

sion to \$30 a month, and of this amount they paid \$22.50 and the provincial government pays \$7.50. In a year or two, as I have said, the federal government is going to pay all of it, the full \$30 and make it universal to all persons reaching the age of 70 without any means test at all — universal, an old age pension of \$30 a month to all persons of 70 and over without regard to their means or lack of it.

Now, touching on the matter of the old age pension, Mr. Harrington quoted a statement made in the House of Commons by Mr. John Bracken, leader of the opposition, in which he referred to the Canadian government's plan to wipe out the means test in giving old age pensions. I'm very glad that Mr. Harrington mentioned this. What Mr. Bracken was talking about was something else altogether. The Government of Canada has a plan to take over the old age pension completely for all persons of 70 or over.... And then on top of that there would be a pension for all those who needed it between the ages of 65 and 70. In other words, there'd be a means test for those between 65 and 70 and the Government of Canada would not pay all of it but only half, the government in each province paying the other half. That's for persons between 65 and 70 who needed it. But all who reached the age of 70 would receive it without any means test and the Government of Canada would pay the full amount. That's the plan to which Mr. Bracken referred in his speech and that plan has not yet come into force. It's expected to be put in force within the next year or two. Mr. Chairman, as we have only one stenographer, perhaps we might have a short recess.

Mr. Chairman I'll leave the chair for ten minutes.

[Short recess]

Mr. Smallwood Mr. Harrington, in discussing the confederation election of 1869, tells us we did not have the secret ballot in 1869 when our people voted on confederation. But then, neither did the people anywhere else on this side of the Atlantic at that time. But what's that got to do with it? The fact is that there was no secret ballot 80 years ago when our people voted on confederation. Every voter had to walk into a booth and in a loud voice declare whom he was voting for. There was nothing secret about it. The local merchant or his agent was right there in the booth.

He was the agent for Charles Fox Bennett, the biggest merchant in Newfoundland, who was the leader of the anticonfederates. And it took a pretty brave fisherman in those days long ago, to go against the local merchant. Now, what actually happened in that confederation election 80 years ago, what did happen? Thirty members were elected to the House of Assembly. Ten of them were confederates, 20 of them were anticonfederates. But that does not tell the story at all. One thousand votes more for confederation in that election, just another 1,000 votes, and it would have been 20 confederates and 10 anticonfederates elected. If only 1,000 of those who voted in that election had voted the other way, we would have become a province in 1869. Just a few hundred votes more in Bonavista Bay and three confederates would have been elected there. Just another couple of hundred votes or so, and three confederates would have been elected in Trinity Bay instead of the two confederates who were elected.... And so it was in most districts. A mere thousand votes more for confederation in the whole country and confederation would have won. You see, Mr. Chairman, I too have read the whole story of that famous election.

And while we are at it, I noticed that Mr. Harrington did not tell us anything about the famous and patriotic Newfoundlanders — as a matter of fact Lady Squires was kind enough, a few months ago, to tell me of the last interview Sir Richard Squires gave before he died. It was given to the *Winnipeg Free Press* in 1938. In that interview Sir Richard Squires declared — it was the last thing he ever said to the public — that confederation was the only hope for Newfoundland.

Sir, Mr. Harrington touched on the question of education and referred to the clause about education in the terms of union. There's really only one point in his remarks on this subject that calls for any comment. He will not, I think, deny that the education clause protects all our rights as they are now. Every denomination with its own schools at the time of union will go right on with its own schools just so long as it wishes to. That right is guaranteed in the terms. Not only that, but each denomination is guaranteed its rights, to its share of the public money spent on education. Then again, if any two or more denominations should ever wish to unite or amalgamate their schools,