this debate were it not for the attempt, on the part of some people, to create the impression that this parliament had, with only one dissenting voice, given unanimous approval to the proposed union of Newfoundland with Canada, according to the procedure followed up to now.

That is not a fact. The hon. member for St. Maurice-Lafleche (Mr. Hamel) has