PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

AND

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

DURING THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

1911.

"PLAINDEALER" PRINT,
ST. JOHN'S, NEWFOUNDLAND,
1912.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND.

SESSION 1911.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 8th, 1911.

OPENING OF THE SESSION.

The General Assembly having by several Proclamations of His Excellency the Governor, been prorogued until this day, the members thereof met in the Assembly Room.

At three o'clock in the afternoon a message from His Excellency the Governor was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod commanding the immediate attendance of Mr. Speaker and the House in the Council Chamber. Accordingly Mr. Speaker and House attended His Excellency the Governor in the Council Chamber, and, having returned to the Assembly Room,

Mr. Speaker informed the House that when in attendance on His Excellency the Governor in the Council Chamber His Excellency had pleased to make a gracious Speech to both branches of the Legislature, of which, for greater accuracy he had obtained a copy, and which he read to the House.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. President and H nourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly:

It is with pleasure that I meet you again, as the representatives of the people of Newfoundland, and I am glad to be able to congratulate you upon the continued prosperity of your country.

Since the last session of this Legislature the British Empire has sustained a profound loss, through the death of our well-beloved Sovereign, King Edward the Seventh, ever to be remembered as the Peacemaker. Despite his brief reign, his late Majesty won the unstinted admiration of the civilized world, by his efforts to promote international concord. By his keen interest in the advancement of the oversea possessions of the Crown, the promotion of constitutional liberty, and the extension of free institutions amongst them, he did much to cement the ties that bind together the sea-divided possessions constituting the

Empire. No ruler in any period of the world's history achieved such a place in the council of nations, or was recognized as such a power for peace and harmony; and all will pray that the sentiments which inspired him will make their influence increasingly felt in the years to come.

I feel assured that you will avail yourselves of the earliest opportunity of expressing your sympathy with the Royal Family in their bereavement, and your loyalty to his successor, His Majesty King George the Fifth, whose accession you, in common with other portions of the Empire, have hailed so heartily, and under whose wise rule we trust that continued happiness and prosperity may be the portion of the British Empire.

His late Majesty having always actively associated himself with every movement for the alleviation of human suffering, my Government propose the erection, in connection with the General Hospital in this city, of a Home for Nurses, to bear his name, and to serve as a lasting monument to the memory of one as distinguished in the realms of humanitarianism as in those of statesmanship.

The arbitration before The Hague Tribunal of the dispute between Great Britain and the United States, with respect to certain liberties of fishing claimed by the inhabitants of the United States in certain waters of Newfoundland and Canada, to which I made reference in my Speech of last year, resulted in an award which, it is hoped, will dispose of an international complication that has, from time to time, for well nigh a century, embittered the relations of the countries concerned. All advocates of the peaceful solution of such questions must rejoice that arbitration, as a means of disposing international disputes, has received so effective a stimulus from the adoption of this method by the British and American nations—ever in the van of movements tending towards concord throughout the world.

The provisions of the award itself did not ensure finality as to one or two of the issues involved. The several Governments affected, however, felt that a more speedy and efficacious adjustment of the matters at issue could be secured by a friendly conference than by resort to the procedure prescribed for their determination by the award of the Tribunal. I am glad to inform you that, as a result of such a conference, held at Washington last month, at which this Colony was represented by my Prime Minister, an agreement was reached by which the process of dealing with any questions that may not yield to diplomatic negotiations, will be materially simplified, and delay and expense to the Colony avoided. A copy of this agreement, as well as of the proceedings before The Hague Tribunal, and of the Award, will be laid before you.

The material well-being of the Island has been more than maintained during the past year, notwithstanding a shortage in the catch of fish along the Labrador, and other parts of the Colony, due to causes temporary in their character. The realization of the product, because of an enhanced value arising from the short supply, assisted very largely in counteracting the effects of the smaller quantity available for export. The seal, herring, lobster, whale and other fisheries were prosecuted with encouraging results, and everything points to this year's fishing operations being pursued on an even more extensive scale.

The export of minerals has been well maintained, and the attention which outside capital has been giving to our mineral resources justifies the belief that extensive development in this respect may be anticipated in the near future.

I am gratified to be in a position to announce that the loan authorized by you at the last session of the Legislature, for the construction of certain Branch Railways, was raised in England by my Government on terms more advantageous that any previous financial operation effected by this Colony. An additional advantage of this transaction is that the amount received has been deposited in banks in this city on terms which yield a rate of interest equal to that paid for the loan itself.

Satisfactory progress has been made with the first of the Branch Railways. The rails have been laid to within twenty-two miles of Bonavista, the completion of which branch will be resumed next spring, while the construction of the branches to Trepassey and Heart's Content will be undertaken at the same time, and it is hoped that even greater progress than last year may be made this season.

Seeing that the Colony's securities on the London market, while bearing the same rates of interest, are quoted at varying figures, and that the effect of this is to depress the standing of our securities generally, it is proposed to introduce a measure for the conversion of those earlier loans into Inscribed Stock, so as to maintain a parity between them and the securities issued more recently, in which latter, by law, trustees and others can invest funds under their control, this not being permitted with our previous loans.

My Government are of opinion that the time has now arrived when the first steps should be taken towards providing pensions for the aged poor. A measure dealing with this subject upon a basis within the financial means of the Colony will be submitted for your consideration.

Concurrently with providing assistance for the aged poor, my Government feel that they should extend educational advantages, so far as possible, to every child in the

Island. In accordance with instructions issued by the Government, the Superintendents of Education have prepared statements which show the number of settlements in the Island where there are now, without schools, sufficient children of an educational age to justify the opening of such schools. You will be asked to provide an appropriation which shall effect this result.

Since last session the policy of extending the telegraphs to remote portions of the Island, hitherto unprovided with this facility, has been assiduously pursued, and during the present year it is hoped to completely encircle St. Barbe peninsula, and provide extensions for other districts as well, besides constructing wireless stations at points on the northern coast for the benefit of the sealing fleet, this agency being likewise extended along the Labrador Coast, so that the fishermen may all the more partake of its advantages.

During the past year provision has been made for steamers to ply between St. John's and Fogo District; on Fortune Bay; and along Northern Labrador; and this year the Government hope to arrange for an additional improved service on the West Coast, between Port aux Basques and Bonne Bay, in place of the two boats now plying there.

Realizing how greatly the marketing of our fish in a fresh or frozen state, as well as the utilizing of the by-products thereof, would enhance for our fishermen the value of their annual catch, my Government have entered into an agreement with American capitalists, who desire to avail themselves of the facilities afforded by the Cold Storage Act of last session, for the establishment in this Colony of a cold storage enterprise on an extensive scale.

Agreements have also been concluded with English capitalists for the establishment of factories for the manufacture of peat-fuel and of explosives, and negotiations are at present in progress with a view to the introduction of other industries which will assist in the development of our latent resources, and the provision of new avenues of employment for our people. You will be asked to enact legislation to ratify these several contracts.

The past year has witnessed a substantial increase in our exports, due to the output of the pulp and paper mills at Grand Falls. The approaching completion of similar mills at Bishop Falls will further enlarge this total; whilst various persons are at present negotiating for the establishment of other like enterprises. The pulp and paper industry promises to largely augment the volume and value of the Colony's exports in future, and to form a source of permanent employment for many of its people.

The manifest desirability of retaining at home as much as possi-

ble of the large sums annually expended abroad in the purchase of farm products, much of which could be raised amongst us, has impressed the Government with the imperative necessity of stimulating the development of agriculture as much as possible ; and careful far-reaching measures were set on foot, in accordance with the provisions of the Act passed for that purpose at the last session, to carry this policy into effect. The co-operation of distinguished Canadian agricultural authorities was invited, and cheerfully given. Agriculture societies, to the number of seventy, were organized in all the districts ; stock and seeds of an improved quality were distributed ; and experienced peat-cutters were engaged, who spent several months in instructing the people in different parts of the country how to cut up and use this material for fuel.

During the autumn an Agricultural Exhibition was held in this city, at which displays were made by every electoral district. The variety and excellence of the exhibits, as a whole, more than justified the highly encouraging estimates of our agricultural capabilities made by the Canadian authorities already mentioned, besides confirming the conclusions of the various eminent men of every station who, during their periods of residence here in the past, championed the cause of agriculture, and advocated its more extensive pursuits. The Manufacturers' Association co-operated with the Government by holding an exhibition of local manufactures at the same time, and demonstrated conclusively the great possibilities in this direction which lie before the Colony. The success of the combined exhibitions will, it is hoped, result in similar displays being made frequently, so that the rate of progress in both departments of industrial endeavour may be more accurately measured, and an incentive created which will result in continued improvement.

It is pleasing to observe that the Colony's foreign trade for the last fiscal year was the largest in its history, and that, from the revenue returns thus far of the current fiscal year, there is reason to believe a still better showing will be made for the period which terminates on the 30th June next.

A conference to devise methods for the better preservation of our forests from destruction by fire was held in St. John's early last year. The result was the organizing of a temporary protective force, or fire patrol, towards the maintenance of which the Government and the several interests concerned contributed. This proved so satisfactory that it is proposed now to give it permanent status by legislative enactment.

During the past year or two very gratifying evidence has been afforded of the awakening of the outside world to a better knowledge of this Colony's standing and possi-

bilities, a fact attested by the steadily increasing readiness of capitalists to invest in the development of our chief industries and in the establishment of new ones.

The manifold advantages to this Colony from the maintenance of the tri-weekly cross-country train service the past twelve years have been shown in the inauguration of large enterprises along the line; and, with the building and operating of the branch railways, the time has come for a daily service. Negotiations are in progress between the Government and the Reid Newfoundland Company with this end in view.

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly;

I am glad to be able to inform you that the revenue for the past fiscal year was the largest in the history of the Colony, and the excess over expenditure larger than any surplus ever previously realized. It is equally gratifying to be able to state that the revenue for the first half of the current fiscal year was considerably larger than for the corresponding period in any fiscal year heretofore, and that it was in excess of expenditure for the same period. This virtually ensures a substantial increase of revenue over the estimate for the current fiscal year, which ends on June 30th next, and that a surplus over expenditure for the same period may be hoped for.

The economic condition of the Colony affords cause for satisfaction. The commercial and trade outlook is encouraging, and everything points to a continuance of the conditions that, of late, have yielded such substantial returns to all engaged in our various occupations.

The Estimates for the coming fiscal year will be laid before you in due course, and I feel sure you will readily make due provision for the carrying on of the public service. The Estimates have been prepared with due regard to economy, and the additional votes which will be found therein represent services which the increasing progress of the Colony renders absolutely necessary.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly:

During the past few months two more trans-Atlantic submarine telegraph companies have landed their cables on this Island, a fact which attests its importance from a commercial standpoint, besides contributing to the progress of the communities among which these companies have established their stations.

As, during the present year, a census of the British Empire will be taken, you will be invited to appropriate a sum for the purpose of making an enumeration of the population of this Colony.

Owing to the lamented death of His late Majesty, the Festival of Empire, arranged for last summer,

was postponed for a year. The plan and scope of this exhibition have been considerably changed in the meantime, and the Colony has undertaken to participate in it upon its new basis. Although this will call for an additional appropriation, we may reasonably conclude that the result, by helping to spread more widely a knowledge of the Colony's resources and progress, will be commensurate with the outlay.

The Imperial Conference, made up of delegates from His Majesty's Government, and from those of the oversea dominions, for the consideration of matters of moment to the Empire as a whole, which convenes in London at intervals of four years, will re-assemble there in May next, and the participation of this Colony therein will be arranged for.

The Coronation of Their Majesties, King George and Queen Mary, will take place in London on June 22nd, and I am sure that in due course preparations will be made for adequate local observances of this auspicious event.

I leave you now to your deliberations, and pray that Divine Providence may guide you therein.

HON. THE PREMIER (Sir Ed. Morris)—Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House I desire to propose the adoption of the following Address to His Majesty King George V. The address is two-fold in its scope and character; it expresses the deep sorrow and heart-felt sympathy of the Colony with His Majesty and the Royal Family in the calamity which has fallen upon the Empire, and indeed the whole world, in the death of His Majesty King Edward VII.; and on the other hand tenders our congratulations to him who now occupies the Throne—testifying our loyalty, fealty and devotion—not alone to the Throne, but to His Majesty personally and his Royal Consort. I feel that this House does not desire to proceed to the regular business of the session, that it would not be meeting the wishes of those who sent us here—the people whom we represent—until officially and formally giving expression to their bereavement in the loss of the late King, and to their loyalty to the King who now reigns over us—to whose service to-day we were sworn.

His Excellency, in the Speech which he has just delivered, in referring to this lamentable event, as you will have noticed, referred to the reign of King Edward as being brief. That is perfectly true, if we measure the reign as we usually measure events, by the duration of time. But when we estimate it by the work performed, the important character of its events, the activities crowded into it, I think you will agree with me that there never was a reign in English history more ample and copious in its sustained work. His late Majesty had scarcely come of age when he met the great loss of his life in the death of his

illustrious father, the Prince Consort, and I think I am not overstating the facts when I say that from that hour until his accession to the Throne in 1901, he shared with his Royal Mother the burdens and responsibilities in performing the duties and tasks of Empire, so that when he ascended the Throne as King of England he brought to the performance of his duties a ripe experience and preparation for his task such as was never before enjoyed by any of his predecessors. It was not easy to succeed to such a reign, or to fill the place of one who had occupied so large a space in the public mind as Queen Victoria. Hers was the longest and most illustrious reign in the long line of English monarchs, the most glorious in the annals of English history, marked by wonderful achievement and advancement in every department of our civilized life. Indeed the last decades of her reign —the last part of the nineteenth century—were marked by such advance and development in commercial and industrial life, in the promotion and growth of sciences and the arts, as never have been and probably never will be exceeded.

There was no department of the life of the nation that she was not conspicuously a part, and she might truly have said with the Latin poet, *Quorum pars magnum fuit.* She was not only a greaf Queen and a great Christian, but a great woman —glorious in the methods of her life. By her example to the world as a mother and a wife she raised the home to a loftier and higher plane than ever attained before, and she is remembered to-day not alone in her regal robes with the sceptre of power, but as the bereaved widow of Windsor, whose life sorrow brought her permanently closer to her people. No other sovereign ever filled so sure a place in the hearts of the people. There never was a period in her long reign of sixty-five years in which there was any change in this sentiment, and no matter what occurred, or what troubles, political or otherwise, existed, they never affected the relations which existed between the Queen and the people. And when she laid down the sceptre, when in 1901 she passed away after a glorious reign, the whole world agreed that her life had borne the fruit of its earliest promise, and that the words of her friend and laureate written of her fifty years before, were prophetic :

She wrought her people lasting good,
Her Court was pure, her life serene :
God gave her peace, her land reposed
A thousand claims to reverence closed
In her, as mother, wife and Queen.
And statesmen at her Council sat
Who knew the season when to take
Occasion by the hand, and make
The bonds of freedom wider still
By shaping some august decree
Which kept her throne unshaken still,
Broad based upon the people's will,
And compassed by the inviolate sea.

This was the inheritance to which King Edward succeeded. He assumed the duties of a position of which the loftiest ideals had been created. Much was expected of him; but he more than fulfilled the hopes and expectations of his people. He was essentially a monarch of the people. His Excellency refers to the fact that it is as the Peacemaker that he will be known in history. It is in that great role that he won the respect and love, not only of his subjects in England and in the dominions beyond the seas, but also of the world. His every action was for the cause of peace. Not alone did he fulfill his duties as a King, but he allowed his activities to penetrate into every domain of life. Politicians very often create strife: the Press, not perhaps intentionally bring the nations to the point of the bayonet, and if it was not for some one behind the scenes to allay angry feelings and restore better understanding, peace would be the exception. This was the work he engaged in from the time he ascended the throne to the day in which he lay aside his task. Not only were his efforts used to this end, but he has handed down his Empire improved, strengthened and buttressed, and given a new lease of life to monarchical institutions. Those who have had the opportunity of studying the attractive feature of Republican institutions on this side of the water, as well as Europe, have seen that much may yet be said in favour of the older institutions. Democracies, Republicans, Socialists, all were able to be monarchists under the late King. And yet he disliked the revolutionaries, the iconoclast, the man always desiring to uproot, believing with Tennyson, that.

"He is the best conservative
Who lops the mouldering branch
away."

He liked the wheels of life to run smoothly and all his efforts were to oil them so that they might never jar.

It would be idle to say he did not take an interest or play a great part in the public life of his people. True under our constitution the King cannot take an active part in the politics of the country; but although he may not have openly interfered, how was it possible for a man of his character and ability to associate with the great statesmen who make the politics and public life of England, without to a very great extent guiding and moulding their views? During the latter days of his reign England was disturbed and affected with important domestic questions, great constitutional issues; but there is no evidence to show that he leaned to one side more than another. I can only say, speaking as an outsider, that I believe if the King had any leanings whatever, they were toward political reform.

It was my great privilege two years ago to be his guest in his historic home, Buchingham Palace.

There, surrounded by the great officers of state and representatives of great Kings and potentates, he found time to recognize every one and had a word for all. He honored me in talking over with him some matters connected with the Colony, and he gave me to understand that he took a lively interest in Newfoundland and fully followed its progress. He allowed me to say what I thought of the French Shore Question, and I told him how he was beloved in Newfoundland, and how we appreciated his efforts in the matter of peace with his great neighbor, France, which had helped so materially in bringing about the French Treaty. He seemed to be pleased and delighted to know that such a feeling existed.

It was only a short year later I saw him lying dead. I was outside Buckingham Palace when the last bulletin was put out, and I shall never forget the feeling of the great throng waiting there, when they learnt he was no more. It was not the ordinary sorrow or regret that comes to one when a great man has passed, it was a feeling of deep, personal loss—a sense that the man had died because his burden was too great, that he had been trying to do too much for the nation. A few days after it was my privilege to officially represent the Colony at his burial in the historical chapel of St. George's, Windsor, and seen his remains laid in his last resting place. And as I listened to the beautiful liturgy of the Church of England burial service, and heard the choir chant his favorite hymn :—

"My God, my Father, while I stray
Far from my home, on life's rough way,
Oh! Teach me from my heart to say,
'Thy will be done.'"

And when the Archbishop of Canterbury intoned :—

"Now the labourer's task is o'er ;
Now the battle-day is past ;
Now upon the farther shore,
Lands the voyager at last.
Father! In Thy gracious keeping
Leave we now Thy servant sleeping.

I felt that the words could not have been more appropriately applied if they had been specially written for him.

King Edward worked for his people, and he maintained and upheld the lofty ideals set for him by his mother and father, and when he passed away the words of the Laureate, written of his father, were equally applicable to him :

"We have lost him. He is gone. We know him now. All narrow jealousies are silent and we see him as he moved. How modest, kindly, all-accomplished, wise! With what sublime repression of himself, and in what limits and how tenderly! Not swaying to this faction or to that. Not making his high place the lawless perch of winged ambitions, not a vantage for pleasure. But through all these tracts of years wearing the white flower of a blameless life before a thousand

peering littlenesses in that fierce light which beats about a Throne and blackens every blot."

It would be fulsome to say that our late king had no weaknesses. Like all mortals he had his short-comings, but they only reminded us of his human side. He would have been the last to claim impeccability. It has become fashionable for a section of the world to encourage the bringing out in bold relief the short-comings of those prominent in public life. They seem to be a target for the vilest slander and fair game for those who write for the prurient and morbid reader. And so it will be to the end. Dullness and mediocrity may go unmolested and unattacked, but people never tire of finding flaws in those whom they are neither able to emulate nor excel. George Elliott, probably the deepest thinker and writer in the last century, produced in that classic of hers—"Romola," speaking of Savanarola, the great martyr of the fifteen century, who died on the scaffold in defence of civil and religious liberty, after pointing his weaknesses and his short-comings, summed up his character in these words :

"It was the custom of old, when an ox was led out for sacrifice to Jupiter, to chalk the dark spots and thus give the victim a show of unblemished whiteness. Let us throw away the chalk and boldly say the victim was spotted, but it was not, therefore, in vain that his mighty heart was laid on the altar of men's highest hopes."

If there were any weaknesses or short-comings in the late king, they do not want any chalk. They represent his human side, the side that made him one of ourselves, that drew him to us, that created the great bond of sympathy and love which existed between him and his people.

It is to this inheritance that his present Majesty, King George, has succeeded, and I think all will agree that in him we have a successor who will sustain the highest and best traditions of his name, and that we may fairly look for his reign to be one that will add lustre to the throne of England. Following the example of the late king, his father, and his illustrious grandmother, we believe that he will strengthen the bonds of loyalty that bind the people of the Empire to the Throne. His Majesty has already shown a very deep and keen interest in the welfare of the Dominions beyond the seas. It is only a very short while ago that this country had the honour of extending to him proof of its hospitality and loyalty, and the records of that visit show that he takes a very appreciative interest in the Colony.

I feel that the Address which I now beg to propose to the House will pass unanimously, and will, in its assurances of loyalty and devotion, in a small measure assist the

king in assuming the burdens and responsibilities of the great Empire of which he is now the Head and Ruler.

SIR ROBERT BOND—Permit me to say, Mr. Speaker, how sincerely we who sit on the opposition side of the House unite with the honourable members of the Government side of the House in their tribute of loving homage to the memory of our late Sovereign Lord, King Edward VII., who, since we last assembled here, has passed from thime to eternity, leaving a blank, not only in the Empire but in the world, that probably never can be filled. Someone has said: "The greatest man of Europe has passed and left no successor." I think, sir, that high as is this estimate, it scarcely did justice to our late Sovereign. The most kingly of kings, the most manly of men, the most perfect of gentlemen, he was undoubtedly the central figure and the most attractive personality in the whole wide world. We Britishers mourn him as the father of his people, as the wise Constitutional Ruler whose personal magnetism drew closely to him more than four hundred millions of the human race, who rejoiced to acclaim him as their King. The civilized world mourns him as the "Peacemaker," the great "Conciliator," and the future historian will no doubt attribute his real greatness to the exercise of his remarkable qualities of heart and mind in the interest of the world's peace. At no former period in the world's history was such a force making for peace more indispensable, for the tendency of national ambition to-day is to excel in the construction of vast armaments and in the mobilization of vast armies. It is a sad and striking commentary upon our twentieth-century civilization that whereas for nineteen hundred years the gospel of peace has been proclaimed from the pulpits and platforms of Christendom, yet to-day the great nations are bristling with bayonets and bending beneath the weight of war taxes. When we consider that there are twelve million soldiers in Europe ready to take the field; that the annual expenditure of England, Germany, France and the United States, on account of their armies and navies, approximate ten hundred million dollars; that the war debt being carried by Christian nations is nearly thirty thousand million dollars, and that the interest on this debt, plus the cost of maintaining armies and navies, means at least nine hundred million dollars a year, or six million dollars per day, wrung from the world's weary toilers, it is not surprising that the best minds in the world have ranked as truly great the monarch who devoted his talents to the maintenance of peace among the nations of the earth, and the emancipation of mankind from one of its greatest scourges, a suicidal rivalry in armaments. Within the past few weeks the heart-strings of

civilization have been vibrations to the touch of that great philanthropist, Mr. Andrew Carnegie, who has dedicated ten million dollars of his wealth to the cause of universal peace. A section of the press of both continents has been conjecturing how this munificent gift can possibly be used in promoting the object for which it was donated. It will be used doubtless in the education of the world's public opinion, the only foundation upon which the world's peace can be permanently established. Our late king recognized this; the last nine years of his life were devoted to this great cause, and by the kindness of his heart and the majesty of his mind he so moulded public opinion as to maintain the peace of Europe and to lay the foundation upon which the temple of universal peace will yet be based.

I believe I am correct in stating that in no part of His Majesty's wide dominions was sorrow for his decease more general or more sincere than in Newfoundland. I have formed this opinion from the evidences of loyalty and affection that I have seen in the homes of even the poorest of our people. In the course of my political life I have visited such homes in every creek and cove and hamlet of nearly every district in the island, and there was scarcely one in which a coloured plate or other picture of our late king and his royal mother did not occupy a conspicuous place. These tokens, simple and inexpensive in themselves, conveyed to my mind a wealth of loyalty and devotion on the part of those who possessed them. The warm and generous feelings of our people for His Majesty were by him as warmly reciprocated; of this fact I had personal knowledge. It was my high privilege to be honoured by His Majesty with an expression of his kindly interest. My last interview with the late king was shortly before I left England for this Colony in 1907. When leaving the presence of His Majesty he said to me: "Tell my people in Newfoundland that I am deeply interested in their happiness and prosperity." When I had an opportunity of addressing the people from numerous platforms and of delivering this Royal message to them, the enthusiasm that was manifested spoke most eloquently of their heart's true feelings. The great king is dead! but he will never be forgotten while fidelity to duty holds its place in the grateful recollection of our race. We may be quite certain, sir, that the loyalty and devotion and love of this people will not be withheld from the great king's successor, His Majesty George V., for it is only a few years since His Majesty and Queen Mary honored this Colony with their presence, and by their unaffected kindly bearing, graciousness and tact, charmed and won the hearts of all. It has been said, and truly said, that no monarch who has sat upon the Throne of England ever brought to the

duties of that high station such an intimate knowledge of the outlying portions of the Empire as our present Sovereign. That this knowledge will be turned to practical account His Majesty has already demonstrated, and we may, therefore, confidently expect that the bond between the king and the nation will grow stronger and stronger as the years advance, eventuating in the greater Empire territorially of which we dream, but an Empire made greater and stronger by the closer weaving together of these silken cords of loyalty and affection, and by the welding together tn one firm bond of brotherhood the various links that form the chain of British Empire.

Sir, I am sure that there is not a member of this House but will join in the prayer that the Almighty Ruler of the Universe, out of the fullness of His riches and grace, may grant unto our Sovereign Lord King George wisdom and length of days to fulfill the high ideals of kingship and humanity that have been bequeathed unto him by his illustrious father.

I beg to second the motion that this Address do pass.

And it was ordered accordingly.

ADDRESS

To His Most Gracious Majesty the King.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY;

We, Your Majesty's faithful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly of Newfoundland, in session convened, respectfully approach Your Majesty with this expression of deep and heartfelt sorrow for the death of our beloved Sovereign, King Edward the Seventh, and of our fealty and devotion to Your Majesty on your accession to the Throne.

As the representatives of this, the oldest British Colony, we would ask Your Majesty to believe that nowhere has the universal grief felt at the death of your royal father been more poignant than in Newfoundland, where he ever held a specially warm place in the affections of its people, who revered him as their Sovereign, but loved him for himself. His enlightened rule, by contributing to broaden the spacious movements of national coalescence, to enlarge the freedom and liberties of his subjects, and to exalt the principles of constitutional government, aided materially in the advancement of his over-seas possessions and the spread of that civil and religious liberty which is our proudest boast.

His late Majesty's eminent qualities as a ruler were conspicuously apparent, and the unerring wisdom of his public policy was beyond dispute, while his admirable personal attributes and that rare charm of truest kingship which displayed itself in consideration for the least of his subjects, won for him their affectionate regard and reverence. By his tolerance, his liberality and his warmth of heart, he bound to-

gether more firmly every section of the vast Empire he ruled so wisely and so well during the nine years that Providence confided to his hands the exercise of sovereign authority in this mighty realm. The manifestations of grief at his death, profound though these proved to be, were nevertheless but a feeble expression of the sorrow felt for one who was no less a kingly man than a manly King.

In this mourning for the illustrious dead all nations joined, grieving for a monarch whose all too brief reign formed an epoch in the world's history—one marked by that peace with honour always the object of a ruler and a people truly great. This universal regret fittingly expressed the world's appreciation of the self-sacrificing labours of a monarch whose whole career showed him to be imbued with the noble mission of bringing about harmony in international relations by the promotion of mutual knowledge and mutual trust.

We pray that the King of Peace may grant to Your Majesty, to your Royal Consort, to the Queen Dowager, and to the other members of the Royal Family, in this personal bereavement which has been to the nation a calamity, the healing balm of Divine Consolation; and we trust that the memories of the work wrought for peace on this earth by the kingly soul recently recalled to the other world, may lighten the burden of your sorrow. Our fervent prayer also is that Your Majesty may be vouchsafed a long and glorious reign, endowed with the blessing of peace and prosperity, and that, under the wise guidance of which your statesmanlike purposes already assure us, the Empire's influence may ever increase and the devotion of your subjects, in the Motherland and in the British Dominions beyond the Seas, to your person and throne be intensified, that you may shed new lustre on your name and ancestry by faithful service in the greatest of public trusts that man can be called to fulfil, the sovereignity of this British Empire.

The HON. the PRIME MINISTER then moved, seconded by Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond, Leader of the Opposition, the adoption of the following Address to His Excellency the Governor:—

To His Excellency Sir Ralph Champneys Williams, K.C.M.G., Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Island of Newfoundland and its Dependencies:

May it Please Your Excellency:

The Legislative Council and the House of Assembly having passed the accompanying Address to His Most Gracious Majesty the King, request that Your Excellency may be pleased to transmit the same to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies for presentation to His Majesty.

And it was ordered accordingly.

On motion of the HON. the PRIME MINISTER it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting its concurrence in the said Address.

MR. GOODISON—I rise for the purpose of moving the appointment of a Select Committee to draft an Address in Reply to the Gracious Speech from the Throne.

In doing so, Sir, I shall be glad to avail of the Opportunity, with the permission of the House, to make a few observations on some of the matters which have been brought before our notice to day by His Excellency.

In his opening remarks His Excellency made reference to the death of our late King, and also the accession of King George. These events, Sir, have already to-day received suitable recognition from this House. The Prime Minister, and the Leader of the Opposition have spoken most appropriately and effectively on both matters. It, therefore, is not necessary that I should refer to either beyond adding that I am in full accord with the remarks which have fallen from both Hon. gentlemen, and I am equally sure, Sir, that their remarks reflect the feeling of every man in our Island Home.

I observe with much satisfaction that His Excellency announces the intention of the Government to erect as a memorial to the late King a Home for Nurses in connection with the General Hospital. I regard this as a most appropriate memorial. The interest which King George always evinced in every movement which made for the betterment of his people, was especially shown in the manner in which he supported and worked for the Hospitals in his kingdom. It is therefore a happy resolve on the part of our Government that Newfoundland's memorial to our late beloved King should take the form of a "King Edward Nurses' Home." Such a Home, Sir, has become a necessity in any case. The ever increasing work of our General Hospital has made a corresponding increase in the staff of nurses necessary, until, at the present time there are in residence at the Hospital some forty nurses, counting those who are now in training. Heretofore these forty nurses have occupied one large dormitory. When the new Home is built this dormitory will be available and will be at once fitted up for patients, and it will mean that some fifty or sixty more cots will be added to the present Hospital accommodation, an arrangement which I am sure will command itself generally.

His Excellency in the next paragraph brings to our attention the recent Arbitration before the Hague Tribunal, settling, as we hoped it has done, a complicated question which has disturbed the relations of the countries concerned for very many years. This Arbitration, Sir, comes to us in the nature of a legacy from the late Government.

When the administration of Sir Edward Morris took office they found that all the details had been arranged for holding this Arbitration and that nothing remained for them, but to see that the interests of the Colony were safe-guarded. This they proceeded to do. The services of the most eminent counsel were arranged for, men who were experts in this line of work, and from this side there went to give advice on purely local matters, our own Prime Minister and Attorney General, with Sir James Winter as special counsel. The result has been an award, Sir, which apparently leaves all parties satisfied. The United States claims that the award has been given the way they want it ; Canada claims that she is equally satisfied, while Newfoundland thinks the matter might have been worse for her. Time alone will tell whether the award to us is worth the amount of money which this Arbitration will undoubtedly cost the Colony. It is a matter for satisfaction to find that the Prime Minister has been able to arrange during his recent trip to Washington for the settlement of any side questions which may arise by a less expensive method than reference to the Board of Experts, or back, if necessary to the Hague Tribunal itself. A copy of this Agreement will be laid before us during the session, and we shall hope that further Arbitration may not be necessary.

His Excellency refers in the next paragraph to the fact that onr Island is at present time in a prosperous condition, notwithstanding the shortage in the catch of fish along the Labrador coast last summer. This Sir, is a matter for sincere congratulation, having in view the fact that only a very few years ago a shortage in the catch of fish on the Labrador mould have meant anything but prosperity for our Colony. The time appears to have gone and I hope for ever, when the prosperity of our Colony is solely depending upon the fisheries. It is unfortunately true that during the past season the Labrador catch has been practically a failure and following on the same result last year when the catch was equally bad, it has made it specially hard for both fishermen and supplying merchant. I am not so sure, Sir, but this failure of the fishery is a blessing in disguise. It will certainly curtail the old system of credit supplying which has been the bane of the Colony for many years.

We have had the advantage of good prices for the fish which was obtained, the law of supply and demand enduring this, and these good prices have materially helped the condition of affairs. In our chief bulk fish markets to-day, however, the Mediterranean, it is well for us to remember that we are not the only country exporting. The Norwegians are there, and the French this year and last are our greatest competitors. It will not do for us

to be careless in our methods of either cure or shipment. We cannot afford to ship fish now that is not of the very best quality. We shall assuredly be the losers if we follow such a policy. I am glad to find that the Seal, Herring, Lobster, Whale and other fisheries were prosecuted with good results, and to learn also that no curtailment of fishery operations is contemplated this year.

I observe also that the export of Minerals has been well maintained and that operations in the future will be on a more entensive scale than heretofore. It may not be out of place here to state that the Bell Island tax on ore for the past nine months has netted in round figures $80,000, and will, it is hoped by the end of the fiscal year, have turned into the Treasury a round $100,000, thus justifying the estimates of the Government in this connection.

His Excellency next makes known to us the very gratifying fact that the Loan authorized by the Legislature last session for the construction of the branch railways has been raised in England by the Government on terms more advantageous than any previous financial operation affected by the Colony. I remember distinctly that last session when the Prime Minister gave it as his opinion that he would be able to place this Loan at 96 net, the idea was ridiculed by the Opposition, I believe, if my memory serves me right, that it was suggested that he would be doing well if he realized 91 or 92. The result has shown, Sir, that the Prime Minister knew what he was talking about. I understand that 97 1-2 was actually obtained which would give us 96 clear, and I heartily congratulate Sir Edward Morris and the Government on this excellent showing. And, as the Speech from the Throme further informs us, the money thus obtained is not eating idle bread. It has been deposited in the Banks of our city on terms which yield rather more than what it costs. The interest is compounded every three months. It costs us 3 1-2 per cent., and we get 3 1-2 per cent. with compound interest, until such time as it is required.

Reference is also made to the Branch Railways and to the excellent progress being made. These railways authorized by the Legislature last session are being constructed with all dispatch. The one began last year is almost completed. In fact, if the weather had continued at all fair last fall, the line would have been laid into Bonavista by now. However, as it is, the track is graded almost to the end and the rails laid to within 22 miles of Bonavista. This branch is to be finished first in the spring, and then the Trepassey and Heart's Content branches will be undertaken. It is hoped that even greater progress will be made this year than was made last year. Too much cannot be said as to the boon this railway work is to the working

man, the fisherman, of this Colony. This was especially noticeable last year, when, coming home after the utter failure of the fisheries, our men had no difficulty in finding work which provided for their winter. Again, Sir, I would endorse the wise provision made by our Government in their railway contract of last year whereby our men are guaranteed $1.50 per day instead of the old rate of $1.00 paid on the completed cross-country line. The lines as completed will be at once operated, and it is to be remembered that the Contractor operates them at his own expense, and for forty years. Certainly the Contractor must have high regard for the latest possibilities as to traffic, both passenger and freight, in the districts through which this railway goes, or he would never have consented to such a stipulation. It is well that we should remember that operating does not cost the Colony one cent until the lines are turned over to the Government 40 years hence.

It is but fair too that I should refer to the excellent relations prevailing between Contractor and the men employed. The men are treated fairly, and the Contractor has no cause to complain of the work being given him in return for his dollar and a half a day.

His Excellency next calls our attention to the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill this session for the purpose of converting the old debenture bonds of this Colony into inscribed stock. This does not mean a new Loan in any way. It is done with the idea of maintaining a party with all our paper. It appears that in England and elsewhere trustees are not allowed by law to invest their trust funds in debenture bonds, whilst they are allowed to invest them in inscribed stock. It is rather a surprise to find on the official bulletin of the Stock Exchange of London, our 3 1-2 per cent. debenture bonds listed at 94 and our 3 1-2 per cent. inscribed stock of our last three issues at 998. Just the same value, just the same security, both equally good, but the one under the Seal of the Colony a trustee's investment; the other not a legal investment. It is now proposed to exchange all the debenture bonds for inscribed stock and this state of affairs will be ended.

In the next paragraph we have His Excellency calling our attention to one of the most important measures outlined in this session. When the party of Sir Edward Morris went to the country in 1908 and again in the spring of 1909, one of the promises which were then made was that if returned to power, an Old Age Pension scheme would be put through. This promise is now about to be fulfilled. A measure dealing with the matter will be brought down at this session. I understand that the plan by which it is to be carried out will be that $200,000 will be taken from the surplus of this year and invested

in the 4 per cent. debenture bonds of the Colony. This will give $8,000 a year, and this $200,000 will form the nucleus of what will be an Old Age Pension Fund. With this $8,000 that is obtained the Government propose to ask for a direct vote of $12,000; this will make in all $20,000 available this year for Old Age Pensions. It is further proposed that the pensions shall be $50 a year for each man on the list. The idea is that this will lessen the drain on the present Poor Fund, and make all the more for those who are left—the widows and orphans who are not thus provided for. It will mean, Sir, that 400 worn out fishermen and Laborers will have an assured income for life of $50 per year. There will be but 400 to start with, but this is only the beginning. Next year it is proposed to similarly provide for another 400, and so on until every aged man in this island who is in need of it, will be able to avail of it.

Concurrently with this scheme His Excellency announced that the Government is planning further as asistance for the educational grant to be used to provide for the isolated settlements, the small places where now no schools exist. The Government, I understand, Sir, have been to considerable pains to get full reports from school inspectors to help them to a proper understanding in this matter. These reports show, Sir, that in this island of ours to-day there are 65 settlements where there are no schools at all, there are 60 settlements where schools are kept open for less then six months, for lack of funds, and there are 200 settlements where schools are only kept open from six to nine months for a like reason. An appropriation for such a purpose will mean that the right of every man in this Colony to have his child receive at least an elementary education will be recognized. The men in these settlements help to pay the taxes as well as the men in the more favoured districts, and their rights should be respected, and I am sure that the action of the Government will be warmly commended.

His Excellency informs us, also, that the telegraph system is to be further extended to remote parts of the island, hitherto unprovided for, and that it is hoped to completely encircle the St. Barbe peninsula to Port Saunders, a distance of 115 miles, touching at Norris' Point, Cow Head and Parsons' Pond. This is but a part of the proposed extension. It is now intended to run it on to Port aux Choix, Brig Bay, Flower's Cove, Cape Norman, Quirpon, Griquet, St. Anthony, Lock's Cove, Conche, and Englee. When I tell you, Sir, that there are between six and eight thousand floats frequenting this coast every summer, you will understand the importance we attach to this work. In the past a weekly service has supplied the west side of the coast as far as Flower's Cove, and on the north-east and east side a fortnightly

service to Quirpon, and that only between May and December. After that, it is only the courier who gets around the coast at all. Cape Norman and Cook's Harbour on this coast are most important. It is there our floaters harbour, and yet they have never had any telegraphic communication with the rest of the island. Our fishermen every year, on their way to Labrador, touch in on this coast to see what they can get there, but heretofore there have been no means of getting information as to whether fish is there or not. Our plan is to make a complete circuit of St. Barbe peninsula, with the idea that if the line becomes broken on one side, telegraphic communication can still be kept up on the other.

It is also proposed to extend the Marconi wireless system on our West Coast and Labrador. Last year it was comtemplated putting up six stations, and this plan is now to be carried out. The first station will be at Cape Fogo to connect with one on Belle Isle. The station at Cape Fogo will be in all respects an up-to-date Marconi Station. There will be another at Grady; another at Cape Harrison, and for this latter station the material is now on the spot; another at Makovik, which was erected last year and will be operated this year; another at Cape Harrigan. and another at Paul's Island just outside of Ford's Harbour, which is within 20 or 30 miles of Nain. These in operation last year at Battle Harbour, Venison Island, American Tickle, Domino and Indian Harbour, will take care of the whole of the Labrador Coast very fully. We hope, also, in the near future to be able to carry this scheme out down to Cape Chidley, and to connect with the system which will be erected, we understand, at Fort Churchhill by the Canadian Government, thus making a circuit of the whole Newfoundland and Canadian Labrador. I need not point out, Sir, the immense advantage this will be to our fishermen on the Labrador Coast, giving information, as it will, of ice movements, and making it possible for men to locate fish and get up and down the coast without the risk they now run. To complete this programme, I understand that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has recommended to the Government that the mail boats shall be fitted with wireless telegraphy, and if this is only done it will mean that the fishermen will not have to go even as far as the Marconi stations, but can get on board the mail boat as she passes up and down the coast, send his message and get his reply without waiting. I hope the Government see their way clear to carry this out in the near future. The Canadian Government is contemplating carrying the wireless telegraphy as far as Fort Churchill. We will then have a complete circuit of the Labrador Coast. This will mean much to our isolated fishermen, and it will mean much to the seal-

ing industry, since information may thus be obtained as to the locality and movements of the fish, the ice, and the seals.

His Excellency also tells us that it is the intention of the Government to arrange this year for an improved service to Fogo and in Fortune Bay. There can only be one opinion regarding these services; they are immensely superior to what these districts have hitherto enjoyed. I hope the Government will soon see their way clear to extend to other and needy places the same kind of service they have given to the districts of Fogo and Fortune Bay.

Reference is made to the necessity for cold storage. We are told that the Government have arranged with a large American firm of capitalists to erect a large cold storage plant on the West Coast. One approaches the subject of cold storage with considerable diffidence for we have heard so much about it in the past without results. But in this case the Government have used every care and have satisfied themselves fully as to the standing and bona fides of the firm. The capitalists with whom the agreement has been made are well known and reliable business men of Portland, Maine, who have been doing a large business for many years.— Their standing is guaranteed by bankers and commercial men of that city. They have agreed to come here and establish five cold storage plants, also five smoking plants and five glue factories, and will also undertake the manufacture of fertilizers and other by-products. Their hope is that with the use of the cold storage plants they may be able to supply large quantities of fresh fish to the American market at a fair margin of profit. American fishermen now send cargo after cargo of herring to Gloucester, where they are cured and smoked and still profitably sold, and the promoters think by doing the curing where they are sure of better facilities they can realize a greater profit. So they have entered into an agreement with the Government, under the provisions of the Cold Storage Act of last year, which guarantees them the equivalent of 5 per cent. on their investment by this Government. Arrangements have also been made with an English firm to come here and manufacture explosives. Last year some $80,000 worth of explosives were imported into this country, an amount that should form the basis of a good business if secured. The company believe they can do their manufacturing here much cheaper than they are at present doing it, and they are willing to take the risk. The agreement with them will be handed down for ratification. The Government have also entered into an agreement with a peat manufacturing firm, who hope to start operations during the next year.

The paragraph in His Excellency's Speech which follows is the

one which deals with the operation of the agricultural policy of the Government during the past year. It was one of the planks in the platform of this party that every effort should be made towards the development of agriculture in this Colony. It has been one of the main aims of the present Government since it came into office, and no effort has been spared to make the work done valuable and effective. During the past year the Department of Agriculture and Mines has pursued that object with great vigor; they have imported into the Colony some of the best live stock obtainable to improve the local stocks. Seventy new agricultural societies were formed during the past year. Of these sixty-three were instituted by members of the Board of Agriculture personally; the other seven, being in places difficult to reach, were started by residents. To these 70 societies a sum of $17,600 has been granted, each society receiving a grant of $200, except in a few cases where a little more was added. In addition to that, the Government imported 30 Sable Island ponies, which have been distributed throughout the island. They have imported 50 pure bred bulls and 1,000 barrels of potatoes have been distributed for seed. The Department of Agriculture and Mines has kept in touch with those to whom this seed was distributed and carefully tabulated all returns sent in; and it will be interesting to know that while the average crop used to be seven or eight barrels from a barrel of seed the new seed has increased the average in many cases to 22 barrels. This is an increase which speaks for itself. During the coming year there will be a still further distribution of pure bred cattle; and arrangements have been made to purchase 500 sheep 250 pigs, 50 bulls and another 1,000 barrels of seed potatoes.

In October and November, it will be remembered, an agricultural exhibition was held here in St. John's. The Government promoted it and its carrying out was under the management of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. It was, I believe, the most successful exhibition of the kind ever held here, and it was an eye opener to everyone as to the agricultural possibilities of this country. Exhibits came in from all over the country, every district took part. We had some from St. Barbe, from Bonavista, from Fogo, St. George's, Trinity and Twillingate and from all over the country. The judges, experts who came here from Canada say that the exhibits could compare favorably with those at any of the fairs held in Canadian provincial towns, and they were astonished that we should still have to import so much for our own use. From 30,000 to 40,000 barrels of potatoes and turnips are imported into the country each year, and yet we could grow ourselves the finest potatoes and turnips they could wish to see. And the prizes did

not go only to the farmers of St. John's. Even the district of St. Barbe won a first prize for cabbage, Harbor Grace won seven and so on. Every district competing held its own. The Government having decided to get expert advice, they induced some of the foremost Agriculturists in Canada to come here. Dr. Robertson, than whom there is no more eminent man in his line in Canada, or indeed in America, came down and gave us his opinion and advice. He was most encouraging. Dr. McPhail also came.—The opinions were all upon the same lines, that it should not be necessary for us to import any of the vegetables which we were importing so largely. I was much impressed by the address Mr. Browning, who made the opening speech on behalf of the manufacturers. He claimed that it was impossible to sell local manufactured goods because of the prejudice that existed against them. Does the same thing apply to the products of the soil? Surely it may not be, for finer products it is impossible to grow. Mr. Browning made the statement that if a pair of St. John's boots were offered side by side with imported ones, the foreign article would sell every time. That prejudice this exhibition should do a great deal to obliterate ; it has been an object lesson to the people of this Colony. The Manufacturers' Exhibition was as good or even better. The manufactures were shown in such a way as should certainly dispel any such prejudice. We should be patriotic and buy local manufactured goods and local grown vegetables, now that we have shown it is possible to supply them for the local market, and I think that the time is coming when the Government will have to take steps to see that where articles of local production are available, it shall not be possible to import articles of the same nature. His Excellency states that this year's revenue has been the largest in the history of the Colony, the surplus amounting to $400,000 ; $200,000 of which has been appropriated to the Old Age Pension Fund, and $100,000 apportioned to the districts in the same way as last year. The condition of the country's finances is specially gratifying when we remember that during the past two years we have had partial failures of the Labrador fisheries. It demonstrates in no uncertain way that we are at last carrying our eggs in more than one basket ; the result of the development of new industries brought about by the introduction of outside capital. Newfoundland is gradually becoming known to the outside world, and we are fortunate in having at the head of our Government a man who is seeing that the country is receiving its proper share of advertising, a man who believes in his country, and who has faith in her possibilities, and who is using his efforts to induce men of capital to develop her latent industries. The year that has past

has been an exceptionally good one, but we confidently look to the coming year to be a better.

Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in moving that a committee be appointed to draft the Address in Reply to His Excellency's gracious speech.

MR. HOWLEY—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the appointment of a Committee to draft an Address in Reply to His Excellency's most gracious Speech from the Throne. As a general rule, when the Speech from the Throne indicates a great prosperity with every prospect of a continuance this is a very pleasant duty. The pleasure in this case is not lessened by my being associated in it with my hon. friend the member for Carbonear, who has made such a very able and eloquent address. I shall not occupy the attention of the House with any lengthy remarks at this late hour, but I should like to refer to one or two points.

The late lamented death of our late King, Edward VII., has been spoken to so ably and eloquently by the Hon. the Premier and the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, that it would be presumptuous for me to attempt to add anything to what they have said. I may perhaps be permitted to say that I had special occasion to personally witness the intense loyalty and devotion of our people, even in the humblest settlements of the Colony, to the Throne and to the person of the King. When the news flashed over the wires that the King was no more I happened to be in a remote place in the District of Burgeo. I was accompanied by an English gentleman, who was astonished at the reverence, love and loyalty shown by all sections and conditions of our people, a feeling which seems to have been universal, extending to the very ends of the Empire. Their grief was most disinterested and most sincere. The wonderful personality of Edward VII. had made an impression not alone upon his own subjects but upon the whole world; and while we realize that "Peace hath its victories no less renowned than war," we have a closer realization of that axiom when we reflect that the glory of Edward VII., a glory obtained by his efforts in the cause of peace, will probably last longer and shine more brightly than that of any of the great world conquerers of past centuries. Each of us in our humbler spheres can take and hold the lesson of his life and so shape our conduct that when we too come to the inevitable day of reckoning, we may as truly as our late King be able to say, "It is all over; but I think I have done my duty."

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to note the prosperous condition of the country's commerce, industries and revenue. I am pleased to note the indications of the opening up of new industries, the coming in of outside capital, the awakening, so

to speak, of Newfoundland. Like my hon. friend, the member for Carbonear, I do not think I would be doing my duty if I did not take this opportunity to say that if Newfoundland is about to enter upon her own, and about to assume that place which she is entitled to, we have in a great measure to thank the tireless energy, the indefatigable industry, the boundless patriotism and faith in his native land of the Premier all through his life, but more particularly since he assumed his present office. I say this without in any way attempting to disparage the great and disinterested services rendered in the past by such men as have occupied the position of Prime Minister. But the characteristics of the present Premier are his wonderful energy and capacity for work. The ideas he conceives he carries into execution, and the country is reaping the benefit of his activity and vigor. We see on all sides evidence of his efforts to raise up and advertise the country and to bring into it capital and industry for the people. There is not a magazine of any consequence that has not had from his prolific pen some article about Newfoundland, its resources or attractions. He has given his life exclusively to this country, and while other men have done their work while in office and deserved the thanks of the country for their services, I think I may say conscientiously and sincerely that no one has done more than the present Premier and the fruit of his labor is daily more and more apparent.

I am glad to see that the telegraph system is about to be extended, and I fully recognize what this means to the people of St. Barbe and those who frequent the Labrador, but I hope the Government will recognize that there are 3,000 voters in Placentia Bay without any telegraph communication at the present time, and I hope they won't be forgotten. I am glad that the Government is at last in a position to introduce the long desired Old Age Pensions. It is only such of us as have had occasion to visit the outports of this country and meet the aged, infirm and decrepit fishermen of 70 and 80 years of age, who have spent their lives toiling on the waters, that can appreciate what this will mean to them. While they are young and can work they can support themselves, but when having spent 40 or 50 years braving the perils of the sea, toiling to earn a bare living, they come to the age when they are no longer able to work, and when they see themselves (as I have seen them) old, grey headed and infirm, with their families scattered or with their own responsibilities of home, which tax them to the utmost—when we recognize this, we cannot but feel what a necessity and what a benefit these old age pensions will be to those people. Mr. Speaker, if the other work of the Government shows that it has a head surely this old

age pension provision shows that it has a heart also.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to occupy the time of the House very much longer, but I should like to make one reference to the exhibitions which were held in this city last year. Both the Manufacturers' and the Agricultural Exhibitions were revelations as to what can be done and produced in this country.

I had the pleasure of visiting the Cape Breton Provincial Exhibition the week previous in company with some friends, and although Cape Breton has for years been an agricultural country, yet there was not a dissenting voice among us in pronouncing that our exhibition was far ahead of that of Cape Breton.

The Manufacturers' Exhibition was certainly an eye opener to our people, and goes to show what really can be done if we go about it the right way.

The Agricultural Exhibition, while far short of what it might and ought to have been, was certainly an excellent one, showing that we are on the threshold of agricultural development. It is hoped that with care and attention these branches of industry will develop to a much larger scale. At present almost everything we produce requires Government assistance, but I should like to see the day when they will be carried on free of the Government aid. There is too much depending upon the Government for everything and the sooner we get away from this the better. It will come with the spread of education, but until then we shall never be free from what I cannot help looking upon as a retarding element in our development. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for a Committee to draft the Address in Reply.

SIR ROBERT BOND—In dealing with the Address delivered by His Excellency the Governor this afternoon, I shall not attempt at this late hour, to trespass unnecessarily upon the patience of the House, and as all matters of importance referred to by His Excellency will be presented for discussion in some other form during the present session, I shall confine my remarks to the highly interesting and most important subject to which the second paragraph of His Excellency's Speech directs our attention, namely, the recent Awards of the Hague Tribunal. I am glad to say that those who sit on the Opposition side of the House are able to unite with His Excellency the Governor and those who sit opposite us in this House, in an expression of satisfaction at the result of the Colony's reference to the Hague, but I regret that our expression of satisfaction cannot be as full and complete as we could desire. We have to regard the decision as a compromise of course, but still such a compromise as we think should establish peace with honor. The distinguished gentleman, Dr. Lammasch, who presided over the Hague Tribunal, in his

opening address to the Court, said that matters of great importance had been adjusted by the Tribunal within the past ten years, some of them involving the most delicate questions of sovereignity and national pride, all implicating intricate problems of international law. But perhaps never till now had there been entrusted to an arbitral a question of such gravity and of so complex a nature; that during more than ninety years the questions implicated in the case before them had been the subject of almost uninterrupted diplomatic correspondence and transaction, and more than once had brought England and the United States of America to the verge of war. That was not an exaggerated statement, it was literally true. In the year 1897 the tension in respect to the issues that have been dealt with by the Hague was so severe that one of the leading London papers, *The Standard*, alleged that "His Majesty's Government had believed it necessary to take into consideration the contingency of war with the United States of America in the advent of no settlement being reached." I was in England carrying on negotiations with His Majesty's Government relative to the dispute when this statement appeared, and on being questioned by Reuter's representative about the same, I replied: "War with the United States is out of the question. It would be the calamity of the ages. Self-respect is the surest road to peace, and no country appreciates self-respect more than the United States of America or regards the people who sacrifice it with more contempt." I fully appreciated the gravity of the situation but in a letter addressed to Lord Elgin, Secretary of State for the Colonies, a few days previous to this, I had suggested a reference of all questions in dispute to the Hague Tribunal, and I was hopeful that all parties concerned would agree to the proposal, and it was thus my high privilege to lay the first stone in this structure of peace, which, it is to be sincerely hoped, has been firmly established by the decision of the Hague Tribunal. I have no desire, Sir, I have no intention to unnecessarily revert to the past. But in order to furnish a reason for our measure of satisfaction at the decision announced at the Hague, it is necessary to consider the issues that were involved in the reference to that Court; the attitude of this Colony in respect to the same, and in how far the Colony has been sustained in her attitude. It was not a mere question of the taking or purchasing of a few herring that was involved, it was one of jurisdiction and sovereignity—the jurisdiction of the Government of this Colony in the carrying out of its municipal laws, and the sovereignity of Great Britain in and over the Colony and its territorial waters. The position set up by the Government of the United States of America may be briefly stated as

follows : 1st—That the fishery laws of this Colony are not binding upon United States fishermen in the exercise of their rights under the Treaty of 1818.

Now in respect to their position, the attitude of the late Government, of which I had the honor to be Prime Minister, was that the liberty to take fish which the inhabitants of the United States have forever under the Treaty of 1818, in common with the subjects of Great Britain, is subject to all reasonable regulation or laws made by Newfoundland for the protection of the fisheries, provided always that such regulations or laws are equitable or fair as between our local fishermen and the inhabitants of the United States. The Hague Tribunal has upheld the Colony in this contention. It has declared that the right to make such regulations without the consent of the United States and to improve them, is inherent to the sovereignity of Great Britain and that if the United States contests the reasonableness of any such regulations or laws, the reasonableness must be decided by an impartial commission of experts. . If the Hague Tribunal itself had, as might reasonably have been expected it would have, passed upon the existing regulations and laws, the reasonableness of which have been contested by the United States, and had ordered that a commission of experts must deal with all future regulations before they can come in force, provided the United States contests their reasonableness, then I submit there could be no room for cavil or complaint on either side. But that rules and regulations approved by the Legislature for the preservation and continuance of the fisheries laws under which both American and Newfoundland fishermen have in common conducted their fishing business advantageously, harmoniously and without question or protest for a quarter of a century or more, should now at the instance of the United States be suspended, pending the report of an American and Dutch expert, is hardly that justice to peace that might reasonably have been expected from such an august Tribunal.

Granting that from the Treaty of 1818 "there results an obligatory relation whereby the right of Great Britain to exercise its rights of sovereignity by making regulations is limited to such regulations as are made in good faith and are not in violation of the Treaty, and that the reasonableness of a regulation is a question to be decided by an impartial authority," it does not seem contrary to common sense and reason that laws that have been in existence for years, operating for the good of all parties concerned, as experience has demonstrated, should now be subject to such a test as proposed. The concession to the United States is all the more remarkable in view of the remarks of the President of the Hague Tribunal during the hear-

ing of the Colony's case. He said that "if the concurrence of the United States is necessary to the enforcement of the fishing regulations of Newfoundland, the logical deduction and consequence would be that the United States shared the Sovereignity." Of course the complete sovereignity of Great Britain in and over the Island and its territorial waters has been admitted by the Award.

It is also remarkable inasmuch as it seems to violate a doctrine of international law recognized and enforced by the United States, namely:—"That aliens while within the jurisdiction of the United States and enjoying the protection of its laws must be obedient to them equally as citizens of the United States are." This is laid down in Moore's Digest of International Law and the British International Law, as defined by Philimore, concurs in the doctrine by stating that 'every individual on entering a foreign country binds himself by tacit contract to obeys it laws." However, I have shown where the Hague Tribunal left us, but that is not where we stand to-day. I will deal with the latter aspect presently.

2nd—The Government of the United States contended that the inhabitants of that country had a right to employ Newfoundland fishermen while exercising the liberties conferred upon them by the Treaty of 1818 in defiance of the laws of this country.

The position taken by the late Government was that we had a perfect right under the law to say to our own citizens: "You shall not take service upon American fishing vessels exercising liberties under the Treaty of 1818," and to prevent them from so doing. In this position the Colony also has been upheld by the Hague Tribunal, for it has been decided that while non-inhabitants of the United States may be engaged as members of a fishing crew, such non-inhabitants derive no immunity from the Treaty of 1818. In other words, the engagement of Newfoundlanders by American skippers does not protect these Newfoundlanders from the penalty attaching to a breach of our law when it says: "Thou shalt not engage in the exportation of bait fishes in American bottoms." This is entirely satisfactory.

3rd.—The Government of the United States contended that American fishing vessels were not bound to enter or report at our Custom Houses.

The position taken by the late Government of this Colony was that American fishing vessels entering ports of this Colony must report to Custom House or become subject to the penalty provided for a breach of our Customs law. The Hague Tribunal has upheld the Colony in this contention, for it has decided that the requirement that an American fishing vessel should report, if proper conveniences for doing so

are at hand is not unreasonable. This is entirely satisfactory.

4th. The Government of the United States contended that American fishing vessels entering the harbours of the Treaty Coast were not liable for light dues.

The position taken by the late Government was that as the lighthouses were built and are maintained out of the taxes contributed by the fishermen of this Colony, it was not unreasonable to demand light dues from American fishing vessels deriving benefit from these lighthouses.

The decision of the Hague Tribunal that the exercising of the fishing liberty by the inhabitants of the United States should not be subject to light dues not imposed upon Newfoundland fishermen. The annual cost of maintenance of the lighthouse system is forty-five thousand dollars, which amount is very largely contributed by the fishermen of the Colony.

The American fisherman have the benefit of these lighthouses, and it therefore can scarcely be regarded as satisfactory that the award should have exempted there from contributing to the upkeep of that which is for the common benefit of the fishermen of the Treaty Coast. It is of course correct that light dues are not imposed directly upon the Newfoundland fishermen, but they are taxed indirectly for this light service. So that is only a question of expediency of Regulating the tax, and under the award of the Hague Tribunal, American fishermen may be liable for light-house dues.

5th. The United States Government contended that American vessels resorting to the Treaty Coast for the purpose of exercising the liberty granted under the Treaty of 1818 were entitled to have the commercial privileges of buying bait from the fishermen of Newfoundland.

The position taken by the late Government of the Colony was, that the Treaty of 1818 did not confer any commercial privileges on the citizens of the United States and that they have no right to buy bait without the direct sanction of the Government of this Colony. The Hague Tribunal has upheld the Colony in this contention, for it was decided that American vessels at the same time and during the same voyage exercise their Treaty rights and enjoy commercial privileges even assuming they were accorded by some other agreement. This is entirely satisfactory, and coupled with the decision 2, leaves us complete masters of the situation so far as the sale and purchase of bait fishes is concerned.

6th. The United States contended that under the Treaty of 1818 American fishermen were granted the privilege of fishing in the bays, harbors and creeks between Cape Ray and Quirpon Islands.

The position taken by the late Government was that no such right

or privilege had been granted, and that American citizens were by special phraseology confined to the coast fishery between these points. It will be remembered that when I put forward this position in this House in 1906, I dated that I believed it was the first time that the point had been raised. I was not then unmindful of the fact that Great Britain had never taken exception to the exercise of this privilege by American fishermen, that Newfoundland had never done so, but on the contrary I knew that she had taken the very opposite position before the Halifax Commission in 1878. But sir, I still believe that under a strict interpertation of the Treaty of 1818, American fishermen must be excluded from the inshore fishery beween Cape Ray and Quirpon for I was aware that very high authorities on International Law have held that mere 'custom', or 'practice' growing up under a Treaty could not set aside what was clearly the intention of the wording of the Treaty.

The decision of the Hague Tribunal has been against the Colony on the point and of course we gracefully bow to the decision and honorably accpt it. It is exceedingly gratifying to me and to my late colleagues in the Government of the Colony to find that Lord Robson His Majesty's Attorney General used this language in dealing with this point, namely, my difficulty about "question 6, and I might "just as well be frank to the sub- "sequent conduct of Great Britain, "her conduct at Halifax, her con- "duct in various other ways. That "is my difficulty about question 6, "my difficulty is not on the con- "struction of the Treaty. I think "that on a strict construction of the "Treaty the balance of my argu- "ment is strongly in favor of my "case on question 6. From what "is the argument to which they "have come? Coast of Newfound- "land, Coasts and Bays of Labra- "dor, and for drying and curing in "bays of a particular coast of New- "foundland, namely, the southern "portion from Cape Ray to the "Ramea Islands. But not a word "said about fishing in bays on the "southern or western coast of New- "foundland. It was not given and "it was not renounced. Now this "whole argument is an argument "which I submit would stand good "and would be very difficult for "the United States to meet under "ordinary rules of construction but "for the fact that we have not "maintained the claim. I have to "face that fact we have not main- "tained the claim. Why have we "not maintained the claim? We "have not asserted it because really "it was a matter of so little interest. "These really had not been fishing "there. I am fighting for them "now to maintain the jurisdiction "of Great Britain. The United "States are fighting in order to "break or to oust the jurisdiction "of Great Britain. Sir Robert

"Bond to whom the question was "important undoubtedly raised the "point when the controversy be- "came acute and both times he had "to face the fact that in the mean- "time there had been many ad- "missions. I say that there are "those admissions and they do not "really affect the substance or the "merits of the argument upon "the question of the construction."

These extracts from Lord Robson's address indicate that this Claim on behalf of the Colony was neither frivolous nor vexatious and that in his opinion under a strict interpretation of the treaty of 1818 we showed have been upheld.

Sir, I conld wish that we had been upheld for if we had been the whole of our fishery troubles would have been ended forever. But seeing that we have not. I still repeat we must honorably accept the Award. As I have shown the Colony has practically won every point save the sixth. There was a seventh question submitted to the Hague Tribunal lent as it was one in which the Dominion of Canada was primarily interested, and it was put forward at her instance I have passed it over. It is question five in the submission. When must he measure the three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors referred to in article No. 1 of the Treaty of 18.18. We claimed that the renunciation applies to all bays generally.

The United States contended that it applies to bays of a certain class or condition. Suffice it to say that the Hague Tribunal upheld our contention. Through the courtesy of the Honourable Minister of Justice I have been privileged to read the whole of the oral argnment in this submission and I would be remiss in my duty if I did not or if I failed to express my sense of the obligation that the Colony is under to His Majesty's Government, His Majesty's attorney George Lord Robson and to Sir Robert Findlay in the matter of the conduct of our case. No truthful person can peruse those volumes without recognizing the immense research that was necessary to sift documentary evidence that ran back as far as the seventeenth century. This could not have been forthcoming but for the interest taken in our case by His Majesty's Government; no intelligent person can peruse the arguments of Lord Robson and Sir Robert Findlay without being struck with the clearness of thought, accuracy of discrimination and strength of reasoning or fail to admire the ardor and the eloquence by which they gave these traits their highest effect. Probably no international question has called forth a greater display of intellectual ability than this North American Fishery within the past ninety years, but I doubt sir, if in the whole history of the case there will be found more beautiful specimens of dialectical ability than that in the argu-

ments of Lord Robson Sir Robert Findlay and Senator Root. I repeat, sir, we lie under the deepest obligations to His Majesty's Government, to Lord Robson and to Sir Robert Findlay for the victory we have won at the Hague. Let us hold what we have won as a lever to be used in the interests of the fishermen of this colony, let us not be cajoled on the one hand or menaced on the other into a relinquishment of the rights and powers that have not been placed beyond questions in the Hague Tribunal or Award. I must use the word menace just now because in reading the argument of one of the United States Counsel a Mr. Elder, I noticed an intimation that if the Hague Tribunal decided against the contention of the United States, respecting the purchase of herring, and Newfoundland still refuses to grant the privilege, the United States would take the same course not explained to compel Newfoundland to accede to the demand. A most astounding statement before a Peace Commission truly and Lord Robson that it permit it to pass without comment. Lord Robson in addresing the Court said Mr. Elder intimated very clearly that "if notwithstanding such a finding as he "asked Newfoundland still re- "fused to grant the privileges then "the United States would have to "consider what measures they "would take which was language "of course moderately and cau- "tiously expressed but nobody "could fail to detect a a tone which "was not unlike a menace to New- "foundland."

The only consideration that should be given to this threat or menace is this that it indicates most unmistakeably what immense valor the Americans place upon the privileges of purchasing supplies of herring in our waters; it indicates the truth of that which I have been contending for years namely that barring the right of our fishermen to catch for them, and the right to buy fish from our people, the New England herring fishery on our coasts must be abandoned, why? Because it will not pay to bring the necessary crewe and equipment from Gloucester. Now as regards our Fishery Rules and Regulations. The contention of the United States that they are unreasonable is but a flurry that is stirred up in order to hide the real grievance. These fishery Rules and Regulations have been in force for years on the Treaty Coast but we never heard a complaint respecting them from the United States until a few years ago when we said to the Government of that country: "You promised Newfoundland a free market in the United States for its fishery products in exchange for trading privileges you are now enjoying; we have waited fifteen years for the fulfilment of that promise, henceforth we shall confine you to your fishing privileges under the Treaty of 1818 until your privilege is redeemed." It was then and not till

that complaint was made respecting our fishery rules and regulations. I ask you to note, sir, that under the operation of the rules and regulations of which complaint is now made by the United States their fishing vessels obtained all the fish they required on the Treaty Coast during the years and years that have passed. If our fishermen could and would supply all the wants of the Gloucester fishing fleet through all these years and under these regulations why cannot American fishermen supply themselves under the new regulations? If these rules were good for our fishermen, how can they be bad for American fishermen. If they did not hamper our fishermen in the conduct of the business, how can they hamper American fishermen? Of course the contention of the United States Government amounts to an absurdity unless it is admitted by them that it will not pay their fishermen to bring large crews and necessarily large outfit of fishing gear from Gloucester to prosecute the fishery as it has been conducted for a quarter of a century or more. If this is admitted and that their only possible chance of making the voyage pay is by using purse seines, thus reducing the labor and the cost of the outfit; our answer should be clear and emphatic namely—"You have destroyed your own fishery by the use of purse seines and the Canadian fisheries in certain localities were well nigh depleted by the same means. "You shall not destroy ours if we can prevent you."

Under the Award of the Hague Tribunal this dispute as to the use of purse seines and as to the other prohibitions was to be referred as I have already stated to a special Commission of experts to consist of an American, a Dutchman and a Britisher. In the event of our representation not agreeing with the other two, there was left to us an appeal to the Hague Tribunal for a finalization of the dispute. But now if I understand aright the Government has deprived the colony of this right of appeal by entering into a special agreement with the authorities at Washington to substitute another tribunal in which the decision of the American and Dutchman will be final. This I think was a most unfortunate blunder, no doubt it will be said in the extenuation that it will be done to avoid the large expense of another appeal to the Hague. My answer is that all the money so far expended will be so much thrown away if we lose this reference and that our safety lies in appealing to a court constituted as was the Hague Tribunal. Was this return to the Hague or to a special commission on the subject of regulations the menace implied in the words of the American Counsel to which I have referred? Probably because he dwelt with more force than justice upon the poverty of our people. He may have reasoned thus in his mind, a further reference to the Hague on a special commis-

sion means nothing financially speaking to a great and wealthy nation as United States but it will mean much to an insignificant, poverty-stricken country. This I say may have been the thought that found expression in the menace to which Lord Robson took exception. It is to be greatly deplored that during the bitter party controversy over the late Government's policy in the matter of the herring fishery so much was said and written as to the poverty of the people on the West Coast and of their dependance upon the American fishing fleet for a livelihood. To this must be attributed the ideas of poverty and of indifference of our people to the great issues that were before the Hague Tribunal, ideas which undoubtedly influenced the argumeuts and attitude of the United States Government in relation to Newfoundland, I am led to this conclusion, sir, from a perusal of documents laid before the Hague Tribunal and of the arguments of the American Consul. Articles that appeared in the *Western Star* and *Daily News* and copies of the petitions that were gotten up by the opponents of the late Government were put in evidence before the Tribunal and arguments extending over days were based on them thus showing the importance that was attached to those utterances. Mark, I do not say that these party utterances influenced the arbitrators in their decision. I do not say so because I cannot prove it. But I do say that they were used by American counsel for the purpose of influencing the arbitrat rs and I am not at all certain that they did not minimize in the eyes of the arbitrators the importance of a decision by them in respect to the reasonableness of existing fishing regulations. They might well have reasoned the point in this way : " well if it is true the people on the Treaty Coast are so poverty stricken that the dollars left by American skippers is a veritable Godsend to them, if it is true they want no interference whatever with Americans on that coast, if is true that the whole electorate of the Colony is opposed to any such interference and turned the late Government out of power when appealed to on the question ; if this be true and it has not been denied by Newfoundland or any other British Counsel why should we deal with the question ?

No question as regards regulations may hereafter arise, we will therefore exercise the discretion given under article III of the terms of reference and make provision for a special commission in case it is required. " It is exactly what the Hague Tribunal did and the colony is now confronted with another reference of a capituation to the Americans. I have read in that matchless book of truth and wisdom " The way of the transgressor is hard."

How abundantly has this been verified in the case of my political opponents. The only Newfound-

land Counsel that addressed the Hague was my esteemed friend Sir James Winter and he was met by American Counsel in this way : oh that my enemy would grant an interview and he proceeded to read to the court an interview that Sir James had given a representative of the London *Morning Post*, three or four years ago, in which he strongly upheld the American position and condemned the fishery policy of the late Government.

It will be perceived, then, how seriously handicapped was the Colony by these party political utterances. I have no doubt the Government of the Colony was handicapped in its recent negotiations at Washington from the same cause. The United States might have said to them : "Why should we recede from our position as regards your regulations. You are the men who denounced the late Government for interfering with us. It was your party organs that declared that the people on the West Coast would starve were it not for the gold left amongst them by American shippers. Did you not admit to them, through the lips of His Majesty's Attorney General, Lord Robson, that the late Government were defeated at the polls upon this fishery question? If this was not true then you have greatly deceived us and we have nothing more to do with you, and if all that you have alleged is true then we defy you to withhold the privileges we demand, for your mandate is not to interfere in any way with American fishermen."

This, of course, is a very awkward position for the Government to find themselves in and it indicates how important it is when dealing with great international questions for the Colony to present a solid front unbroken by petty party squabbling and jealousy. I trust, sir, that there will be no difference of opinion as to the course the Colony should adopt in the present instance. So far as I am aware the only question at issue between the United States and Newfoundland to-day is as to the prohibition of Sunday fishing and purse seines. The unreasonable attitude of the United States in respect to that prohibition is made apparent by the acquiescence of the Government of the United States within the past fortnight in a precisely similar prohibition in Canadian waters. On the nineteenth day of January the Canadian Minister of Justice in announcing the result of the recently concluded fishery negotiations at Washington said, "There has been little difficulty in convincing the representatives of the United States that there is nothing unduly burdensome in our fishery regulations and their objection to the prohibition of Sunday fishing and purse seines has been withdrawn."

Now if this Colony has failed where Canada has succeeded then, I submit, there must be something defective in our diplomacy or the

set policy of the United States is to try and drive the Colony into acquiescence with her demands by the "menace" of further expensive litigation. We should resist this attitude whatever the cost may be. Those who sit opposite me in this House are at present the public trustees; the people have confided their rights and interests to their keeping. It is not for me to presume to formulate a policy for the Government, but, sir, I am here to express an opinion as to what I believe the Government should do in the interests of the public.

Now then the immense value of the herring fishery to the Americans has been made patent by all that has transpired between the United States and Newfoundland since 1908. If this herring trade is so profitable to Americans that they can come more than eight hundred miles to prosecute it, why should the industry not be profitable to our own people who have the fishery at their very doors? Why because the United States authorities have placed a prohibitive tariff barrier against the entry of fish caught by Newfoundlanders into American markets in order to secure a monopoly of the trade for her own citizens. Recognizing this, what should be our course of action? A few years ago we might well have paused before arriving at a decision; we were awaiting patiently for the fulfilment of America's pledge of a for a free market in exchange for the privileges we have so freely accorded her fishermen. But now there should be no hesitation as to our course of action. We should assist our people in getting over the tariff barrier by granting them a bounty on the export of herring to America in vessels owned and registered in this country, a bounty that would do more than off-set the American duty, that would enable our fishermen to obtain vessels suitable for that trade.

Some one may argue, "If this were done the United States would increase her import tax proportionately." I don't think so, for if one can read aright the signs of the times the great body of consumers in the United States are about tired of paying heavy taxes in the interest of a few Gloucester fishing firms and no government dare oppose the popular will very long. Remember the United States must have our herring, remember also that they cannot profitably procure them by the unaided efforts of their own citizens and let us govern ourselves accordingly. We should remove from our West Coast fishermen the stigma of pauperism and dependence upon American fishermen which has been attempted to be fixed upon them, we should bring to an end the days when Newfoundlanders shall be mere "hewers of wood and drawers of water" to American skippers, and we can do it by aiding and encouraging them through a wisely distributed bounty system. It was by this system that the great her-

ring industries of England and Scotland were brought to the enormous proportions that they assume to-day. Then let us profit by such examples. Believe me, sir, I am not actuated by any mere desire for party capital in making this suggestion, for I tell you in all sincerity that I care not who makes the laws of this country, or who administers them, so long as they are made and administered with an eye single to its welfare and advancement. My work in relation to this fishery question extended over thirty years and cullainated at the Hague, I am content the honour and dignity of Newfoundland as a self-governing state of the Empire has been upheld, the jurisdiction and sovereignity of Great Britain and over this Island and its territorial waters has been confirmed, and a way has been made plain whereby the people of Newfoundland may enjoy to a fuller extent than heretofore the riches that lie at their very doors.

We know now what we never knew before, the full extent of our rights and powers ; That is a question for the present Government to determine. I do not know, sir, if the present Government are looking towards Reciprocity with the United States, but I hope they are not. This from me, who has ever been a most ardent advocate of Reciprocity with the United States, will, no doubt, at first appear inconsistency whatever in my position. My advocacy of Reciprocity has been for Reciprocity apart from Canada, and statement with whom I have come in touch on the subject are well aware of this.

I have never failed to appreciate that a free entry into the fish markets of the United States in which Canada participated would be of very little benefit to Newfoundland. Why, you may ask ? Because Canada's vast fishery products, combined with her close proximity to the United States, means the exclusion of our fish. We could not possibly complete with the Dominion of Canada in the American markets.

The value of the fisheries of the Dominion of Canada for 1908 amounted to twenty-nine and a half million dollars, and fifty per cent of that amount was produced by the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, both of which are within easy distance of the principal consuming and distributing cities of America. It is a notable fact that the export of codfish from this country to the United States was not as large during the years that we were united with Canada under a reciprocity treaty with the United States as it was prior to and after the abrogation of that treaty, which shows that Canada's proximity to the free market enabled her to shut out a portion of our former trade, and it bears out any contention that if the Dominion of Canada secures a free market for her fishery products in the United States then we should turn from a considera-

tion of reciprocity with the United States and shape a new policy in the interests of the fisheries of this country.

There is no reason whatever why, under a strict enforcement of those rights that have been confirmed to this Colony under The Hague Award, and the application of a liberal bounty to our fishermen, we should not secure a trade in herring amounting to at least a quarter of a million dollars in value, and which at present is monopolized by a few fish dealers in Gloucester. Newfoundland waters are the home of the bait fishes, and thereby we hold the key to the North American fisheries. That key is now in the keeping of the Government. What will they do with it? Apart from the aspect of the case that I have already presented, I think that free entry of Canadian fishery products into the United States will materially benefit us in this way: The principal demand for fish in the great industrial centres of the United States is for fresh fish.—They won't purchase salt or canned fish of any kind if they can obtain cheap fresh fish.

Canada, with her magnificent railway facilities will be able to run into these centres immense quantities of fresh fish. This must lead to a considerable shortage of Canadian salt cod and can fish in foreign markets, which will be thrown open directly to our shippers, or, the Canadian firms will purchase necessary supplies from our people to fill their orders. In either case the Colony stands to gain. Sir, there may be some whom from want of thought, or actuated purely by some personal interest, may say the Government should endeavour to get in with Canada in her tariff arrangement with the United States of America, even if we have to sacrifice the West Coast fisheries and the pulp industry of Newfoundland and Labrador to accomplish it. I cannot understand honest and patriotic men taking up such a position. I can, however, understand men who form a monopolistic combination in respect to our forest lands taking up such a line of argument, but against such it is the duty of this House to guard itself.

The question that a Committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne was then put, and it was ordered accordingly, and that the following be such Committee:—Mr. Goodison, Mr. Howley, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Mr. Shea and Mr. Davey.

HON. the PRIME MINISTER then laid upon the Table of the House a copy of the Proctor's and Award of The Hague Tribunal of Arbitration on the North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Question, and a copy of the oral argument before the said Tribunal.

HON. THE PREMIER gave notice that he would ask leave to move the House into a Committee of the Whole to introduce Resolu-

tions: To confirm an agreement between His Excellency the Governor and Messrs. Trefethen and Lord, in relation to the establishment of Cold Storage plants in the Colony;

To confirm an agreement made between His Excellency the Governor and the International Carbonizing Company, Ltd., for the purpose of manufacturing Fuel from Peat;

To confirm an agreement made between His Excellency the Governor and the British and Canadian Explosives Company, Ltd., for the purpose of manufacturing Explosives in this Colony.

RT. HON. SIR ROBT. BOND gave notice of questions.

MR. KENT gave notice of questions.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, February 9th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, Feb. 9th.

The House met at 3 o'clock p. m., pursuant to adjournment.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—On behalf of the hon. member for Port de Grave, wnose position in the House precludes him from performing this duty, I ask leave to present a petition from William Joshua Snow and others from Clarke's Beach, in the District of Port de Grave, praying for a grant of money to enable them to construct a road at that place. This road would lead to agricultural lands, and I know of no other way in which money could be better expended than in the improvement of roads to facilitate the people in carying on their agricultural pursuits. I have therefore much pleasure in presenting this petition and asking that it be referred to the Department of Public Works, where I trust it will receive the consideration it deserves.

HON. C. H. EMERSON—I beg to present a petition from Thomas Mercer and others of Black Duck Pond, in the District of Port de Grave, asking for a sum of money to repair a road at that place. Petitioners state that this road was built some fifty years ago, and since then has practically received no attention or repair. Their petition seems a reasonable one and I trust will be acceded to, and I would move that it be received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. CLIFT—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Newtown, Sunday Cove Island, in the electoral District of Twillingate,. The petitioners state that during the past seven or eight years they have been subject to great inconvenience by reason of the s. s. Clyde not calling at that place and they point out that it would take but litttle time to call there and land the mails, freight and passengers. There are over twenty families in the place and judging from present appearaoces it seems that it is increasing in importance and prosperity, which renders the calling of the steamer all the more necessary. In the earlier part of the year I addressed to the Postmaster General a communication dealing with the petition, and asked him to bring the matter before the Government, so that the prayer of the petition might receive consideration before the ports of call for the ensuing season were determined upon, and the Postmaster General returned it to me suggesting that it might be presented to the House and referred to the Colonial Secretary. I now ask that it be received and be referred to the Hon. Colonial Secretary for his consideration. I trust that when it does come up it will be favorably received for the granting of the prayer of the petition would be the means of affording a long sought for facility to the people of the settlement. I have much pleasure, therefore, in presenting the petition.

SIR ROBERT BOND—I beg leave to support the petition which has just been presented by my friend and colleague, Mr. Clift, on behalf of the people of Newtown, Sunday Cove Island, asking that it be made a port for the s. s. Clyde. While I suport the prayer of the petition in all earnestness, I am not unmindful of the fact that there may be difficulty in responding to the prayer, while the great bay of Notre Dame is limited to one steamer. In no portion of the

island is a second steamer more necessary than in this bay; a fact which, I think, will be admitted by those who are acquainted with the amount of trade done there. Especially must this be known by the Reid Newfoundland Co., who, I am sure, find it difficult, very difficult, to meet the requirements at the present time and under existing circumstances. Possibly now that there is a special steamer and I understand a very excellent one, running to Fogo, some readjustment of the schedule may take place, so as to enable the Fogo steamer to take in some portion of the Bay and thus relieve the present want of accommodation. If this is not possible, if the contract that the Government has made with the Company makes it impossible for further ports of call to be added without an increase of cost, the Government should do all in its power to make the provisions necessary for the placing of a second steamer in the Bay of Notre Dame. There is such a large amount of freight to be handled there that a second steamer should require little or no subsidy. We must recognize, of course, that business men are not philanthropists and the contractors will certainly require some subsidy, but out of the overflowing funds at present at the disposal of the Government they might extend a portion to the people of the Bay of Notre Dame. Thre is no doubt that a second steamer is necessary and I feel sure that the members on the other side of the House, who for the time being walk in pleasant paths and have an abundance of funds at their disposal, will endeavor to ascertain if it is not possible to meet in some way or other the demands of these people who require much greater facilities to cope with the ever increasing trade.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— I would like to say a word or two in reference to the petition just presented by my learned friend, Mr. Clift, and supported by the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

It is quite true, as has been stated, that Newtown, Sunday Cove Island, is a place that should be made a port of call for the steamer, but the difficulty is the Clyde has even now more to perform than she can do. It is impossible to add more ports, for this would prevent the steamer from making her regular connections with the train. Last spring the Government undertook to revise the schedule of the bay steamers and ports of call were added to all the steamers except the Clyde, as it was found impossible to add another port of call to her list without dropping one, and as far as I know there is no port that can be dropped. This is the present position, and although we have had applications from threee or four places at which it seems very necessary the steamer should touch we are unable to accede to any of them. It is apparent to those who are acquainted with the facts that if the Clyde is the only steamer in the Bay no more ports can be added. As to the second point raised by the hon. gentlemen opposite, I may say that the question of a second steamer has not come before the Government officially, but I have no doubt that when it does, the matter will be given every consideration.

These several petitions were received and referred to the Departments to which they related.

HON. MIN. FINANCE AND CUSTOMS laid upon the Table of the House the following:

Statements of the Customs revenue collected in the Colony during the year ended 30th June, 1910.

Statements of imports and exports of the Colony for the year ended 30th June, 1910.

A comparative statement of goods, wares and merchandise imported into the Colony during the years ended 30th June, 1909, and 30th June, 1910, showing increase and decrease for the year 1909-10.

A comparative statement of revenue received at each of the outports for the years 1908-9 and 1909-10.

A comparative statement of revenue at each of the outports for the years 1908-9 and 1909-10.

A comparative statement of light dues, showing collection at each outport for the years 1908-9 and 1909-10.

A return of the bank fishery for the year 1910.

A statement showing the revenue collected on goods, wares and merchandise imported through the Post Offices.

A statement showing the movement of shipping during the year ended 30th June, 1910.

An abstract of shipping for the year ended 31st December, 1910.

Questions.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—to ask the Hon. the Premier if the question of a tariff agreement between the Colony and the United States of America has formed the subject of correspondence or of discussion between the respective Governments within the past six months, and, if so, to lay upon the table of this House a full statement of what has taken place.

HON. THE PREMIER—In reply to the right hon. gentleman I beg to say that the question of a tariff agreement between the Colony and the United States has not formed the subject of correspondence or of discussion between the two governments within the past six months or at any time.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the hon. the Premier to lay upon the table of this House a statement showing the total cost to this Colony of the recent appeal to The Hague Tribunal, and if the whole of the accounts have not been received and paid, to furnish details of the payments to date, intimating if such payments are in full of all demands or only payments on account.

HON. PREMIER—I beg to say that the total cost to the Colony of the recent appeal to The Hague Tribunal is not known to the Government as none of the accounts have as yet been furnished them. The payments made by this Government to date are being prepared and will be ready for the next sitting. For the information of the House I may say that the whole of the cost of the printing, amounting to some thousands of dollars, and the fees of the two English King's Councils were paid by the British Government. The whole of the costs incurred by the United States has been paid for by that country, as well as half of the arbitrators' fees. The other half will be paid by Canada and Newfoundland equally. The British agent has paid all the bills so far and none have been furnished this Colony to date.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the hon. the Premier to lay upon the table of this House a copy of all correspondence that has taken

place between this Government and American citizens in respect to the establishment of industries in this Colony.

HON. PREMIER—In reply to the right hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I beg to state that no correspondence has taken place between this Government and American citizens in respect to the establishment of industries in this Colony, except that between the Government and Messrs. Trefethen and Lord of Portland, Maine, the parties referred to in the agreement concerning which I have given notice. The correspondence is very little and I shall have it copied in time for next sitting. I have the originals with me and I will lay them on the table of the House, in order that the gentlemen opposite can peruse them.

I may say also that although I gave notice yesterday to move the House into Committee this afternoon to confirm the agreement between the Government and Messrs. Trefethen and Lord, I shall not do so until Monday next. In the meantime the copies of the agreement are being printed and will be placed in the hands of the members as soon as possible.

MR. KENT—To ask the hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the table of the House a statement in detail, showing all money paid or appropriated for or towards each of the purposes specified in the Act passed during the last session of the Legislature, entitled, "An Act for the Encouragement of Agriculture," giving the names of the parties to whom payments were made, with dates and amounts of such payments under each of the following headings, namely: (1) Paid for formation and superintendence of agricultural societies for each district; (2) the grant paid to each such society to aid in carrying out its object; (3) paid teachers in public schools of the Colony for services as secretary to each such board; (4) paid to others as secretary; (5) paid to or towards or in connection with cost of holding agricultural shows in the Colony and the purchase and freight of exhibits and for prizes at such shows; (6) paid for the compilation of agricultural or farm notes for the local press and for publication of such notes; (7) paid for the delivery of lectures on agriculture throughout the Colony; (8) paid for the compilation and publication of an agricultural primer for the schools; (9) paid for the encouragement of agricultural localities; (10) paid for salaries of experts giving instructions in the cutting and drying of peat and for all expenses and outlays for or in connection therewith; (11) paid for scholarships in schools for highest marks in agriculture; (12) paid for any other cost or expense in connection with any other matter, undertaking or service for or in connection with the encouragement of and improvement of agriculture in the Colony.

HON. MIN. AGRICULTURE AND MINES—The statements asked for are in the course of preparation.

MR. KENT—To ask the hon. the Prime Minister what if anything has been done to comply with the prayer of the petition presented to this House during the last session thereof by th people of Bell Island in relation to the establishment of local self-government on the Island, also to lay on the table of the House a copy of the said petition, and to state whether it is the intention of the Government to in-

troduce any legislation on the subject during the present session.

HON. PREMIER—I may say in reply to the hon. gentleman that nothing has been finalized in relation to the petition of the people of Bell Island for the establishment of local self-government on the Island. The matter has been before the Government on three or four occasions and it is hoped that something may be done before the end of the present session. I am having a copy of the petition made and shall lay it on the table of the House when we next meet.

MR. KENT—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of this House a statement showing in detail all moneys spent on or appropriated for the public wharf at Bell Island, in the District of St. John's East, from March 1st, 1910, to date, giving the dates of payment, the parties to whom payment was made, and the amount of every each payment, with vouchers therefor, and showing what such payments have been made, whether for labor, materials, commissions, superintendence, etc.

HON. MIN. OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—The statement asked for is being prepared.

Notices of Motion.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—To ask leave to introduce a bill to confirm an agreement made between His Excellency the Governor and Messrs. Trefethen and Lord in relation to the establishment of cold storage plants in this Colony.

On motion of Hon. Prime Minister deferred till Monday next.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—To ask leave to introduce a bill to confirm an agreement between His Excellency the Governor and the International Carbonizing Co., Ltd., for the purpose of manufacturing feul from peat.

On motion of Hon. Prime Minister deferred till Monday nexe.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—To ask leave to introduce a bill to confirm an agreement made between His Excellency the Governor and the British and Canadian Explosives Company, Limited, for the purpose of manufacturing explosives in this country.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND gave notice of question.

MR. KENT gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourns until to-morrow, Friday, Feb. 10th. at three o'clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, Feb. 10th

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

HON. MR. EMERSON—I beg to present a petition from J. Sparkes and others of Port-de-Grave, asking for a railway siding at Northern Long Pond. The petitioners state that if this siding is placed there it will be of great advantage to the inhabitants of Georgestown, Turk's Gut and other settlements. I would ask that this petition be referred to the Colonial Secretary's Department.

MR. EARLE—I beg to present a petition from the Orange Lodge at Change Islands, asking for the sum of $80 to construct a road to their Hall. I may say that the building is one of the largest in the Island and is very much used for public meetings. The road is not at all satisfactory. I would ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. WINSOR—I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Cape Freels asking for a grant of $100 to enable them to build a breakwater. I may say that this is a very rough shore with very shallow water, and anything that can be done to enable the inhabitants to of that locality to secure their boats in stormy weather should be done. I also beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Brendan's for an allocation of $200 for repairing a bridge and putting rails around the same. This is a most dangerous place, and petitioners state that the repairs are badly needed. I saw the place myself some few weeks ago and know that this is true. I would ask that this petition be referred to the proper department.

These petitions were received and referred to the departments to which they related.

Questions.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the hon. the Premier of the Government is cognizant of any breach of the Bait Act by any American citizens in the Districts of Fortune Bay or Burgeo and LaPoile.

HON. PREMIER—I beg to say to the right hon. member that the Government is not aware of any breach. This morning I wrote to the various departments that I thought might have information —the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Customs Department—they have heard nothing. If the right hon. gentleman has any information I shall be very glad to receive it, if it is of such a character that it can be given.

MR. KENT—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement with vouchers showing in detail all payments made in the District of St. John's East between March 1st, 1910, and this date, whether from Main Line Grant or Special Grant, or from any other source whatever, giving the names of the parties to whom payments have been made, the amount and date of every such payment, and specifying the particular purpose for which every such payment was made, namely, for labor, material superintendence, commission, or otherwise howsoever, also specifying the particular part of the District in which such payment was made

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—In Mr. Kent's absence I would ask that question.

HON. PREMIER—I would ask in the absence of the Minister that this question stand over till tomorow.

MR. SPEAKER presented to the House a certified copy of Minute of Honorable the Executive Council appointing the Commission of Internal Economy for the Session of 1911.

Ralph Williams, Governor.

The Governor has the honor to communicate to the Honourable House of Assembly the appointment of the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the Legislature, in accordance with the provisions of the Statute 61., Victoria, Cap 1, Sec. 4, as set forth in the accompanying Certified Copy of a Minute of the Honourable Executive Council approved by the Governor on the 3rd. Feb.

At the Government House,
St. John's, Newfoundland,
February 6th, 1911.

January 30th, 1911—Under the provisions of section 4, Cap. 1, 64 Victoria, the following to consti-

tute the Commission of Internal Economy of the Legislature, viz.:

Hon. Sir E. D. Shea, President of the Legislative Council; Hon. John Harris, Hon. George Skelton, M. D., His Honor the Speaker, Hon. Sir E. P. Morris, Kt., K.C., LL.D., Hon. Donald Morison.

MR. GOODISON, on behalf of the Select Committee appointed to draft an Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech present the report of the Select Committee as follows:

To His Excellency Sir Ralph Champneys Williams, K. C. M. G., Governor and Commander in Chief in and over the Island of Newfoundland and its dependencies.

May it please Your Excellency,

We, the Commons of Newfoundland, in Legislative Session assembled, beg leave to thank Your Excellency for the Gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of the Legislature.

On motion the said report was received and adopted unanimously.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rise it adjourn until Monday next, Feb. 13th, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, Feb. 13th.

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

HON. MIN. OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Three Island Harbor, Wesleyville, for an allocation of $400 to build a landing place. Also one from Shoal Harbor, St. Brendan's, for a wharf. Also one from George Hurley and others of Musgravetown, for a wharf. Also one from Dr. McDonald and others, of Salvage, for a well. I may say that these petitions have the hearty support of myself and colleagues. I would ask that these petitions be referred to the proper Departments.

MR. PARSONS—I desire to present a petition from the people of Bay Roberts on the subject of a public wharf. There is a small wharf there at present, built in shallow water, but necessity compels the people to ask for a sum of money to build a larger wharf in deeper water, so that a larger class of vessels may be discharged. I hope and trust that the Government will be able to accede to the request of the petitioners. I would ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg leave to support that petition, Mr. Speaker, as I know the position of the wharf to which the petitioners make reference. For the past number of years there have been quite a few wharves in Bay Roberts, but I am sorry to say that not one of these has gone out in the water far enough to enable any vessel over 150 tons to be discharged. When steamers or large vessels come into Bay Roberts the people find it quite impossible to discharge them. I am in favor of granting the prayer of the petition, and I am sure if it is done all the people of Bay Roberts will be pleased.

MR. DOWNEY—I desire to present a petition from the people of Codroy Valley, asking for the sum of $40 for a ferry at Grand River. I may say that at present there is one at the head, and one four miles above, but they are not sufficient

to meet present requirements. It is well known that Codroy Valley is the most flourishing agricultural section of the country, and already the farms extend 7½ miles from the present ferry. To get to the railway station with their produce the people have to come that distance to the ferry then cross the river and then go 7½ miles to the railway station. The people are put to such expense and trouble to do this that they find it impossible to raise paying crops. If the Government accede to the request of the petitioners it will be a great boon to these people.

MR. HOWLEY—I have been asked o support the petition and do so very willingly, because I know the section of the country from which it comes, and know the need of the ferry asked for. I would like to point out to the House that this section of the country is entirely devoted to farming and does not participate in the marine grants and other such allocations from the public revenue which are provided for the general good, and as it is the policy of the Government to encourage agriculture, I do not think anything better in that direction could be done than acceding to this petition.

MR. HOWLEY—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Dunville, in the District of Placentia and St. Mary's, asking for an allocation of $1,000 for a road along the water side at Dunville. The petition is numerously signed and sets forth that this road has already been commenced, but that owing to want of funds or some other reason it has never been completed. Anyone who is acquainted with this section of the District will be able to see at a glance what a great convenience this road would be. I would ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

I would also ask leave to present a petition from the people of Boat Harbor, on the Western side of Placentia Bay, asking for an allocation of $200 for a bridge. Boat Harbor is a comparatively recent settlement, having sprung up through immigration from other parts of the District, and already there is a considerable population there. Within the past few years they have built up a comfortable settlement and erected a school at their own expense, and they are making the settlement a flourishing and thriving one. The bridge is necessary to enable the people to cross a very deep chasm as they go from one side of the harbor to the other, and to enable the children to get to and from school. I would ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I have much pleasure in supporting the petition from Dunville. This road has now been in course of construction for nine or ten years, and is so far unfinished. Its completion means a great deal to the people of the North East part of Placentia and I hope the Government will take it into consideration. As to the Boat Harbor petition, as my hon. friend says, this is a new settlement. The people there are mostly engaged in farming and this bridge would be a great convenience to them in their work. I hope the Government will take it into consideration. They will not only be helping the people but also advancing the policy of agriculture.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Mr. Speaker I beg to support that petition.

MR. CLIFT—I beg to present a petition from Samuel Parsons and others of Long Island, Twillingate District, asking for a sum of money to construct a wharf and freight shed at Lush's Bight. Petitioners point out that such a wharf is very necessary for the conduct of their business and traffic, and for want of such a place they are subjected to great inconvenience in having to row out to the steamer and get their goods from the ship. I have much pleasure in supporting this petition, and I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see his way clear to grant the amount. Also a petition from Arthur Parsons and others of Lush's Bight, asking for the sum of $350 for the purpose of repairing roads and constructing new roads at that place. Also a petition from Willis Purchase and others of Lush's Bight, Card Harbor and Triton Harbor asking for $590 to connect the main road with the line leading to Fortune Harbor. Also a petition from Thomas Keefe and others of Little Harbor, Twillingate District, on the subject of roads. I ask that these petitions be referred to the Departments to which they belong and I hope that the prayers of the petitioners will receive that consideration which their importance merits.

THE PREMIER laid on the table correspondence asked for by the Leader of the Opposition, between the Government and Messrs. Trefethen and Lord on the subject of cold storage. Also a statement of payments made on account of expenses incurred in connection with the Hague Arbitration.

MR. SPEAKER acquainted the House that he had received the following message from His Excellency the Governor :

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly :

I have to thank you for your Address of Sympathty to His Majesty the King on the death of His Majesty King Edward the Seventh.

Its substance has been sent by telegraph to the Secretary of State for the Colonies for His Majesty's information and the Address itself will be forwarded at the earliest possible date.

I am confident that in no part of the Empire is that sympathy more real than in his ancient Colony, and that the two branches of the Legislature give utterance to the wishes of all Newfoundland in thus expressing their loyal and grateful acknowledgment of the wise rule of our late King.

RALPH WILLIAMS,
Governor.

Government House, St. Johns', Nfld.,
11th February, 1911.

MR. SPEAKER also acquainted the House that His Excellency the Governor would receive the House with the Address of Thanks at Government House at noon tomorrow.

HON. the SPEAKER called the attention of the House to Rule 45 of the Rules of the House, which states that the ordinary routine of the House shall be as follows :

(1) Petitions.
(2) Reports of Committees.
(3) Notices of Motion.
(4) Asking of Questions.

Notices of Question should be given early in the session and not kept until the House is about to adjourn. This would facilitate the proceedings of the House.

MR. CLIFT gave notice of question.

Notice of Motion.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — To move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider Resolutions to confirm an agreement made between His Excellency the Governor and Messrs. Trefethen and Lord, in relation to the establishment of cold storage plants in this Colony.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to request the hon. the Prime Minister to be so good as to defer that motion until to-morrow. The Leader of the Opposition thought he would be able to get here to-day, but he has been prevented from so doing owing to the trains not getting in. I hope therefore that the Premier will be good enough to defer the motion till to-morrow, as the Leader of the Opposition is very anxious to hear what there is to be said on this matter. I am sure the request is a reasonable one, and that the Premier will be willing to accede to it.

THE PREMIER—I have no objection to the hon. member's request being acceded to if the House is satisfied. No doubt the House will be glad to accede to this very proper and reasonable request.

MR. CLIFT—Thank you.

Pursuant to notice, and leave granted, and on motion of the HON. PRIME MINISTER, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider resolutions to confirm an agreement made between His Excellency the Governor and the International Carbonizing Company, Limited, for the purpose of manufacturing fuel from peat.

MR. SPEAKER left the Chair.

MR. PARSONS took the Chair of committee.

HON. the PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to have gone into this matter this afternoon as I had assumed that the question of the establishment of cold storage would have occupied the whole of the session. Under these circumstances I shall only offer a brief statement in relation to the present resolutions and ask the committee to rise until a day later in the week, when we shall have an ample opportunity of discussing and considering this measure. I have no doubt that every member in the committee has already read this agreement and is acquainted with its various terms; and being a matter of the utmost importance to the Colony it should be very carefully considered and weighed before it is adopted. It may be that before this agreement has been executed between the parties, that more effective, more modern, more up-to-date methods of dealing with peat will have been discovered; and it had to be regarded from that aspect when this agreement was made so that care was taken that nothing in the nature of a monopoly, nohing that could in any way affect the future development of the Colony from a peat standpoint, should find a place in the agreement. What the peat industry is worth, or is capable of being developed into, is a matter of which we are still in the region of doubt. Of course no one can give an accurate opinion; no one of us has sufficient information to give more than a guess as to what these vast peat areas may mean to Newfoundland. Up to the present they have not been worked or used either by the ordinary process or

mechanically. Several attempts have been made, companies have been formed, a great deal of nevotiation has been done from time to time, but it all has come to nothing. I know many persons in this country who have spent a great deal upon investigating our peat deposits. Unfortunately up to the present nothing has been accomplished ; but this contract is an attempt, and the Government do not claim it as any more than a bona fide attempt, to work those areas, and convert those that are fit for the purpose into a cheap fuel for our people, and a substitute for that very expensive fuel that they are now compelled to use. I think it may be fairly said without exaggeration that we have very extensive and valuable peat areas in Newfoundland. Before this committee rises I hope the Ministre of Agriculture and Mines will be able to lay before us the result of the peat examination made last year ; reports of the various experts brought here from abroad to investigate our peat areas and ascertain their extent ; also communications from a number of persons in different parts of the Colony, who, led on by their example, have since done something in the way of treating this fuel locally and artificially. From what we know it is safe to say that there are very large peat areas, capable of supplying sufficient for a very large company, distributed all over Newfoundland. Over in Bonavista Bay, particularly near Wesleyville, I am told there are very large and extensive deep peat areas. Some of them have been tested to a depth of 40 or 50 feet, and I think the same is true of Lamaline, down in Burin District, in Fortune Bay and also on the West Coast and in Notre Dame Bay. Two years ago the Agricultural Department availed of the services of Mr. Downey, one of the Board, to make investigatings in relation to these peat areas, and I hope we may have the advantage of seeing his report before this committee rises. The whole of the information we have been able to obtain was brought to the notice of English capitalists by the Government, and the present agreement which we have before us is the result of the negotiations which took place. These people come to us recommended by financial authorities in England, and there seems to be no doubt as to their financial standing.. They are at present engaged in this business in other parts of the world, and I think, therefore, we may reasonably hope that if this agreement be adopted, we may see them establishing in this country, not only giving labor by the development of these dormant waste, idle resources, but establishing a permanent object lesson as to what can be done in the way of manufacturng our peat areas into a commercial article of fuel. I think that to-day the item of fuel, the very expensive article that we now have to purchase, is one of the living troubles that our people suffer from in St. John's and all over the Island. Of course there are still settlements sufficiently near to wood so that they do not suffer from the price of coal. But there are many places where the only fuel procurable is the coal imported from North Sydney ; and owing to the great demand on these mines, due to the great consumption, the justifiable increase in the price of labor, and other causes, the fact remains that we

are to-day paying $6.50 and $7 for a ton of coal that a few years ago we could procure for $4, and it is becoming dearer and dearer every year, and the time has come when some attempt has to be made to meet this condition, and if our peat can be utilized so as to make a good substitute we have made a good start. I do not claim that this will be panacea for all our ills, or that it will do all that we could desire or wish; it is as I have already said, only an attempt to aid the people procuring a cheap and useful fuel. That is the aspect of the mechanical manufacture of the article. But there is another aspect that, though it is not before the committee, is germane to the discussion. It is the utilizing our peat fuel artificially by the people. I referred a moment ago to the peat cutters who came here last year. All those who were at the agricultural Exhibition had evidence of what they had done. There were several tons sent from various parts of the Island. I had some samples myself, not from what was down there, but other samples, and I must say that once the fire was started and the peat put on, nothing could be more desirable. It only required a little attention from time to time. I had letters from Dr. Grenfell at St. Anthony, and various people at St. Lawrence and Lamaline, Dr. Boyle at Carbonear, and many persons who have given it some attention; and all say there is no reason in the world why this peat should not be used by our people all over the Island with great advantage to themselves. Of course it requires, like everything else, to be introduced. Even the farmers who at one time, many years ago, used this fuel to some extent have entirely lost sight of its uses and advantages. But many of them have taken it up, and last year were using it again, not only as a fertilizer for mixing with caplin, but solely and purely as a fuel. In the past this question of fuel was not so serious or so important. Every man out of St. John's lived near easily procurable fuel, good birch, spruce and juniper; his wood pile grew insight of his house, uncut. But now there are very few of our people but have to go in miles and miles to cut fuel. I can remember when I was a boy of people here going into the woods to cut their firing, but that has not been done for years. These people have already received some concessions under our Peat Act, and they now ask for certain grants of our peat areas, and I am hopeful that they will be able to develop them during the coming year.

We live in an age when it is almost impossible to conjecture what is going to happen from one day to another. The advance of science in the development and manufacture of matter which has hitherto lain idle and fallow is wonderful, and the great assistance given to manufacturers by the utilization of all kinds of by-products makes it safe to say that there is nothing in sight that cannot be utilized in some way profitably to the man who invests his money and labor upon it. One reads in the scientific papers of the most wonderful and startling announcements of what is being done by science and the application of modern up to date machinery in utilizing not only the natural resources that come out of the land, but also every by-product from everything in the sea and one might almost say in the

other matter to bore for it. It is is not my intention to ask the committee to do more than have these resolutions read as well as the agreement, so that the committee may have the matter fully before them and the next time we meet we shall probably have the information to which I have referred, available to the members of the committee.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman I should like to take advantage of this opportunity of expressing my thanks to the Premier for postponing the previous resolutions in accordance with my request on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition. I appreciate his courtesy very much and feel safe in saying that by having acceded to this request he will not in any way delay the measure he proposes to introduce. With regard to the resolutions now before the chair I wish to observe that I am quite in sympathy with any movement that may be brought before this House for the purpose of converting our peat areas into commercial products. I have taken some personal interest in the matter and at one time was engaged in correspondence with experts with a view to having our peat areas examined and reported upon, and in other ways I went carefully into the question of the possibility of the development of our peat areas. I had reference to the various reports that were published in Canada for the purpose of enabling those in charge of that branch of their numerous industries, to form some idea of what can be done there and all led me to the conclusion that no successful plant or machinery had yet been discovered by which peat could be profitably utilized for fuel purposes. Yet at the same time there is no doubt whatever that the day is near when some process better than any of those which have been experimented with, will be brought into use, which will solve the question which has occupied so much thought, and upon which so much time and money has been expended. I have already felt that in view of the very large and wholesouled way in which our Canadian friends were taking up this question of peat development, that we in this Colony could stand by, as it were, and watch the progress they were making and profit by their experience. We know that in Canada they have made very large expenditures with a view to testing the possibilities of their peat areas. A little while ago the Government of Canada sent an expert all over the world to visit every peat manufacturing plant in operation, and he came back and made a report which went to show that while there were great possibilities in the development of peat, no process had yet been found sufficiently developed so as to be able to convert the peat into the desired commodity. I hope that under the present agreement those who will have the option of taking up our peat areas will be able to bring about this long desired and much needed substitute for coal which we now have to import. That we have large areas of peat throughout this Colony nobody will deny. It is only a question of getting a proper plant and system of utilizing them. I am sure that when the reports promised by the Premier, of the hon. member, Mr. Downey, who has evidently given this matter some attention, of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and of those peat cutters who were

other matter to bore for it. It is is not my intention to ask the committee to do more than have these resolutions read as well as the agreement, so that the committee may have the matter fully before them and the next time we meet we shall probably have the information to which I have referred, available to the members of the committee.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman I should like to take advantage of this opportunity of expressing my thanks to the Premier for postponing the previous resolutions in accordance with my request on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition. I appreciate his courtesy very much and feel safe in saying that by having acceded to this request he will not in any way delay the measure he proposes to introduce. With regard to the resolutions now before the chair I wish to observe that I am quite in sympathy with any movement that may be brought before this House for the purpose of converting our peat areas into commercial products. I have taken some personal interest in the matter and at one time was engaged in correspondence with experts with a view to having our peat areas examined and reported upon, and in other ways I went carefully into the question of the possibility of the development of our peat areas. I had reference to the various reports that were published in Canada for the purpose of enabling those in charge of that branch of their numerous industries, to form some idea of what can be done there and all led me to the conclusion that no successful plant or machinery had yet been discovered by which peat could be profitably utilized for fuel purposes. Yet at the same time there is no doubt whatever that the day is near when some process better than any of those which have been experimented with, will be brought into use, which will solve the question which has occupied so much thought, and upon which so much time and money has been expended. I have already felt that in view of the very large and wholesouled way in which our Canadian friends were taking up this question of peat development, that we in this Colony could stand by, as it were, and watch the progress they were making and profit by their experience. We know that in Canada they have made very large expenditures with a view to testing the possibilities of their peat areas. A little while ago the Government of Canada sent an expert all over the world to visit every peat manufacturing plant in operation, and he came back and made a report which went to show that while there were great possibilities in the development of peat, no process had yet been found sufficiently developed so as to be able to convert the peat into the desired commodity. I hope that under the present agreement those who will have the option of taking up our peat areas will be able to bring about this long desired and much needed substitute for coal which we now have to import. That we have large areas of peat throughout this Colony nobody will deny. It is only a question of getting a proper plant and system of utilizing them. I am sure that when the reports promised by the Premier, of the hon. member, Mr. Downey, who has evidently given this matter some attention, of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and of those peat cutters who were

engaged last year in cutting the peat are presented to the House they will be fraught with some interest and we shall have more information to assist us in the discussion of the matter than we have at the present time. So far as I am personally concerned, I shall hail with delight anything that could be introduced in this House which will induce capitalists either from outside or within the country, to turn their attention to this very important matter, so that in the near future we may be able to place upon our markets some substitute for the very expensive coal we now have to burn.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from tthe Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Committee have leave to sit again to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of HON. PRIME MINISTER, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Resolutions to confirm an agreement made between His Excellency the Governor and the British and Canadian Explosives Company, Limited, for the purpose of manufacturing.

MR. SPEAKER left the Chair.

MR. PARSONS took the Chair of Committee.

HON. the PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, in moving the adoption of these resolutions it is not necessary for me to occupy the Committee by remarks of any great length, for the reason that I do not think there is anything in the agreement of a controversial nature whatever. The Company which is party to this agreement are known as the British and Canadian Explosives Company, Limited,, of England. They are very large manufacturers of explosives used in this Colony in connection with mining, railway building and other industrial operations. So far as the Government nave been able to ascertain, the Company is composed of reputable and responsible persons who will likely carry out everything which they have agreed to. Last year there were imported into this Colony explosives to the value of about $80,000, most of which, of course, came in free of duty, because they were imported by the Bell Island mining companies, the Reid Newfoundland Company, the York Harbor Mining Company, and other people engaged in the exploration and development of mining properties. If valued by the amount used locally the industry would not be a very large one, provided the Company only intended to manufacture for local requirements; but they have informed the Government it is their intention to manufacture for export as well. The conditions here seem to be peculiarly suitable to the business; and our proximity to Canada and the United States will make it possible for them to open up a large export trade larger than they now enjoy with these countries. But though the local consumption is now small, it is not to be presumed it will remain so. At present, though this might be called a mining country only in two or three mines are active operations going on; but we are, I think, on the eve of a large mining development, and with this must come a greater demand for

explosives. During the past few years the Harmsworths have expended nearly $200,000 on one of their mineral properties alone—and if this amount is spent merely in examination , what will be spent when actual development takes place.

I have had several conversations with the representative of the Company in this city, and I think he is in earnest and that after a short while we shall have a very large industry in our midst. It is a matter of congratulation that in coming here they will not be treading on the toes of anyone else ; it is a great thing to be able to offer encouragement to all industry of this description without competing with people already established.

It is proposed in these resolutions to give this company free unimproved Crown lands for building purposes ; also the right to cut timber for their boxes and packages, and to use whatever water power is necessary to drive their machinery. These are merely the rights we are prepared to give anyone who will establish a new industry in our midst. The Company cannot establish their works near or in any city, as their manufacturing process is too dangerous. We are to admit their plant, machinery, implements, apparatus, equipment and material necessary for the original installation duty free and also all raw material for the manufacture of explosive. The Committee will understand that in permitting them to bring in the material necessary to manufacture their explosives, dynamite, gunpowder, fuses, etc., we are not giving any concession for the manufactured article which already comes in free of duty.

It will be readily seen, I think, where the advantage comes in from having such an industry established in the country. It will be a good advertisement, apart from the labor and employment it will provide which will probably mean twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars annually, even if they only supply the local market. But they have large customers in the United States and Canada which will be supplied from here, and it is impossible to estimate what their output will be. The advertisement, as I have said, will be worth something when it becomes known that they were lured away from Canada, where they originally intended to locate, by the superior facilities which this country offered. I think that the Committee will see that this is an agreement the character of which will strongly commend itself to them, and I, therefore, beg to move the adoption of the first resolution.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Premier if the factory site has yet been chosen.

HON. the PREMIER— I have no information that it has.

MR. CLIFT—As to section 5, which gives the Company the right to export boxes—had they not that right before ?

HON. the PREMIER—Yes, certainly, but they were not quite sure of it and wanted it put in the agreement.

MR. CLIFT— As to section 7, will not that give the Company a monopoly provided they manufacture enough explosives of good quality to satisfy the local demand ? And wouldn't such a monopoly interfere somewhat with the mining companies ? Suppos-

ing the companies on Bell Island claim that this Company is not manufacturing an article sufficiently good or equal to the imported article, and make out a prima facie case in this respect, I suppose then, that under section 11, this might be regarded as a matter for arbitration; but could either of the Bell Island Companies, for example, of their own act refer this to arbitration so as to determine whether or not the local article is as good as the imported one? I would like this matter made a little clearer.

HON. the PREMIER—The point is well taken by the hon. member. The answer is this: The Government agree that when they are satisfied the Company are able to manufacture an article as good and as cheap as the imported article, they will give the Company reasonable protection against the foreign article—the same protection that every other company in the whole Island is given. If we were to take down the tariff wall every factory in the country, with a few exceptions, would be forced to close down. The Government must be satisfied, and if the Company fail to carry out their agreement, and the article manufactured is not as good as the imported article, creating companies, then this is a matter for arbitration, and if the arbitrators say that the local article is equal to the foreign article then it is only fair to give this company the protection it requires. They are able to produce as good and as cheap an article as that imported. Their representative told me they would never require any such legislation, as they are able to beat the foreign article. As a matter of fact the companies on Bell Island, the Reid Newfoundland Company and other companies are already being supplied by this company, so that no difficulty is looked for in that direction.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and adopted the resolutions without amendment, and recommending the introduction of a Bill to give effect thereto.

Ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the said Bill be now introduced.

Whereupon the Bill entitled, "An Act to encourage the Manufacture of Explosives," was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The remaining notice of motion was deferred.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to move that supply be granted to His Majesty.

MR. CLIFT gave notice of question.

HON. PRIME MINISTER gave notice of motion.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 14th, at 11.45 of the clock in the forenoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, Feb. 14th.

Committee of the Whole on the Cold Storage Resolutions, Mr. Parsons in the Chair.

THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, the Resolutions now before the Committee are for the puropose of confirming an agreement made between the Government and Messrs. Trefethen and Lord, of Portland, Maine, in relation to the establishment in this country of mechanical cold storage in its application to the fisheries of this Colony. I do not think it necessary at this advanced point in the history of this process or system that I should be called upon, or that it should be considered necessary for me to address the Committee with any argument as to the value of this process, or as to the desirability of its adoption by this country, if it can be applied to our fisheries.

What Cold Storage Has Done.

It would be loss of time to go into any details or any matters of history in relation to cold storage and its wonderful growth all the world over during the last twenty-five years. I think, if my memory is correct, it was about 1880 that this process was adopted in Australia and New Zealand in its application to the refrigeration and exportation of meat. Up to that time millions of carcasses of mutton in those countries were of no value or use whatever, unless for converting into tallow or fat by reduction. Now the whole of these meat products are shipped frozen to England; countless industries have sprung up connection with them, and Australia's products bear a largely increased value. Hundreds of ships cross the Atlantic every year and bring mutton and meat from New Zealand and Australia, 14,000 miles, at a freight rate of only two cents a pound. I have only to point out that we here in this country are only 2,000 miles from those very same European markets, and only 1,000 miles from the other great markets of ninety million people in the United States and nearly eight million in Canada, to give ground for the hope that there are no insuperable natural obstacles in the way of our making it profitable also if we adopt it in this country.

Its Value to this Country.

A matter so well known and so clearly established as the value of cold storage ought not to require any argument or any time to convince the Committee that if we can apply it to the fisheries of Newfoundland we shall be doing a very good thing. The question of cold storage is not a novel measure in this Legislature. In 1898 the first bill was introduced for the purpose of encouraging cold storage companies and the adoption of these principles in the handling of our fishery products. I am sorry to say that that Act has lain dormant on the Statute Book; nothing was done, nohing came of it. The late Government in 1904 again took up the matter and an attempt was then made to interest parties and have a bill introduced into the House confirming an agreement with some people in Canada and the United States. An agreement was entered into, but, I understand, that the restrictions placed on them were such as made it impossible for the contractors to obtain the necessary capital; and the arrangement fell through. Last year the Legislature unanimously passed

practically the same bill as that of 1898 and 1904, but increased the capital from $130,000 to $500,000, or, in other words, broadened out the guarantee. I think also in 1904 the capital was increased upon which the guarantee was to be give.n

The Proposals in Detail.

The present contract, though of a more extensive and comprehensive character, is in its details and principles simple and easily understood. Under this agreement the contractors agree to erect a certain number of cold storage plants—five in all and one each year, each having a capacity in the neighborhood of 1,000,000 lbs., and in addition to these they will put up glue factories and buildings for other industries, such as smoking houses, etc. I think the Committee will agree with me that there is little room for such a company in this country if their advent does not increase the present price of fish. It is indeed improbable that they will obtain much fish for their works unless they give our people a higher price than they are now being paid, and if they do that, if they will raise the price only twenty-five cents a quintal, it will mean thousands of dollars extra going into the pockets of those who pay the revenue out of which this company will have to be subsidized $25,000 if they faii to make any dividend.

Why We Should Make a Change.

It might reasonably be asked, what is the object of changing our present methods and means of disposing of our fish, and why did the Legislature make the attempt in 1898, in 1904, and why are they doing it to-day? The answer is obvious. We have been accustomed all our lives to cure and market our great staple product in one way, and whilst competition in the markets was small in the days when other food stuffs, canned, preserved, and cold stored did not seriously compete with us it made little difference to us in Newfoundland. Of course there were years, as we all know, of bad fisheries and bad prices, and the people emigrated to other countries. The object of this bill is to avoid a condition of things which any day may come to this country —a repitition of that which occurred a few years ago, when the fishermen of this country, unable to sell their produce at any price, were forced to take it back to heir homes or store it in St. John's. We don't want again to witness the day when cargoes of fish will have to return to Newfoundland because of glutted markets. We want to anticipate and prepare for such a contingency as this.

Danger of Not Being Prepared.

We have had many troubles in this country that might have been averted if we had been prepared. The crash, the great fire and many other misfortunes came for the reason that we were not prepared to cope with them, and any day the competition of other countries engaged in the fish trade, and the competition of new methods and ways of putting up fish and new foods of every description, to which even ourselves contribute by our canned goods, and which are telling against us, might bring a repetition of these conditions; and we, as the custodians of the public interests of this country, I might almost say, the fishing interests, since they are supreme, must never tire of opening up new methods

and systems to prevent such a disaster and at the same time assist our people in getting the highest value for their labor. I do not expect that this company will, for some time, be able to obtain any great markets for our codfish, but we have in the waters around our coasts millions of tons of fish, some of which are there all the year round, that can and will be utilized. Not only that, but a great deal now thrown away because it is considered valueless, can, by proper scientific application, be converted into gold and money without requiring any additional labor or time.

What We could do with Codfish.

Take our codfishery of to-day. We market in weight somewhere about 1¼ million quintals and on the average we throw away nearly one third of that every year in offal without making any effort to utilize it. There is, for example, fertilizer, which we are throwing away in immense quantities every year, and yet we have to import thousands of dollars worth annually to assist in our agricultural development. One half the industries to-day could not be carried on were it not for the utilization of the natural by-products. Take the products of the Standard Oil Company as an illustration. We can remember when kerosene oil cost from fifty to sixty cents a gallon, though to-day we can buy it for eighteen cents. Why is this? The reason is because they are utilizing every component part of the crude petroleum, manufacturing 20 or 30 different by-products, and this enables them to sell kerosene oil almost as cheap as the by-product. It is the same with every other industry. The unfortunate thing in his country is that we have not been able to utilize our by-products. But to get back to the main issue.

Prospects regarding other Fisheries.

This company will devote themselves entirely to codfish. We have in this country as fine halibut grounds as in any country. They are not in any particular district; they are all over the Island, and all up through the Straits of Belle Isle, right down to Labrador, and we know as little about them as we do about the fishery in Mars. Our fishermen have never engaged in this fishery except to a very small extent, though it pays the fishermen of Gloucester to come here year after year and prosecute the halibut fishery to the extent of half a million dollars practically in sight of our very doors. There is no difficulty at all in selling this fish in Canada and or the United States. Then there is turbot, salmon and many other kinds of fish. I was speaking to a gentleman the other day and he enumerated many other fishes which might be utllized and put up for market. He spoke of the flat fish, which are plentiful all around our coast, and we can also get eels and turbot. All these fish, which are now practically of no use or value, can be turned into money. Then, again there is the caplin. There is probably nothing in nature so certain as the return of the caplin to our shores every year. I believe there are records when they were scarce, but they come with mathematical precision and certainty, and there are millions of tons of them. The shores everywhere are black with them, and yet, I am told, they can be put up in cold storage and shipped to the United States and Canada, where they can be sold as a delicacy.

Opportunities in Herring Fishery.

Then take our herring fishery. Only the other day the herring fishery at Bay of Islands closed and we shipped away some 80,000 barrels of herring, of which 60,000 went to the United States. And what did our people profit from this? About $1.25 per barrel, or, at the highest figure, probably about $100,000. If these herring could have been cured and smoked and boxed, the value would probably have doubled; but as it is we are now supplying the smoke house at Gloucester, and providing work for the men who make boxes in Gloucester. Wnat we want to do and what this bill will enable us to do is to construct smoke houses in Bay of Islands, Notre Dame Bay, Fortune Bay, the home of the herring, and Placentia Bay, and let Newfoundland take her proper place in the great herring industry of the world. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, as to the value and quality of our herring, but the misfortune has been that from the very moment we take the herring out of the net we begin the work of lessening their value. It is a very sad reflection that to-day in Chicago Scotch herring are selling at $13 a barrel, and a barrel of Newfoundland herring will not sell for more than $4, even though it is of better quality.

The Remedy he now Proposes.

It is for the purpose of remedying this that the present measure is before the House. I say that if our people are encouraged and if these cold storage plants are installed and nothing utilized but caplin, lobsters, turbot, salmon eels, flat fish and herring, that is, if they never touched a codfish, there are millions of dollars in the industry, if it is properly exploited. We have a market, present and increasing, of ninety million people in the United States and nearly eight million in Canada crying out for cheap food and fish, and whilst the demand is increasing the cost of producing the article is not increasing. Our people can produce fish as cheaply to-day as forty or fifty years ago. I do not know that everyone views this matter as I do, but I most solemnly say to this Committee that I do not know of any more important work or work of a more serious nature than he application to the fisheries of Newfoundland of the most approved methods of curing and putting up and marketing fish.

The Value of the Bait Act Proved.

Some members of this Committee may remember the passing of the Bait Act of 1886. I was at that time on the floors of this House and the first important vote I gave was in favor of the Bait Act, which has turned out to be the sheet anchor of Newfoundland. It was that Bait Act which turned our people from being bait catchers for the French into independent owners and but for it this Colony would have been bankrupt long ago. It was a big fight for Newfoundland to put up, and it was only by the strongest efforts that we succeeded in crippling the French fishery. Our people were handicapped for they had to compete in the foreign market with these people, who were being paid as large a bounty as our people were being paid for their fish. The French fishermen going into Italy or Greece or Spain got 15, 16 and 17 shillings bounty, when our people were only getting that amount as the whole price. Our

only policy was to attempt to cripple the French fisheries in every legitimate way and this we succeeded in doing, chiefly by stopping their supply of bait. But other competitors have arisen since those days.

What our Rivals have Done.

The Norwegians have developed their fishery to a large extent; as also have the Icelanders, though not to so large an extent, but to an extent appreciable in Newfoundland. In 1895 there were over 40 thousand quintals of fish shipped from this country to Bristol for consumption there and at Falmourth, Plymouth and other places round the southern portions of England. All that has now been driven out by fish from Iceland. These people sell their fish a dollar cheaper than our people and brand it Labrador fish. I could enumemerate numerous other instances to convince this Committee of the imperative necessity for doing something to develop new markets for our fish. For many years I suppose it is safe to say there will be a very large market for our fish in the Latin countries, for in these warm southern countries fresh fish will not keep, only the salted aricle. These people like our fish; they know it is a good cheap article of food, but the competition from other countries and the development of new methods and the introduction of new foods is lessening our markets every year and our only salvation is to find new avenues for the disposal of our staple. And how can that be done except by turning to the neighboring continent where there are millions of people who want our fish if we can give it to them.

Now, sir; the Committee is conversant with the agreement before the House; it is framed on the Act of last year, which is practically a copy of the Acts of 1904 and 1898. My attention has been drawn to certain statements in the public press as regards the interpretation of section 5. And I want to say right here that I do not agree that the section is capable of the interpretation placed upon it, but so far as I am concerned I feel sure there can be no objection whatever to the insertion of such into the contract as will place beyond all doubt as to what it means. I am unable to find any other meaning for than the one which its framers intended it to convey. If you look at the Cold Storage Act of last year as well as at the two Acts of 1904 and 1898 you will find the words are practically verbatum as in this agreement.

The Guarantees we are to Give.

We guarantee to make up to the Company whatever shortage there is on five per cent. of their invested capital. If they make four per cent. we will have to pay one per cent. If they make three per cent. we shall be bound to pay two per cent. If they make only one per cent. we shall have to pay four per cent. on their invested capital. In brief, whatever shortage there may be of five per cent. we pay it. That is the substance of the section; it has nothing to do with the profit or loss of the business. It does not make any difference whether they do a business of $10,000,000 or only $1,000,000, whether they lose one million or five million. We are not interested in that. Our interest lies in the fact whether or not they make five per cent. on their invested capital. If they do not we have to pay that

amount. If the invested capital is half a million and they fail to pay any dividend, we will have to pay $25,000. It is a mere question for the Legislature whether they think it worth their while to take the risk in the interest of every fisherman in the country, or whether they are going to do nothing at all. I agree with those who raised the point, that we must run no possible risk. We are not going to take any risks.

Closest Criticism of Measures Invited.

I invite and court the closest examination of the bill and I recognize the right of the press to give expression to any fair criticism and give light to the slightest objection. It is the act of a friend rather than the act of one who wants to obstruct, and I say right here that if that section is capable of any such construction, which I do not admit, then words must be inserted in the Act before it leaves this Committee to put it beyond doubt as to what it means. Another criticism which has been made in relation to this contract is its effect on every lobster packer and dry fish packer, on account of the right of free entry of certain items in this act. All I can say is that we are prepared to put every item in this bill on the free list, so that every man who wants to may go into this business to-morrow. What would be the effect of this on the lobster packer? How would it injure him? The price for lobsters has been going up by leaps and bounds. Last year they were $16 a case, and yet the packer is only paying three cents each for lobsters or $3 a hundred. How is it going to affect him? I am prepared to allow all the tin for tinning lobsters duty free for the lobster packer. But these people are not going into the lobster packing business. They will buy lobsters for the purpose of cold storing them and when our lobsters are sold fresh frozen in London, New York, Boston and other parts of the world at 40 and 50 cents each, the catcher will get more than three cents each for them in Newfoundland. What is the object of taking off the duty on the tin for lobster packing? It would only make it a little cheaper for the consumer of the lobster. It would not give the catchers a better price.

The Question of Selling Bait.

Another criticism was that while the Act of 1904 gave the contractor the right to sell bait only to Newfoundland fishermen this agreement gave the Company the right to sell it to everyone. That was written evidently without any knowledge on the part of the writer that there is such a thing as the Bait Act. And while that Act remains on the Statute Book the Government has full control over the export of our bait fishes and can decide to whom a license shall be given and where the fish shall be exported.

Reference was made in the papers to the way in which local companies were treated in this matter. There is nothing whatever in that criticism, nothing whatever. The paper names Mr. Lake and Mr. Clouston. These men would be the last in the world to say anything against this agreement. As a matter of fact anything asked for by Mr. Clouston has been given to him. In 1909 Mr. Clouston applied to the Government to get free entry for all

his packing and wrapping paper and other articles and everything he asked for was granted. Then the Newfoundland Fresh Fish Packing Company of Fortune Bay was granted a drawback on all their tins, equal to the duty paid on them. And another Order in Council in 1910 gave a drawback on labels and something like $195 was paid to this Company on the export of their fish.

The Concessions that are Given.

What does this relief from paying duty amount to? Ammonia is to be brought in duty free. There is not a gallon to-day brought in for this purpose and very little for other purposes.

Vegetable oils. At present there are no vegetable oils imported here for the curing of fish and I only wish there was a great quantity, because it would mean labor. And besides this the more fish we send to the market fresh, the more we increase the price of the fish left behind. Not alone do we get a greater price for the fresh article but we raise the price in the foreign market of the hard cured fish.

Then there is tin and lead for cans and solder, gasolene engines and gasolene. These gasolene engines are already allowed in duty free to the fishermen and I think it would be a good idea if we allowed in gasolene as well to them, if we could make the distinction and I think we could.

Printed and lithographed labels. I should very much have liked these labels and such work done this country, but when the Government pointed out their desire for this, they informed us that these were a particular kind, made by an expensive process, which could not be done here.

Then all their plant, machinery and implements necessary for their initial installation. This is given in all similar contracts in every other country, where they wish to encourage any industry.

In addition to this we give them the use of any water power necessary where they can find it, if not already granted to someone else. There can surely be no objection to this. If they go into Bay of Islands, Notre Dame Bay or Trinity Bay and find a water power which has been running for centuries and never been of any use to anyone, there can be no objections to granting it to them. They can only use it in the same way as Harmsworths and others have done, and it can be of no use to them without the expenditure of a large amount of money.

Testimonials to Standing of Lessees

I think it will be admitted that there is nothing in this agreement of an objectionable character. Last year when this bill was before the House I went into the whole question of cold storage, and therefore I do not consider it necessary to go into the matter again to point out its advantages. It would be like whipping a dead horse. There is no argument left. Everyone holds the same opinion on the subject. The great difficulty is to get anyone to spend money; to interest himself in the country. There are so many attractive propositions offering elsewhere. Since the passing of this Act the Government has been exerting itself in its endeavor to make a contract with reputable people. That is half the battle. If you make a contract with peo-

ple who are not in earnest and have no capital, you are certain to fail. We had a great deal of correspondence on the matter, and at last made this agreement with these people, and without tiring the House by reading them, I will table them. They are from leading citizens of Portland, Maine, where the contractors have carried on business. There is one from the President of the First National Bank, one from Drummond and Drummond, leading counsellors at law in that city, one from a Mr. Hall, a leading and prominent man, a letter from the President of the Fidelity Trust Company, one from the Postmaster General of Maine; and all express the opinion that they are men of good financial standing.

Predicts Great Things from the Project.

I feel sure that if this agreement is ratified by the Legislature it will be of inestimable value to Newfoundland. You cannot expect any big firm to go into this kind of business without spending millions. That we recognize from the start. In 1902 I took considerable interest in this matter, and to some extent was responsible for bringing down those people who came here. I was also interested in the 1904 agreement, and was only sorry that after the trouble and pains which I took in endeavoring to make it an accomplished fact, it at last fell through. In 1902 the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took the matter up, a committee was appointed to consider cold storage in all its bearings, and we held what was practically a public meeting down in that office. There were there the late Sir Robert Thorburn, Mr. W. B Grieve, Hon. R. K. Bishop, Hon John Harris, Capt. Dawe, the late Mr. E. C. Watson, the late Mr. James McGrath, Mr. Alex. McDougall, Hon. John Harvey and the Secretary. Nearly all these men were interested in the fis trade of the country. and they were unanimous in their opinion that the encouragement of cold storage implied considerable prosperity for the people. It was the merchants who would most likely be affected by the change in trade conditions. But they all saw that although they might be temporarily affected, yet they were bound in the end to profit by the increased prosperity of the fishermen.

Opinion of Local Authorities.

This is the report that was made and signed by these gentlemen:

"On this subject the Committee are of opinion that cold storage is thoroughly practicable and can be made availible for a considerable portion of the catch of codfish in this Colony, and especially for the transportation of the proceeds of the winter fishery prosecuted on the South and South-West Coasts of the Island, in a fresh condition to the United States and Canada.

"That considering the great benefits that would arise to the fishermen from an increased price for the products of their labor, which has already resulted from the initiation of this fresh fish business, and which would be largely increased with improved methods of handling;

"Considering also the great advantage that would accrue to the general trade of the Colony by the opening up of new markets and the consequent withdrawal of the large amount of

this winter fishery from the dry fish trade, your Committee are unanimously of opinion that an effort should be made to initiate this new departure in business on an extensive scale;

"They are of opinion that looking to the expenditure required to carry on this new and expensive business on such a scale as to make it a success and the great public benefit that would arise from its extension, the Government of the Colony should aid this new enterprise in a substantial way. Without such assistance the Committee consider no private capitalists would initiate this new business.

"They are unanimously of opinion that the most suitable place for erecting an experimental refrigerator is Port aux Basques. It is the terminus of the Newfoundland Railway, the shipping port for Canada and the United States, open all the year round, an important point in the winter fishery, and also connected by rail with Saint George's Bay and Bay of Islands, and consequently the most advantageous situation for carrying on a successful trade in fresh fish, especially in the winter season, when the fish of all kinds are in extra demand, and fetch the highest price."

The Advantages to accrue to the Colony.

That was the report of those gentlemen in 1902. All those men must of necessity have known of the competition which would spring up in their own industries, but they were broad minded enough to see that any industry which would contribute to the benefit of the country would also be a benefit to them indirectly.

The contract now before us for consideration is an honest attempt on a very large scale to introduce the cold storage system into this country and, if successful, it will mean a great deal for the fishermen. It will mean the utilization of thousands of tons of fish and fish products which are now being looked upon as useless. It will mean the development of new methods for our fish. It will mean the utilization of property now going to waste, and, if it does this, will it not be a great boon to the country? Our people, our young men, are leaving the country year by year. They are going to Gloucester, they are going to Nova Scotia to work in the coal mines, to Bell Island, and receive in those places for working the whole year what they would earn in three months on the Labrador.

Will Help to keep our People at Home.

These are all very potent reasons why we should welcome this measure; and I should like to say that whilst I do not find fault with any criticism in this House or out of it, I hope that the Committee will look upon this measure as a national measure, not as a mere party measure, but as a very large national attempt to deal with the larger industry of the country and to deal with it in such a way as will mean altered conditions in the way of marketing our fish products and enable our people to provide more fully for their families than at present. We often hear of suffering amongst our people in the outports and here in the city, and we know that it is

Government would guarantee the annual payment to any company engaged in the business of cold storage the sum by which the net profit of the company might be less than five per cent. on its paid up capital to an amount not exceeding thirty thousand pounds sterling, or one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. The Act was availed of by a number of shareholders residing in London, England, who established their business on the Southern Coast under the style of the "Newfoundland Fish Industries Company." The subsequent history of that Company is a chapter of deplorable management, extravagance and failure. In the year 1904 I introduced a cold storage bill into this House which became law. The bill extended the guarantee provided by the 1898 Act from five years to twenty years and upon amount of five hundred thousand dollars, instead of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, as provided in 1898. The bill that I asked this House to approve guaranteed payment only on the express condition that the company should satisfy the Government of the expenditure of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars in plant, machinery and buildings, and a further sum of two hundred thousand dollars per annum in the purchase of fresh fish for exportation, and which should have been exported in a fresh condition and the manufacture of fish offal. The guarantee was also contingent upon the company erecting and operating eighteen cold storage depots for providing and supplying bait fishes to the fishermen of this Colony alone. Foreign fishermen, mark you, were not to be permitted to avail of bait supplies under the 1904 bill. Under the Agreement now before us no provision is made for supplying our fishermen with bait from cold storage, but on the other hand these suboidized cold storage plants may be used for supplying American fishermen. Further, while the Agreement before us subsidizes an American company, who may engage in the general fish business of the country, the bill of 1904 limited the guarantee to the export of fresh fish and offal.

Under and by virtue of the bill of 1904 certain residents of the United States and Canada incorporated as the "Newfoundland Cold Storage and Reduction Company," engaged to carry out the cold storage scheme that I have briefly outlined, but failing in their engagement their charter became forfeited. I might add that the company required from the Government such a definition of their rights under charter as would have enabled them to export large quantities of fish for bait purposes; this the late Government declined to accede to and the refusal was probably the primary cause of the withdrawal of the company. Now we are face to face with a new proposition. On this occasion the House is invited to confirm an agreement entered into on the 27th December, 1910. In view of the majority at the back of the Government I fully appreciate the course that no matter how defective or oppressive to our fishermen this Agreement may be shown to be because of the numerical weakness of the Opposition, it must pass in its present form unless the Government is open to conviction and amend it.

Now let us examine this Agreement, not in any mere carping or

fault-finding spirit, but in the hope that we may be able to discover defects if they exist and if it can be shown that they do exist that the Government themselves without any formal motion from the Opposition may deem it expedient in the interest of the Colony, to amend the contract before it is ratified by the House. In the first place I would observe that the contract before us differs very materially in its scope and object from that which the Legislature approved in 1901. The main object of the contract of 1904 was to secure the exportation of fish in cold storage so as to relieve the congestion in foreign markets of salt fish which ever militates, to a greater or less degree, against the successful conduct of the codfishery, an industry which is so material to the well being of the whole community; to secure the the reduction of fish offal to a merchantable commodity, as it now goes to waste; and also to secure the cold storage and distribution of bait fishes for the benefit, the whole benefit, of the fishermen of this Colony. These objects commended themselves to the Legislature as sufficient to warrent the payment by the Colony of the subsidy I have named. It is an entirely new departure from any existing business in the Colony, and in no way competed with branches of the fishery business established for years by the enterprise of our commercial men.

The contract that the House is now invited to confirm is one to subsidize for fifteen years an American company which is about to engage in the general fish trade of the Colony, provided they establish and operate five cold storage plants, five smoke houses, two glue factories and two fertilizer plants. This contract does not confine the company to the expert of fresh fish, in fact fresh fish is not mentioned from first to last, but, on the other hand, from a perusal of section 6, it is abundantly clear that salt fish and canned fish and smoked fish is to enter very largely into the business, and the preamble to the Agreement or contract leaves no room for doubt as to the intention of the company to handle other other products. The main object which the Legislature has ever had in view in holding out a consideration for the establishment of cold storage was the export of codfish in a fresh condition, so as to relieve congestion in the salt fish markets. By this means it was hoped that we should obtain higher prices for our staple production. But under the Agreement now before the House the company need not place codfish in cold storage or send a single fresh codfish out of the Colony. The whole of the cold storage plant which the Government have contracted for may be used by this American company as an engine of destruction of our own fishery industry, inasmuch as it is competent for the company to use the whole of the cold storage plants in connection with the freezing and shipping of bait fishes for the supply of American and Canadian fishermen. There is nothing in this Agreement to prevent them from so doing, but on the contrary, by section 8, they are facilitated in carrying on such a business.

Now let me put my objections to this Agreement more clearly, if possible, and more succinctly.

Firstly--I contend there is nothing in this Agreement to prevent

the company from using the whole of the cold storage plants exclusively for the freezing, storing and distribution of bait fishes for the use of American and other foreign fishermen, and from confining the distribution of such fishes to foreigners, thus leaving our own fishermen unprovided for. If this is admitted, and it must be admitted, then under this Agreement we shall be subsidizing a huge foreign instrument that may operate with disastrous effect to the interest of our fishing population and the trade of the Colony; or these cold storage plants may be used exclusively for the freezing of herrings for the American markets. If this is admitted, and it must be admitted, then we shall be subsidizing a foreign company to compete most unfairly with our own people, for the company will not only have the benefit of the guarantee payments from the Government of the Colony, but they will also have the benefit of a free market in the United States, for under the recent United States Treasury Order or decision all fish caught by American crews shall enter the United States free of duty. There is no stipulation in this Agreement, as there was in the 1904 Agreement, that the company shall purchease supplies of fish from our people. They are left free to employ their own crews to fish for them, and by so doing they may claim and obtain a free market in the United States, while our people are barred from that market by a prohibitive duty.

Secondly—I contend that under this Agreement this subsidized American company will compete most unfairly with our merchants and planters in the general fish business. The Company's business as set forth in the Agreement is not alone the freezing of fish and the exportation of frozen fish, but includes the "handling, canning, smoking, packing, and marketing of fish and other products." They may handle salt cod in bulk, in barrels, drums, casks, or cases. They may can lobsters, salmon, trout, codfish, and all other kinds of fish. While our merchants and planters have to pay the manufacturers' price for fish casks, boxes and drums, the Government have agreed under this contract to provide this American company with free supplies of material to make such packages and with free power to drive the machinery for making them. While our fishermen and merchants have to pay twenty-five cent. duty on tinsmiths' tools and ten per cent. duty on tin, and solder imported for the canning of lobsters, salmon, codfish and other produce, this American Company may import such supplies free of duty. While our fishermen and merchants have to pay fifty per cent. duty on the printed labels imported for these tins, this American Company may import all they require free of duty. This is a great injustice, and it may mean driving the poor man out of the fish canning business, and it certainly will mean the curtailment of the business profit of the local supplier, exporter, and of the tinsmith.

Thirdly—I contend that this Agreement means the reversal of the fishing policy that has been followed in this country since the passing of the Bait Act in 1887, for, as I have before said, it practically nullifies in part the operation of the Bait Act. Under and by virtue of the Bait Act we have excluded foreign fishermen from

bait supplies at the hands of our people—I refer now to supplies cutside the bounds of the Treaty Coast. Under this Agreement the American Company have to erect five cold storage plants, and they may erect them on any part of the coasts of the Colony that they may choose. While the Agreement says they shall erect five, they may, if they feel disposed, erect twenty-five or more, and thus have a complete chain of cold storage depots around the Island. Every one of such plants may be used exclusively in the freezing of bait fishes of all kinds; the company are specially authorized under this Agreement to employ Newfoundlanders in conducting the business. No restriction whatever is placed upon the company as to how they may dispose of such bait fishes, and we may suddenly awake to the realization of the fact that the whole banking fleets of New England and Canada are drawing their supplies of bait from these cold storage plants all around our coast. Thus, you will observe, we have practically an annulling of the Bait Act so far as this company is concerned, and a vesting in this company of the whole foreign bait supply, unless there shall follow this legislation a total repeal of the Bait Act. If this Agreement is approved by this House a total repeal of the Bait Act must follow, for this House could never permit the enforcement of that Act against our own people while it was suspended in respect to this company's business. It would be such a glaring courage as no honest body of legislators could be guilty of.

Fourthly—I contend that this Agreement gives away the principal position confirmed in the Colony by The Hague Tribunal. The award of that tribunal declared that American citizens had no right either under the Treaty of 1818 or under any other document to exercise the privilege of buying herring or other bait fishes; it declared that Newfoundlanders could not with impunity sell bait fishes to American citizens, or enter into their employ to catch fish for them while the laws of this country say "thou shalt not."

The Award of The Hague thus left the Government of the Colony masters of the situation. This Agreement reverses that order of things and makes this American Company masters of the whole bait supply of the Colony if they chance to exercise the full powers that it vests in them. Pass ,this Agreement and all the expenditure of money and effort to maintain control of our bait supplies will be so much thrown to the winds of heaven.

Fifthly—I contend that while section 3 of this Agreement limits the liability of the Colony to a payment to the American Company of the sum of seven thousand five hundred dollars per annum, for the next fifteen years. Section 5 leaves the Colony with an unlimited liability to face annually for the next fifteen years. If the Company is successful and can show a net profit of five per cent. on its capital instead, say $500,r00, we shall not be called upon to pay anything more than seven thousand five hundred dollars per year to them.

HON. PREMIER—I only wish to say a few words now in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, as I shall probably have another opportunity to speak more fully before the Committee rises.

In the first place the hon. member asks, "why put these articles in this Agreement if it is intended that they shall be placed on the free list." The answer is very obvious. We might put these articles on the free list to-day and a succeeding Government might put a very heavy duty on them in a few years time. But this Agreement is for fifteen years, and the concessions which we have given these people—as these we gave to the Harmsworths and other parties—should not be affected by future legislation during the continuance of thtis contract. That must be obvious to any person. These parties come in here and ask for free importation of these articles during the continuance of the contract. Merely telling them that we are going to put these articles on the free list is not sufficient for them. They might ask what guarantee have we that you will not put on a fifty per cent. duty next year. The hon. member can easily see that what is on the free list to-day may not be there to-morrow; the policy of a Government to-day may not be the policy of a Government in three or four years time, so that any concern coming before this House naturally seeks that any concessions given them should be continued during the term of the contract. I do not think that there is anything in that point that the right hon. gentleman can possibly base any argument on. The only real point or any importance which the hon. member made or attempted to make, is that this proposed contract affects or nullifies in part the Bait Act. I assume that he means that these people could tomorrow sell bait to foreigners in a different way than our own people. I say, sir, there is nothing to justify that. The hon. member claims that he can obtain high legal opinion to that effect outside this House. Now while I may not be a lawyer of such high standing as the one from whom the hon. member can obtain that opinion, I lay it down here that there is nothing in this contract that in any way nullifies the Bait Act. The contractors cannot do anything under that agreement that our people cannot do. Now I do not mean to say that in taking that position the right hon. member wished to deceive the House, but I know the hon. gentleman too well not to know that in his position as leader of the Opposition he is prepared to take every possible opportunity to strengthen his own case and to weaken that of the Government. I do not say that he would go so far as to intentionally deceive; but a man with the fluency of the hon. member and with his standing in the country and this House is always able to make his arguments appear stronger than they really are. I say again that there is nothing in this agreement that puts these people in the slightest degree in any better position regards the Bait Act than anyone else. Now the hon. member made a point in relation to section 5—the guarantee section; claimed that it was not clearly defined, and referred to the 1904 Act in which there was a well stated limitation, which provided that in no case shall the Government be liable for more than $25,000. That was a clear, well defined limitation. And, sir, the same limitation exists in the section in the present contract. The guarantee is only to apply to a capital up to $500,000, which, at

5 per cent. means $25,000. It is merely expressing the same thing in a different manner. I did not draw the contract myself, I did not draw the section in the contract; but I saw it before it was signed and I agreed with the section as carrying out the intention and meaning of the Government. Whatever meaning may be placed on the section there is only one meaning that the Government will ratify, and that is a guarantee of an amount only equal to five per cent. on their invested capital. In other words, if they invest $100,000 and do not make anything, we shall be liable for 5 per cent., that is $5,000, if they make one per per cent. we shall be liable for $4,000, if three per cent., $2,000, and so on, but we have nothing whatever to do with any other profits or losses, and, as I stated at the opening, if there is any doubt whatever, and if that doubt is a substantial one and one that ought to be noticed, then as far as the Government and I are concerned we are prepared to tear up one hundred contracts and make and remake them rather than prejudice the interests of this Colony in the amount of five cents. I have no objection to and I am prepared to admit the truth of the hon. gentleman's statement that he is speaking as a friend of the country in the discussion of this measure, but I think it is not asking too much to ask him to believe that there are other people in the world who are friends of the country also. You can make contracts—you can fill your Statute Books with contracts—but if you put into them conditions that make them unworkable, they will never get beyond the Statute Book. I could point to half a dozen here now, but I do not want to be in any way personal, and I do not wish to be construed as reflecting on any person particularly; but this Legislature has from time to time ratified contracts here that has never got beyond it, and which have never been in any way productive of any good, and I think the reason of it is they have been tied up with such unnecessary and needless conditions as to make them practically impossible for people who are dealing with the Government to work under. Now the contract before us is a very plain and reasonable one. My hon. friend is afraid that there are going to be 25 or 30 of these cold storage depots all around the Island; and also that people will go into the business of dealing in salt cod, and thus interfere with our own people who are engaged in that business. Does he mean to say that those people are going to come down here and put up these cold storage depots at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars for the purpose of going into the salt cod business. Why such an argument is perfect nonsense. Of course they are not going to interfere with our people that way. Then as to their engaging in the lobster business. They may be going to cold store lobsters, but if they do it will mean that they will give our people a higher price for lobsters. They will not be able to buy a lobster or anything else here without they pay a higher price than is paid at present. That is what it will mean. The more cold storage plants that are started by American, English and Canadian capitalists the better for the people of this country. We want capital brought into this country, we want industries started

and our fisheries developed, and the only way to do it is the way I have stated. and even the hon. member himself admits this, the only question being as to the meaning and terms of the contract. I say you cannot get a business man in the country who has one word to say against this contract, unless it be someone actuated by personal interest and too narrow and too blind to see the advantage to the country.

As regards the herring fishery to which the hon. member has also referred, we are where we were fifty years ago, and it is about time there was a change in that fishery, and something done to make our people more than mere catchers of herring. They should be taught to cure and smoke and box the herring and ship them away as our own products. I think that can be done, and I think we are going about it in a proper manner. I do not care who operates under the Act we are now passing. Any reliable person can come in here and get all the concessions we are giving this firm, and they are not altogether strangers. They have been operating in this country and doing business on the South Coast, and if you go to that part of the Island to-day you will find out something of Trefethen and his dealings with our people, and that he has dealt squarely with them. As long as I am Leader of the Government I am prepared to give the same contract to anyone else; all I want is someone to go in and do his work. I hope the hon. member's words may be prophetic, and that we will have a chain of twenty-five cold storage plants all over the Island. "You give them wood for cases and to make drums," the hon. member said. Well would it be a good thing if twenty-five or thirty thousand barrels of herring were put up in barrels and boxes made in Newfoundland next year instead of in barrels brought down from Gloucester on the deck of an American vessel. Would it not be better to have our own coopers employed next year in making barrels and boxes than to have these packages brought down from Gloucester. Even if they do cut down our trees to make these boxes and barrels, will that in itself not mean labor for Newfoundlanders? This contract specially states that all labor will be performed by Newfoundlanders, unless it be scientific or skilled labor. I can see nothing, Mr. Chairman, in that contention of the hon. member. There was only one serious point made by the hon. member, and to that I referred earlier in the evening and which I stated would be remedied by this Committee before the resolution passed, so that no doubt whatever might exist; but I want to make it clear that I do not admit that that section is open to the construction placed on it by the right hon. member.

SIR R. BOND—I hope the hon. member who has sat down has succeeded in satisfying himself; he certainly, I think, has not satisfied the House as regards the inaccuracy of anything that I have said.

I suppose the hon. gentleman has satisfied himself in reference to the question of duties upon tin and solder and tinsmiths' tools, gasolene, etc., being included in the agreement.

What I have said was that if it had been the intention of the Government to put these articles on

the free list before they entered into that agreement, then there was no occasion whatever for inserting these articles in the agreement. The hon. memeber says, "What an absurdity, why of course it is necessary; the agreement is for fifteen years, and if we put these articles on the free list to-day another Government might take them off to-morrow." That is not an answer. All that is necessary is to put them on the free list and insert a clause in the agreement that no increase of tariff on articles specified will affect the agreement. Then as to my remarks as to giving free lumber for wood, and free machinery for making boxes and barrels and casks, and drums, what was the answer? "We want to provide work for all the coopers of the country." That is the very reason I object to it. You are not providing work for the coopers. You are providing these people with water power free and you are allowing them to put up machinery, which you let in duty free, to make boxes and drums and barrels. What then becomes of our coopers? Why, sir, our coopers will be driven out of business.

Mr. we are told we have put Acts on the Statute Book that are so bound round with technicalities that no one can work under them. But I would ask who drafted those Acts? Was it not the Attorney General of that tme, who is Prime Minister of the Colony to-day. If the Acts are defective is he not the person to blame? "Acts defective and warped round with technicalities!" I say if that is the case the hon. member is responsible.

HON. THE PREMIER—I did not say anything about technicalities. What I said was that there was so many conditions imposed by these Acts that it made it impossible to work under them. I only drafted the Acts, I was not responsible for the conditions that had to go into them. I may draw a lease, but I am not responsible for the amount of rent charged.

SIR ROBERT BOND—Again, Mr. Chairman, we are told that it is the duty of this House to do everything possible to bring about cold storage in order to relieve the salt fish market. But there is nothing in this agreement providing for that. These plants, as far as the agreement is concerned, can be used for the cold storage of any other commodity in the world except fish. Everybody in this House, I presume, is in favor of the principle of cold storage, but in order to encourage that business we may pay too much altogether, and I am afraid that is what we are doing under this agreement. It is not that I object to cold storage, I am in favor of it, but I do not want to pay too high a price for it.

If, as I contend, you are putting the control of bait supplies in the hands of these people and if it is admitted that they can dispose of the bait in any way they please, then you are thwarting the principle of every bill in favor of cold storage that has ever come before this House. That is my contention. I said at the commencement that I was in favor of a measure that makes it a menace to our own planters and merchants. With their hats in their hand the Government went to these people and asked them to come here, and threby placed themselves in an awkward position, when it came to the point of making a contract. Letters had to be written asking

them to come in as the correspondence showed and this correspondence is not very pleasant reading and does not impress one very favorably at all, as those members who have read it will admit. Let us look at it. I think I am correct when I say that the hon. Premier stated that the company would not engage in the canning of fish.

HON. PREMIER—I said they would not can lobsters.

SIR ROBERT BOND—Let us read this letter from the Company to the Government of Oct. 4th last.

'Would ask for privilege of erecting smoke houses for smoking your product home, factories for canning caplin, lobsters, in fact any kind of fish, and curing and packing your codfish and other fish you produce along modern lines."

You see that one of the first conditions is that the company shall be allowed to can and pack fish and yet the hon. Premier has told us that no canning or packing of fish would be undertaken by the company except for the exportation in cold storage. It shows the recklessness of the Premier's reply to the remarks made by me. Not only are these people permitted to can lobsters and other fish but they are subsidized to compete not alone with the poor fishermen who cans lobsters and salmon, but even with the poor berry pickers. Scores of our people are making a livelihood by picking and canning berries and you are subsidizing this company to drive them out of business. This correspondence from beginning to end is not inviting at all and it does not strike me that you are dealing with the class of men you would like to deal with. Here is a telegram sent to the Premier on Jan. 25th. It says: "Our end progressing beyond our expectations. Hope your end doing well. Congratulations." What a way is this to conduct official correspondence. As I have said, one is not favorably impressed from the correspondence with the class of men the Government is dealing with and were it not for the vouchers that have been placed on the table of the House I would not waste time to deal with the matter at all.

I had hoped that the discussion of this question, which is not a party one, would have been dealt with in the manner I had commenced with but no question comes up on which I give an opinion but I am made the object of abuse by the members opposite. On only one occasion last year did I speak and I was then abused by every member of the Government in turn. So it goes on but it is not going to deter me from expressing my opinion frankly on any matter that comes before the House. I can assure the members opposite of that and I trust that henceforth I shall hear no more of it.

HON. PREMIER—The right hon. gentleman has said that I had accused him of trying to mislead the House. No such statement was made by me. As I have already explained there was no intention on my part to make it appear that the hon. gentleman was trying to mislead the House, but on the contrary I took care to state that I particularly wished it to be understood that I had no intention of saying that he did so. I did not use any words in reference to the hon. gentleman that he could possibly take exception to and if there

was any impudence or impertinence it must have been on the other side of the House. I have never made any attempt to "ballyrag" the hon. member, nor do I know of any member who has done so.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the HON. PRIME MINISTER, the Bill entittled, "An Act to encourage the Manufactture of Explosives," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

MR. KENT gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, Feb. 15th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 15th.

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

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from W. J. Scott and other residents of Twillingate, asking for the sum of $100 for the purpose of repairing the masonry work of the main line of road running to Little Harbour. The petition sets out that unless the matter receives immediate attention, more money will be required later on to effect the necessary repairs. It seems to me to be a case of "a stitch in time saves nine," and I hope that the Minister of Public Works will give the prayer of this petition his immediate attention and favorable consideration. This petition has been handed to me by the Hon. Minister of Justice for presentation to the House. It was sent to him by the petitioners, and he has very courteously handed it to me for presentation, and I have much pleasure in doing so and giving it my warmest support.

MR. EARLE—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the Rev. George Mercer, Methodist Minister, and other inhabitants of Fredicton, on the subject of a road to the Church there. They ask for the sum of $400 and I shall be very glad if the Government will allocate that money. I am always very desirous that people should have proper roads to their places of worship. I know this place well, and in some cases the people have to go through bogs and over great stones. I give this petition my hearty support, and ask that it be referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Flat Island North, Bonavista Bay. Petitioners ask for a grant of $40 to provide a ferry boat to take the children from the North Island to the South Island to school. If one thing more than another has my sympathy it is a petition regarding the education of our children. There are about 18 or 20 children on the North Island, and except during the time when the ice is packed in, their

mothers have to take those children and row them across to school. I earnestly support the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY laid upon the table of the House the Report of the Savings Bank for the year ended Dec. 31st, 1910.

Questions.

MR.CLIFT—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of the cost of the erection of the lighthouse on Old Perlican Island, including the names of all persons who worked on the construction of said lighthouse and the sum paid to each person for wages.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister is out of town but I understand the statement is being prepared.

MR. KENT—To ask the Hon. Prime Minister whether any correspondence or negotiations have at any time since the present Government assumed power, been held with the Fish-Fruit Company, and whether any agreement has been made between the Government and the said Company, and, if so, to lay such correspondence and agreement on the table of the House.

HON. PREMIER—Mr. Speaker, I take it that the hon. member means the Fish-Fruit Expora Company. I table the only correspondence I have. As to the second part of the question, there have been some negotiations but no agreement has been reached.

MR. KENT—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement in detail showing all payments made for labor, superintendence, material, commission, or any other purpose upon or connected with the public wharf at Flatrock, from December 31st, 1909, to date, with vouchers, and showing dates and parties to whom payment was made.

HON. PREMIER—The Minister is out of town.

Committee of the Whole on Peat Fuel Resolutions.

On motion of HON. THE PREMIER the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in relation to the manufacture of Peat Fuel.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the introducer of these resolutions if he does not think it desirable to restrict the Company as to the manner in which they shall work these deposits. When I was on the other side a few years ago I made it my business to visit the scene of peat operations in Ireland and see how the peat business was operated there. I found there in existence a restriction on the manner in which the peat is cut, that is to say, a restriction as to the depth at which it should be cut. The object of the restriction is to prevent the operators from destroying the land by the complete exhaustion of the whole deposit. This restriction enables the Crown to avail of the use of the property with one, two, or three feet of peat remaining as arable or pasture land, or even for cultivation. This system has also been carried out in Holland. Holland is one of the largest peat producing countries in the world, and the amount of peat taken annually is over one million tons, while the amount of land from which this is cut represents over one thousand acres.

Now, under the provision to which I refer, the complete exhaustion is not allowed and the result is there is an immense acreage of this land in the highest state of cultivation. I observe no such restriction in the bill to which these deposits are to be worked, and I think it would be desirable for the Government to act upon the suggestions I have made. I throw them out for the judgment of the House as to whether or no there should be such a restriction as to the depth to which the peat bogs should be cut.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the right hon. member, I think that the point made by him is well taken, and it is a matter for consideration by the Committee. I was not aware that the bogs of Holland were as productive as has been pointed out. I knew that considerable areas were being worked, and the past summer when I was in Holland, I made it my business to visit the operations and I saw the produce that came from these bogs. One can quite understand that after a while when great areas of bog have been worked, the country will be denuded of a great amount of soil, and that then a restriction should be placed on such a company as this, to leave two or three feet of bog for a surface above the clay. That will be a matter of arrangement. But I would point out that I do not think that there is any necessity to make any alteration in the present agreement for two reasons. In the first place this is a pioneer company and one would like to see them as free and as unrestricted as possible. With other companies we will be able to place such a restriction in their agreement, and I would point out that this will not place them in any unfavorable position as to competition with the present company. Because it will simply mean that more property, bigger areas of peat will have to be allowed for developing. The other reason is one which I feel sure will be quite satisfactory to the right hon. member, and that is, that even in this agreement this restriction can still be made of effect, because by virtue of the Crown Lands Act the Government can have full control over the manner in which this property is being worked. I do not think that it is necessary to make the amendment in this agreement, which has been executed after considerable negotiations.

RT. HON. SIR ROBERT BOND—Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. leader of the Government for the manner in which he has received my suggestion that occurred to me. Without in any way wishing the agreement to be altered I think that in the Bill the Government should take upon themselves some power in this connection.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, I may say that during this session a bill will be introduced by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines with the object of making some amendments to the Crown Lands Act and that the Government will take that opportunity of dealing with the question.

RT. HON. SIR ROBERT BOND—Mr. Chairman, before this section (section 12) passes I should like to make a few observations. I do not quite understand why water powers should be granted to this company in connection with its business of working peat. One of the country's most valuable public assets is its water powers, and I

think we should be particularly careful to conserve them as much as possible. I see no necessity in the working of peat areas of employing water powers, and this opinion is based upon that of one of the most eminent scientists of the day—Sir R. H. Sankey, K. C. B., Royal Engineer, who in his publication, "The Utilization of Peat Bogs for the Distribution of Electrical Energy,. states that water power is incapable of competing with peat for generation of electrical force. Further, this eminent gentleman records that no less than thirteen power schemes have already obtained parliamentary authorization in the British Isles within the last three or four years, and it is not too much to assume that before another decade has passed, there will . be hardly an existing industry anywhere which will not be in reach of electrical energy and able to apply it. Now, sir, if peat bogs are of themselves highly useful in the generating of power, surely there is no necessity in granting these areas to give water powers as well. I think that the Government is exercising a most uncalled for liberality in allowing this company to choose, it may be, the very best water powers we have when they are not necessary for the successful operation of its business. They may go all over the country and choose the very best water powers we have, for it is not, sir, because a water power is remote that it is not available. Why, sir, Niagara is being used for the generating of electricity to light New York 400 miles away, and the idea is now being considered of extending it to Chicago 400 miles further on. It is no exaggeration, then, to say that this company can select our very best water powers.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the right hon. member I might point out in the first place that the company considers it necessary to have these water powers in connection with the operation of their works. But if the opinion cited by the right hon. gentleman is correct it seems to me to be obvious that this company will not look for a water power. For if the company can provide the power by cheaper means than the utilization of a water power they will naturally do so, and we will never be called upon to make the grant. But if it is necessary for the development of this that they should need a water power then we will give it to them. Ever since the first settlement by John Guy, 300 years ago, our water powers have been going to waste, and with one or two exceptions, we have never been able to utilize them. Now this company comes here and asks for certain peat concessions, and they claim that in order to work them it is necessary that they should have a water power, and they are not being given this power for any other purpose, for section 11 clearly states that the Government agrees to grant to the company, free of charge, the use of a sufficient number of water powers for its operations under the agreement. That clearly means operations for manufacturing peat fuel, and nothing else. The company is not likely to select a water power first and then see if there are any peat areas near. They will select their areas of peat first, and then ascertain the most economical way of operating them, either by harnessing a water power, or by the use

of coal, or peat fuel, or other means. They may never require a water power if the water powers are too far from the scene of their operations. It would not pay to generate electricity at Grand Falls to run the street cars in tS. John's. Anything from 40 per cent. to 60 per cent. of power would be lost in bringing it that distance. As a matter of fact in order to make it a paying concern the power must be developed as close as possible to the industry. People have often wondered why the Reid-Newfoundland Company do not operate a portion of their road from here to Port aux Basque by electricity. The reason is they have not sufficient electrical power, and a large percentage of what they have would be lost covering the distance. Even bringing the power from Petty Harbor here, a large percentage is lost, so that we may reasonably assume that if this company locates at a distance from water powers we may never be called upon for this concession, And whilst we are prepared to conserve the water powers, we are up against this question, if we do not allow them to be utilized by such industries as these, what are we going to do with them? Water power was necessary for the carrying on of the pulp industry and we did not hesitate to give it, and I think, in this case, it is in the public interest to grant this Company the water powers they require. In every issue of the Gazette we see people asking for permission to use the waters of a particular stream for driving machinery. That is all they ask for and that is all they get; they are not given an extensive control of the river. As I stated a minute or two ago, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition has given it as the opinion of an eminent man that water power is not needed for the carrying on of this industry. If that be so, then we can reasonably conclude that we will never be called upon to grant it, and if we are called upon, it will only be by reason of its being necessary.

RT. HON. SIR ROBERT BOND—It is perfectly true, sir, that the water powers of this country have been flowing on ever since the landing of John Guy. They have been flowing even before John Guy was born; they have been flowing ever since creation's morn, but that is no reason why you should give them away. Does not the hon. member know that it is only within the last few years that water powers have been brought into utilization, that their great value has been found out.

Again, sir, my hon. friend said that the Reid Newfoundland Company were not able to operate the railroad by electricity on account of the great loss of power which would ensue in conveying it. Now that is not correct. What is correct is that they had not enough of power to transmit and utilize, but not by reason of the great loss in transmitting it. My hon. friend said that 50 or 60 per cent. would be lost. He is totally in error. Why, the loss of power between Niagara and New York is only 15 per cent., and that is a distance of 400 miles.

I observed, sir, a few moments ago, that this Company could utilize those water powers for some other purpose than what was contemplated under the Act. The hon. the introducer, in reply, quoted section 11. The purpose of the Company, he said, were for

the manufacturing of peat into fuel. But, sir, what is meant is this, that other business than what was contemplated could be carried on, that is to say, the manufacture of other commodities than fuel. For instance, in Germany they make an article of clothing from peat. They also get it from moss litter, which is exported from Germany to London to be used for stabling purposes; also paving blocks, which in Germany are considered better than asphalt. These other industries, I say, sir, may be started up, and which were not contemplated under these resolutions. However, sir, there are the powers that be, and upon them rests the responsibility.

Before this section passes I would like to ask the hon. introducer of the Bill whether he does not think it desirable from a Government standpoint that there should be some limit as to the area to be given to this Company. We contemplate that if this measure passes and the industry is a success, that a very large community will grow up around this industry. Well, if that be so, should there not be some limit to the quantity of land granted? I do not think it wise. I do not think it is desirable in the public interest that we should give away large areas of land to any Company. What area of land are we going to give to this Company? That is a matter which this Committee should decide. We should have some control as a Government, as a Legislature, over those places, both from a public standpoint and a sanitary standpoint, because we might find that this settlement might become a hot bed of disease, unless the Government had some control over the conduct and carrying out of the regulations of the town, and after all the Government is the responsible party for the health of the people in these places. The Government shouuld preserve some control, so as to be able to introduce municipal regulations, if necessary.

HON. THE PREMIER—In answer to the right hon. member as to the limitation of land for the erection of buildings, etc., I think that we cannot put in any better than it is in the resolutions. The Government agrees to grant to the Company such lands situate near or adjacent to any peat bogs proposed to be worked by the Company as may be reasonably required by them.

RT. HON. SIR ROBERT BOND—But, who is to decide what is reasonable.

HON. THE PREMIER—The Governor in Council is to decide. It is not possible to make any limitation to-day. This might turn out to be a very large industry, and therefore it would require large areas for the proper carrying on of its business. I only hope that it will be a very large industry. What is worrying me is that possibly no applications may be made. As to the point made by the hon. member as to who is to decide what is a reasonable amount, I have to say that every application will be judged on its own merits before being passed on by the Governor in Council and the matter will be given every consideration before it is confirmed.

Now, if my right hon. friend will look at section 17 he will find that every difference is to be referred to arbitration. The hon. member laughs. I do not know what his experience with arbitrations has

been, but mine has been very satisfactory. Some arbitrations have not turned out the way we desired them, but a great deal depends upon the arbitrators. Here if any question arose as to what would be a reasonable quantity of land under section 12, it would be referred to arbitration. The Government would appoint one, the company would appoint one, and then if both parties did not agree on the appointment of a third, the Supreme Court would appoint one, thus in any dispute that arises this Colony has virtually the appointment of two arbitrators, for I suppose that I might hold that the Supreme Court is an interested part of the Colony.

Now as to municipal regulations. This matter was fought as strongly as possible. The question was could we get a company to come in here and pay all municipal and local taxation, but our experience has been, as in the case of the Harmsworths, that they all want to be exempt from that kind of taxation. Ths is one of the things asked for. We gave it to Harmsworths, and these people have asked to be allowed to come in under the same conditions. It would be preferrable if it were otherwise, but it is one of the concessions we always have to grant. We cannot get a company to come in here without wanting such concessions, whether it is a cable company or a peat company. As to the point raised by the hon. gentleman in connection with local sanitation, this Legislature has the power to deal with that. If the Bell Island Company, the Harmsworth Company or this company under consideration are not prepared to live up to agreement to carry out ordinary sanitation, our Legislature has the power to deal with that. It can make them amenable to all laws for protecting the public health. principle cannot be questioned.

RT. HON. SIR ROBERT BOND—I am afraid the hon. member has lost sight of my point. I have no desire to interfere with the provisions made for exempting this Company's w'orks from taxation. I think that every company, whether it is a cable company, a peat company or a pulp company should be encouraged in every legitimate way. I do not want to bring the works under taxation But what I do want is that there should be a restricted area granted to this company, and over that area the Government of this Colony should have control for protection of the public health. We will be called upon by this community to make improvement, to build roads, and if we are called upon by them to give grants for roads, surely it is only right that we retain some control. If it were for only ten or fifteen years it would be a different matter, but we are providing for a hundred years hence—really we are giving them a perpetual lease—and if that be so, is it not reasonable for us to retain some power to control those settlements which might grow up during the next 100 years under this Act.

Before you put the Resolutions, I would ask if there is any provision for continuous operation by the company ?

HON. PREMIER—Yes, section 15 provides for that.

SIR ROBERT BOND—That section applies only to royalties to be paid by the Company. I do not think there is any provision that the Company shall operate con-

tinuously or else forfeit their charter. I have looked through the agreement but I have been unable to find such a clause.

HON. PREMIER—I may point out to the hon. member that with the exception of one clause in the agreement there is no specific section which calls for continuous operation, but the same effect is obtainable for this reason, "unless at least one factory with a capacity of not less than 20,000 tons per annum of peat coal briquettes has been erected and put into operation within three years from the date hereof this agreement shall cease and become null and void." Thus the Company is safeguarded for the Company must spend $130,000 and that is sufficient guarantee that they mean business. It is unnecessary to add anything further to ensure continuous oepration by the Company, for they are not going to spend that sum of money in one area, for it must be spent in each area granted without operating continuously. In making them do that you are penalizing the Company quite enough in the event of the factory not being operated.

SIR ROBERT BOND—The hon. gentleman's answer is by no means satisfactory. The first position taken by him was that a provision had been made whereby the Company would be compelled to operate continuously, but I pointed out that there was no such in the agreement. He next read a portion of section 18, but any hon. gentleman can see from perusing that section that nothing whatsoever is contained therein in refe-rence to continuous operation.

That section only provides that the Company shall erect and put into operation one factory within three years, and has nothing whatever to do with the point raised by me. The learned leader of the Government stated further that the Company would erect factories costing $130,000 would be a sufficient guarantee that the Colony's interests were being safeguarded. I say it is no guarantee whatsoever. Suppose the Company defaults or becomes bankrupt, they still hold the land for a hundred years under the agreement and may dispose of their interest in it to any other party. That was certainly not contemplated by the hon. member for he was and is under the impression that the Colony was safeguarded.

HON. PREMIER—I regard the outlay of the money as sufficient security.

SIR ROBERT BOND—It is not sufficient, for they may become insolvent and still own the land, having a perpetual lease of it. I hope it is not because this point has been brought forward by me that the hon. Premier will not consider it, for I would rather refrain from expressing my views than have them go unheeded because they come from me. We are all here for a common purpose, the protection of the people's interests, and I think my objection is a good one and that the passing of the measure should be delayed until the clause is inserted. I would therefore ask the hon. Premier to take the point into consideration and see if the Company are prepared to forfeit the lease if the clause is inserted.

HON. PREMIER—I may say in reply to my right hon. friend that the point raised by him received the consideration of the Government and it was dealt with very fully by them. The proposition is

this : whether the Colony is safe-guarded sufficiently. The lease from the Crown to the Company is subject to the condition that the Company shall erect within three years from the date of the lease a factory having an output capacity of 20,000 tons of peat per annum and costing not less than $125,000 for each area of one thousand acres of bog land selected by the Company. In other words, every time you give them a thousand acres of bog land, that is about 1¾ square miles, they will have to spend $125,000 on that area. Is not that sufficient guarantee ? Is is possible that you are going to get a foreign company to come in and develop an uncertain industry and bind them to operate it ? There must be some little give and take or we shall not get any company to come here. What person who owned two square miles of bog land would not be glad to lease it for a hundred years if he could get $125,000 spent on it. Is not that sufficient guarantee that work is to be done ? If they come here and spend their money and it turns out a failure isn't that penalty enough. How can you hope to penalize them further ? If there is anything in the venture there will be much more than that amount spent and our people must of necessity benefit by it. If the Company goes insolvent, as sug-geted by the right hon. gentleman, all their property passes to the trustee in insolvency and whoever succeeds the Company is likely to carry the business on. If nobody is inclined to follow on the business whoever is in charge of the Government at that time may obtain a splendid bargain for the Colony. I may also point out under the law of the land to-day leases of bog land may be granted for a nominal sum. If you look at the Crown Lands Act you will find that for a small sum parties may acquire bog land without any clause for continuous operation, but here we have a company that does not want any title until it has installed a plant worth $130,000. Surely this is sufficient security in addition to the other section which I have noted.

It is not because the right hon. gentleman has made the suggestion that I am refusing to give it full value and I want to make it clear that there is no such desire on my part or on the part of my colleagues. We court the closest and most extensive criticism of every bill brought into the House by us, for we recognize that we are only a part of the Legislature and those on the other side , although they have no authority to make contracts, are entitled to have their opinions heard and given as much attention to as those of the members on the Government side.

SIR ROBERT BOND—The learned leader of the Government has endeavored to emphasize the point that in the expenditure by the Company of $130,000 we have an ample guarantee for the working of these areas in which this amount is expended. His line of argument is that the Bill provides that this amount must be spent in the area before it is leased to the Company and that if the Company does not operate they will at least have spent that amount of money. He seems to have lost sight of the fact that the great bulk of the money will be spent on machinery and not on the buildings. The machinery is removable, for the Government has no lieu on it under this Bill, and the machinery

is the part that costs the most money. The shed that covers it will not cost very much and if the machinery is removed the Colony has no security except a few old shacks, while the Company has a hundred years lease of the land.

Again, the learned leader of the House says that it is only bog land that is not of much value just now. While it is quite true that up to the present time we have not utilized our bog areas it does not follow that they will always be worth as little as they are to-day. Look at Holland. Only a few years ago that country was not much better than we are, but look at it to-day. Look at its bog lands. While they were worth practically nothing a few years ago, cut out bog land sells at $800 an acre. I refer to this because the hon. gentleman emphasized t he point that the lands were of not much use. In a hundred years time they may be very valuable.

The hon. gentleman also says that under the Crown Lands Act peat land can be obtained without any clause for continuous operation, but under that Act the parties have to spend money on it and they do not receive any lease in perpetuity. They get no free water power or free entry of machinery. Further, they are not a subsidized company and in fact the position is a different one altogether. I have thrown out for the consideration of the House, for we are now a Committee of the Whole, and are equally responsible for any business transacted by it, the point that the Colony is not sufficiently protected in the agreement now before us. The day may come when you will see the contractors leave the Colony with their machinery and leave nothing but a few clapboards to represent the lease which the Government has granted them.

HON. PREMIER—When that day comes—and I hope it never will—and when we see them going out through the Narrows after having attempted in vain to establish the industry in the Colony, that in itself will be our justification for not putting any further restrtictions on the Company than we now have.

MR. KENT—I would like to make a few remarks in reference to the matter now before the Chair. I think that even the Hon. Premier himself will admit that the Colony has no guarantee under the contract for continuous operation. In fact I feel sure that every member who has listened to him is convinced that the Colony has no security for continuous operation by the Company. He is convinced himself that the Colony has no protection, for his last statement admits the whole position. We are considering a contract which is contemplated to inaugurate and establish amongst us a most important and desirable industry, one which all of us hope to see established here. In order to induce the Company to come here the Government has made certain concessions and agreed to lease lease certain areas to the Company subject to the condition that they erect certain factories within three years from the date of contract, but I do not see any guarantee that the machinery shall be used for the purpose for which the Government intends it to be used under the agreement.

Supposing, Mr. Chairman, that in the course of four years or more from now this Company sees fit to

cease operations at these factories for peat purposes—they saw it would be more remunerative to go into other industries which would be of more financial advantage to them but which would not have an equal claim upon the people of this country, or would not be of the same general utility as the development of our peatareas—they would have a perfect right to abandon the contract and maintain their rights under it and devote their energies and capital to other purposes without forfeiting any of the rights which they have acquired, because the condition upon which they get them is that they put a factory in operation in three years. It is clear from the admission of the Prime Minister that he was not aware whether such a clause was in the agreement or not. He had to read it upside down to see that such a clause was there, and it was only after some considerable time that he discovered it was. I think, Mr. Chairman, such a clause should be inserted. In every contract coming before the Legislature granting rights of this kind, where rights have been granted extending over a number of years, a clause has been inserted providing for continuous operation or in default thereof forfeiture of the rights granted.

HON. PREMIER—It is perfectly true that where large interests are concerned and large franchises and properties are conveyed away, the clause for continuous operation is always put in, but this is not a contract of that character. This Company could come in here to-day and get from this Colony for $300 a fee simple grant of land equal in area to the lot now conveyed to them, and upon which they are required to put up a factory costing $125,000. For thirty cents an acre they can buy a fee simple tittle to any acre of Crown lands in the Colony. The hon. member said that I was not aware whether a clause for continuous operation was inserted in the agreement or not. He said that I had to read upside down. But I am not in the habit of reading things upside down.

MR. KENT—That is merely a difference of opinion.

HON. PREMIER—Yes, but you will find no one to back your opinion. The hon. member had no justification for saying that I had to read this contract or anything else upside down to get a correct view of it. Perhaps the hon. member himself may have to read things upside down in order to get a correct view of them. Now, sir, the agreement placed here this evening does not give away any franchise or any rignt of such importance as to require a clause for continuous operation, and the fact that they are prepared to come in here and on each lot establish a factory worth in the neighborhood of $130,000 amply safeguards the Colony.

RT. HON. SIR ROBERT BOND—I do not think that that is a sufficient answer at all. My learned friend's position is this: That any man can come to the Crown Lands Office to-morrow and obtain for $300 a grant in fee simple without any condition as to forfeiture. That is perfectly true. But is that an answer to this position? Why, certainly not. What is this position? That you are subsidizing this Company in addition to granting them these properties. If a man goes down to the Crown Lands Office and pays $300 for an

area, even though he is not liable to forfeiture, he is not exempt from taxation, he is not permitted to bring in machinery duty free to place upon that land; he is not given any number of water powers in this Colony he likes to ask for. The truth is that the leader of the Government had tion with this agreement. Possition with this agreement. Poscibly but for loyalty to his friends he would tell us that he had nothing to do with the agreement. In fact I am assuming that he had nothing to do with the agreement, because he did not know whether that provision for continuous operation was there or not.

HON. PREMIER—It was there by implication.

SIR ROBERT BOND—It is not there, and my learned friend was so confident that it was there that he spent a considerable time looking for it. He thought it was was there. If he had drawn up the agreement no doubt it would be there. But he did not draw up the agreement, and now when I point out that that provision is not there he tells us that a man for $300 can get the same concession, Now, ther is a mistake again. Under the Crown Lands Act, it is true he can get land for 30 cents an acre, but he would not be exempt from taxation, he would not get his machinery in duty free and he would not get all the water powers he required. It is an utterly different position, but, as I said, an awkward situation has arisen and he has to make the best of it.

HON. PREMIER—One word in reply, and it is this, that it is not an entirely different position at all, and it is not a subsidized company in the way the right hon. member states. Now as to bringing in machinery duty free, anyone can obtain that concession. I want it to be known all over the country that any man can bring in machinery duty free for the purpose of starting a new industry, because every new industry that is started means more employment, and that is what we want in this country. The Harmsworths, the Albert E. Read Co. and the Bell Island Companies, all got their machinery in duty free, no matter how small or how large the industry may be, and no application of that kind has ever been refused by this Government nor by the late Government while I was a member of it, and I have no doubt that the policy was continued after I left the Government. It is only right that this should be so. Now, as to water powers. The trouble is that we have too many water powers running idle and not harnessed. Suppose a concern comes here to-day and asked you for a water power, is this legislature prepared to refuse, when we are giving them to everyone that wants them. The trouble is this, we have done nothing but grant water powers for twenty years, and with the exception of the Albert E. Read Co., the Harmsworth Co., and a small water power at Petty Harbor, I do not know of any water power in the country that is being utilized, except it may be a few in connection with saw mills. Again, as regards exemption from municipal taxation. This Colony has had responsible government for nearly sixty years and has had representative government since '32, and no municipality has been established outside the city of St. John's. Up to

to-day there is no local or municipal taxation outside St. John's. And if this Company is to establish in the outports and if they consider it necessary to be exempt from local taxation, we are only following the precedents established in favor of the Harmsworths and other companies. All the lands granted to the Reid-Nfld. Co. under the various contracts are not taxable, and other precedents can be found if the Committee are interested in the matter. I say, Mr. Chairman, the Committee may feel perfectly satisfied that the rights of the Colony are perfectly safeguarded under this agreement. We cannot get a large enterprise like this to become a pioneer company and spend $125,000 in buildings and machinery on a plot less than two miles of bog land without we make the concessions attractive. After they have established themselves here, when we know where we are and what can be accomplished in connection with the bog land, we can make any further agreements as restrictive as we like, but all enterprises in the start have to get special advantages or they will not come. The trouble is we are not on the visiting list of large capitalists. We are too far from those who have large capital to invest. If you go to the United States or Canada or England and talk up the development of anything in Newfoundland you find these people do not want to come as long as attractive and remunerative investments can be had at home, and to persuade them to bring their capital out here you must offer them some little concessions. Now, I think that any person looking at this matter in a fair, reasonable light, purely from the standpoint of the development of the Colony's dormant resources, will come to no other conclusion than that this agreement is reasonable and fair, and if these peoole come here and are successful and the peat is what we are led to believe it is, then we have made a good agreement for the Colony. But if unfortunately the other thing happens, and they have to leave the Colony and take away the machinery and factories and buildings, I do not think we shall have anything to regret on the score that we made it more difficult for them by unnecessary retriction in the present agreement.

SIR ROBERT BOND—My learned friend said that the late Government up to the time he left it had given away hundreds of water powers for nothing. This is not so. Outside the Wood-Barker Co. and the Harmsworth Co. I am not aware that any other water power was leased in this country; and let me emphasize the word leased. The water powers were not granted but leased, and the lessees had to pay so much a year. Here you give these people their choice of water power unlimited and unpaid for. Again, my learned friend says that it has been the policy of this Government to allow machinery to come in duty free no matter who wanted it. Everybody can receive it duty free. Why surely we have reached the millenium. Does the hon. member mean to tell me that a tinsmith who want to work his business can get his machinery in duty free. Let me tell him that the principle laid down by His Excellency the Governor in Council is the free admission of all machinery for the introduction of new industries. That is the provision, and my hon. friend knows that it only applies to the introduction

of new enterprises. There is no argument in the position taken up by my friend, the Leader of the Government, as against the position taken up by Mr. Kent and myself. They are not parallel cases. It is all very well for the Prime Minister to expatiate upon the great advantages it would be for foreign capital to come here and introduce new industries; but what do we know about these people we are dealing with under this Bill? What guarantee have we that these people will fulfill their obligations any more than any others we have had experience with? We have had experience with gentlemen who have approached the legislature before. And what did we find? We found them stumping out of the country with their bills unpaid. What about the Fish Industries Company started on the south coast of this island? How about the unfortunate shareholders in England and what about the unfortunate tradesman of this Colony.

I do not mean to draw any comparison between this or that company, but the same thing may obtain so far as we know. We have under these resolutions no guarantee as regards this. We are told we are not on the visiting list of other countries. Well, we are getting on to it! Why, sir, it will soon not be in our power to extend an invitation to anybody if we keep on giving away the country at the present rate. There will be very little of it left. I would like to have a map hung up by which we could see what we do still possess. It would be very small. I say there is very little left. If any invitation is given to anyone in future to come and see us it will have to be given by the landlords, the timber monopolists, and others who to-day hold the greater portion of the country in their grasp. We are delighted to see the Company, we are delighted to encourage them, but for God's sake do not let us make fools of ourselves by giving away every asset that the country has. Our experience so far has been that the companies generally give up and go away again without credit to themselves or profit to the country.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, one word to disassociate the proprietors of this concern, the contractors under this measure, from the class that my hon. friend has referred to, who went "scuttling out of the country."

SIR R. BOND—I did not say that.

HON. PREMIER—It is true that this country has been the happy hunting ground of all kinds of visionaries, dreamers, crazy individuals with all kinds of ridiculous schemes from Blackman and Bender down to our own day. I might add to my argument except that I wish to avoid anything that might be construed as personal.

SIR R. BOND—What do you mean.

HON. THE PREMIER—I need hardly explain myself.

SIR R. BOND—Will you explain what you mean by that.

HON. THE PREMIER—I mean what I say. This country has been the happy hunting ground of speculators, and dreamers and visionaries from the time of Blackman and Bender down to our own day. But in this case I have satisfied myself as far as I can that these men cannot fairly be placed in that class. If they "scuttle out of the country,, well, we shall only have to console ourselves with the

recollection that we have done everything in our power to satisfy ourselves of their standing and bona fides. What guarantee have we? Well, no guarantee, except we have made enquiries from responsible parties, and moreover have confidenttial information from our financial agents in London that these people are reputable in the commercial world. The agreement was not entered into until we had made those enquiries. Although the information is private I should have no objection to showing it to the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition if he desires to see it. I am sorry that I cannot make it public.

We shall have no country left, so the Leader of the Opposition has said. Well, there is a small bit of country still left. Though there are large landholders in the country, there is still sufficient left to grant to enterprises of the proper character.

SIR R. BOND—Mr. Chairman, the meaning of the observations I have made must be perfectly clear to any ordinary mind. I made no reflection upon any company. I know nothing about these people. I have not yet been favored with a description of them. I only sought to impress the necessity of precaution in dealing with them. I do not suppose there is one man here outside the hon. the Premier who did not understand my reference. I made no reflection on these people. I know nothing about them. We were just told that there were very good guarantees for them. But we have not been favored with a description of them. They may be the biggest rogues in creation so far as we know. We have been told nothing about them till this discussion. The whole of what I said was to the effect that we ought to exercise caution. That was all. A year or two ago we were dealing with another peat man. The hon. leader of the Government, as he is now, introduced that man to the then Government. That man got a loan of $750 of our money and never returned it, but put it in his own pocket. We ought to be careful in these dealings.

MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Did he give you an I O U?

SIR R. BOND—I have no intention of disparaging this Company. I only refer to other companies that have scuttled out of this country, leaving debts unpaid here and doing us damage in other countries as well. I merely urge the necessity of caution.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has made reference to another person with whom the public have had relations in connection with peat. And he made the statement that I introduced him to the Government and that he got $750 of our money from the Government and scuttled out of the country. If any amount was paid to the party in question it was paid by the now Leader of the Opposition who was then the leader of the Government, and it is not for him now to shoulder the blame on me.

SIR R. BOND—That was not my intention.

THE PRIME MINISTER—Then what object could there be in saying it here this afternoon, if there was no such intention. Is it for the purpose of giving me a character.

SIR R. BOND—Don't be so silly and sensitive.

THE PRIME MINISTER—I am not sensitive, but like a good many

others I was a member of that Government and I tried to row my oar. And if I did introduce anyone to the Government, I had no personal interest in doing so. He was a man identified with peat in the Old Country, and I urged on the Government the desirability of doing something in relation to peat. At my recommendation an Act was introduced here, I forget whether by myself or Mr. Clift, and a small bounty placed on the peat of 25 cents a ton. I communicated with people in England with a view to bringing them here to try to do something with peat. Then I handed it over to the Government and the rest of the business was carried on by Mr. Clift, not in his personal capacity but officially as the head of the Department of Agriculture and Mines; and if they got $750 I did not give it to them any more than any other person in the Government. What had I to do with it? Everything I said to the Government must have been taken as gospel.

SIR R. BOND—I never gave you the credit of that.

HON. THE PREMIER—You gave me the discredit. What other object could there be in saying it this evening.

SIR R. BOND—I will tell you when you sit down.

HON. THE PREMIER—I brought that man here, but if he was not perfect it was not my fault. And I could bring men here who could justify what I am saying. If he got $750 I was not more to blame than anyone else.

SIR R. BOND—Really, Mr. Chairman, this is pitiable. There cannot be a reference made here but the hon. member takes it to himself. Now what did I say? I was talking about the necessity for precaution, and the hon. member said that he had made all enquiries. I do not question that. It was only a few years ago that he also made inquiries and in connection with other people. I suppose that on that occasion also he perfectly satisfied himself of the bona fides of that man. I say he was deceived, we were all deceived. I was not laying any blame upon him. Then, instead of that man bearing out our confidence, he borrowed $750 of us for his expenses in coming out here to investigate our peat areas, and he put the money in his pocket and never came. That is what I said. What nonsense to be so sensitive after 25 years in this House. It is no use when in difficulties to pose as a martyr; but show yourself a hero and get out of them. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to be as serious as I can, though it has become a laughing matter. All this latter discussion is not germane to the point at issue. Is it desirable that there should be inserted in this agreement a forfeiture clause, —that if these people do not contnuously operate these factories then these grants shall revert to the Crown. Unless they do continuously operate there should be a forfeiture clause. The amount invested in these factories will be principally in machinery, upon which we have no lieu; therefore if they like to cease operations and take this away there will be nothing left but the shed which covers the plant. It is not sufficient to accept this shed in lieu of the fee simple of all this land or the lease for 99 years, which comes to the same thing. The clause is not in the agreement, but I suppose it can be put in the Act confirming it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman I have nothing to add to what I have said here half dozen times this evening. These blocks of land can be obtained by anybody in fee simple to-morrow for $300 each. They propose to put on each $300 block $125,000 in buildings and machinery. That will be a sufficient guarantee to the Colony. The day when they have to leave the Colony it will not be difficult to come to the conclusion that they have not received too much in these few acres of bog land.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect thereto.

Ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the said Bill be now introduced.

Whereupon the Bill entitled, "An Act to Encourage the Manufacture of Peat," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the HON. PRIME MINISTER the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act to Encourage the Manufacture of Explosives."

MR. SPEAKER left thte Chair.

MR. PARSONS took the Chair of Committee.

SIR R. BOND—Mr. Chairman, I have a few observations to make upon this Bill. I was not able to be here when the Resolutions were first before the House. I should now like the opportunity for a moment or two of drawing the attention of the Committee to a few points. All the references that I made to the granting of wood and water power to the Peat Company will apply of course to this Bill with equal force. Possibly with even greater force, because the industry is not likely to have anything like the importance and value that the peat industry is hoped to have. There is no restriction in this Bill as to the quantity of land, the number of licenses that are to be granted. I would like the to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance to tell me the value of the explosives imported annually into this country.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—About $80,000.

SIR R. BOND—Eighty thousand dollars. I presume that represents the consumption largely in connection with the railway work going on. I take it that is likely to be abnormal. Are those average figures or for last year only?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Last year only.

SIR R. BOND—Large quantities of dynamite would have been imported by the Harmsworth and A. E. Reed industries for their operations at Exploits and Grand Lake, making the foundation for their dams and so on; and I take it, is the reason why the amount imported reached such an abnormal figure. However, suppose we estimate the annual imports at $50,000. That is still not a very large amount and as explosives are very expensive indeed, the $50,000 would not represent a very large industry. I think that the remarks I applied to the peat bill recently under discussion with reference to the grants of timber areas and water powers, apply with even greater force to this measure, be-

cause the industry will not be nearly so large or important. There is still another point of great importance to which I must refer. Not only are you giving this Company timber areas for the purpose of their manufactures in this island, but timber areas for the manufacture of boxes for the industries on the other side of the Atlantic. I think that is going too far. The mills of this country have to pay a stumpage, a royalty to the Colony; but this Company is asking for a grant of timber land free, and that not only for use here, but also for the purposes of their business outside of this Colony. Is that not going too far, I think it is. It is perfectly legitimate to encourage this Company in their operations in this country, but why outside of this country as well: I presume we want to have the largest possible amount of industries here. Then why subsidize these people to carry on their industries somewhere else? Is that common sense or reason? If we want these people to build up a large industry in this Colony the best way would be not to subsidize them, but to try to cripple them elsewhere. But we are by this measure encouraging them elsewhere. We are subsidizing them by giving them material for the manufacture of boxes for use in other parts of the world.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out to the hon. member that the intention of the Act is clear. I only wish we had fifty companies asking for the same privileges of making boxes in this country and exporting boxes from it. At present we cannot sell our timber.

SIR R. BOND—But you are taxing the people to subsidize them.

HON. THE PREMIER—We are not. I wish we had fifty companies here starting wood factories with the timber of the country and giving employment to our people. Ten years ago we had ten very large saw mills; at Gambo, at Botwood, the Miller mills and others. Where are they to-day? There are only a few mills left now. And if the day arrives when these people will be able to manufacture our timber into boxes and export the manufactured article, is not that better than exporting the raw material itself? What possible objection can there be? Why, we should pay them a bounty to come and do it. As to the value of this industry, the hon. Leader of the Opposition was not here the other evening when I explained to the Committee what it was hoped to lead up to. The representative of the company who met the Government pointed out that they were not coming here merely for the local trade; $40,000 or $80,000 a year would not be a sufficient inducement to come here and erect these expensive and dangerous works. Even if they were certain of a local trade of $100,000 a year it would not be sufficient. But they hoped to manufacture largely in this Colony for export. If they start here I look forward to seeing a very large export to Canada and the United States of explosives made in this country. It is not likely that a company now supplying nearly all the explosives used here in this Colony to-day, the British Canadian Explosives Company, Limited, with a business agent having a permanent office here, would come here to manufacture for the local trade only. I am informed that they supply the Reid Nfld. Co., the

Steel Companies at Bell Island, the York Harbor mines and other concerns in this country. It is not for this market alone that they hope to manufacture, but also for export to the United States and Canada. It is not likely that they would limit themselves to the local trade, and even if they did it is $70,000 or $80,000 a year. I do not know what the proportion is, but suppose one-half that goes into labor. That would be $40,000 a year; a very little industry for the place where they are located. That would keep forty families at $1,000 a year, or eighty families at $500 a year. If we do give them a small water power it can still be used by other people, by a dozen if you like. There are many advantages for the company here. They can obtain labor at a reasonable rate, and among a people who very quickly accustom themselves to the requirements of new industries. They will be established near a port for easy shipping; and the taxation on them is not anything like it is in other countries. On the whole I think we are doing very well.

SIR R. BOND—Mr. Chairman, that is not an answer to my position. My learned friend has made no attempt to answer me. I am not dealing with the question of the export of explosives. I want to see this company enter into the export business and supply not only the local trade but the world. I hope they will establish themselves at Cape Broyle, if they do not blow up my learned friend opposite. I do not want to restrict in any way the manufacture of explosives, but what I want to do is to prevent the Government from subsidizing the company to carry on their business elsewhere by giving them timber areas free to manufacture boxes for use in other countries. That is my position. My hon. friend asks what has become of the big mills. We want all the mills we can get. But if John Jones wants to start a mill to-morrow he has to pay a royalty and stumpage. What has become of the mills up north? J. J. Murphy sold his out at a very large profit. The mills at Millertown were sold for $450,000. What has that to do with it? Any man who starts a mill in this country has to pay for the privilege; and surveyors go round checking his books to get the last farthing out of him. You are not going to check this man's books. You are going to let him manufacture his shucks free, and still you say you want to encourage the manufacture of explosives in this country! And the business done in other countries must necessarily be drawn away from Newfoundland. Of course we shall be told by the Leader of the Government that we have to hold out liberal inducements to these people, but aren't we holding them out by the admission of their machinery free of duty. But why enable them to carry on their business in other parts of the world by giving them free timber to manufacture boxes to be used outside this Colony. That is my point and my hon. friend has not answered it.

HON. THE PREMIER—I did not answer it because I misunderstood the point of my hon. friend's question. But I will answer it now. If he will read section 2 of the Act he will find that the grants are to be issued under the Crown Lands Act in every respect, and these people will have to observe the conditions of the Crown Lands

Act and pay royalty, stumpage, etc. I thought my hon. friend had read what he was talking about.

SIR R. BOND—I stated the contract as I understood it.

HON. PREMIER—I did not assume that the hon. member would make such an argument if he had not read the contract.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that under Section 2 of the Act the Governor in Council is given power "to grant to Lessees," free of charge, out of any ungranted Crown Lands, which may be at his disposal, such lands for factories and other buildings, such licenses to cut timber and such water powers as are provided for in clause 4 of said agreement." That clearly gives them the right to cut timber over these areas free of charge and to use the water power.

HON. PREMIER—No.

SIR R. BOND—I have read this Bill very carefully and I see no reason why I should recede from the position which I previously took up. The Governor in Council will have power to grant these areas free of charge. It is all very well for the Leader of the Government to answer me as he did just now. It was not polite of him to say the least of it. I had not the leisure to read it before, and it was only while sitting here that I have had the opportunity of reading this Bill, as I was not here yesterday. I say now that after reading this Bill most carefully, I see no reason for changing the statement I made a few moments ago. I say these men may obtain the right to export free of every consideration, shucks for the enclosure of their explosives in any other part of the world where they have their factories. I ask you is that fair to the lumber men of this country.

HON. PREMIER—Mr. Chairman I merely wish to point out that I was referring to the interpretation of Section 2, which makes it clear that whilst these licenses are to be given free of charge, they are to be subject to the provisions of the Crown Lands Act. That will include all the provisions as regards stumpage and everything else.

MR. KENT—That is where I differ with the Hon. Leader of the Government. I think he will admit that there is a distinction to be drawn between what the company can claim as a right and what the Government is enabled to grant. The Government is obtaining under this new legislation power to grant lands free of charge to this company, which it could not to other people in this Colony. That is the meaning of the contract. If it was the intention of the introducer of this measure to restrict himself to the terms of the agreement the powers of the Governmentt should not have been extended. The resolutions ought to be amended so as to carry out the object of the Government in that respect. There can be no object in changing the verbiage of section 4. One section is strictly limited the other is as wide a power as can be given to the Government and makes it unfair to others, and if the hon. member is sincere in saying that it is the intention of the Governmen that all lands granted under sub-sections 2 and 3 of section 4 of the contract shall be subject to the Crown Lands Act, then he will limit the powers of the Government to grant these according to the agreement.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Bill without amendment.

Ordered that this report be received and that the said Bill be read a third time to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

SIR R. BOND gave notice of question.

MR. KENT gave notice of question.

MR. CLIFT gave notice of question.

HON. PRIME MINISTER gave notice of motion.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE gave notice of motion.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE gave notice of motion.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn till Thursday, February 16th, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, Feb. 16th.

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

MR. GOODISON—I beg leave to pressent a petition from the Roman Catholic inhabitants of Carbonear on the subject of a road. The petitioners ask for a sum of money to construct a road from Water Street to connect with the road in front of the Roman Catholic Church. They point out, sir, the inconvenience they are now under in going to and coming from their place of worship, using, as they have to do, the narrow back roads leading thereto. They also call attention to the fact that such a street will materially add to the beauty of the town. I am entirely in harmony with the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, and heartily support it. In asking that it be referred to the Department of Public Works, I express the hope, sir, that the Minister will give the matter his closest attention, and that he will find it possible to be able to devise a way to meet the wishes of the petitioners.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS —Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Harbor Main in reference to a road running along the sea shore. The petition states that when the tide rises this road becomes practically impassable and that the inrush of the water makes the houses in that locality unapproachable. The petitioners ask for an allocation of $50 to raise the road. If my colleague were here he would give this petition his most hearty support. I may say that I will do all in my power to see that it gets the attention it deserves.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bayly's Cove, asking for the grant of $120 to enable them to build a road to some agricultural land, I assure the House that if this road is built it will be a great help to these people and I ask that the mattter be referred to the Departent of Public Works.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS —Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present another petition. This is from certain inhabitants of Avondale in reference to a bridge rerequired at that place. The bridge complained of has been built for some 25 years and is now in a dilapidated condition. I may say that I heartily support the petition and that I will do every-

thing possible to see that the money is allocated.

HON. MR. EMERSON—I beg to present a petition from Ambrose Thornhill and others of Little Bay for the establishing of a telegraph office at that settlement. The petition is largely signed and sets forth that the telegraph lines at present passed within two miles of Little Bay East. The trade in Fortune Bay, owing to the impetus given by the Bank fishery business, simply demands every modern facility such as asked by this petition, to be placed within the reach of its business people. Fox Cove, which is situated on the same side of Fortune Bay, is in the same position, and its people are also demanding a telegraph office. The policy of the Government is to extend this particular facility as evidenced by the good work accomplished in the northern peninsula last season, and during the present year he would take occasion to impress upon the Government the necessity of opening telegraph offices at Fox Cove and Little Bay East in the district of Fortune Bay.

Ordered that these petitions be received and referred to the departments to which they relate.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY laid upon the table of the House the Report of the Public Schools of Newfoundland under Church of England Boards for the year ending 30th June, 1910.

Notice of Question.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the Hon. the Premier to lay on the table of the House a copy of all correspondence between the Government and Messrs. Coates Son and Company, of London, England, in reference to the recent loan; also a copy of all agreements entered into between the said parties in respect to tne said loan.

HON. THE PREMIER—The correspondence and all other papers are being looked up and will be tabled later.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the Hon. the Premier if the Government have decided to appoint a Cashier to the Newfoundland Savings Bank, in the place of the late W. B. Payn, Esq., and, if so, "who has been selected for that office and when he will enter upon his duties."

HON. THE PREMIER—When the vacancy occurred through the death of Mr. Payn, the Auditor General was appointed Acting Cashier, and since then the matter has not been before the Govern ment for consideration.

MR. KENT—To ask the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail the dates, amounts and parties of all payments made to date under the Railway Extension Act passed last session, and the contract thereby ratified and confirmed showing separately the amounts paid under the following headings—(1) To the contractor for or on account of the construction of any of the branch lines stipulated for in section 2 of the said contract, showing separately the amounts paid for each on account of such branch lines; (2) To the contractor for or on account of any of the works specified in sections 34, 36 and 37 of the said contract, showing the particular work in respect of which each such payment was made; (3) To any parties for right of way under section 3 of the said Act, including amounts paid for arbitrators solicitors, surveyors and

others for services, travelling or other expenses in connection with the appropriation or arbitration upon and payment of land for such right of way.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS laid the desired information on the table of the House.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a copy of the returns of the expenditure of $20 each to Donald Mercer, John Delaney and Charles French of Bay Roberts, out of main line road grant from Brigus to Carbonear, allocated in April, 1909.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS —The returns are being prepared and will be laid on the table of the House as soon as completed.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a copy of the returns of all road monies (local, main line and special grants) expended by the Road Board or any other authority or person at Tilton in the Electoral District of Harbor Grace, from December, 1909, to the present date.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS —The statements are being prepared.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting the smelting of copper ores.

MR. SPEAKER left the Chair.

MR. PARSONS took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that last session an Act was introduced, following on resolutions submitted to the House, in relation to the smelting of copper ore. That Act provided in the first place that all smelters for use in the Colony should be admitted duty free. It also provided that there shall be paid to the proprietor of every copper mining claim, on all copper ore mined from such claim and smelted in the Colony, a bounty of one dolar for every ton smeltable ore landed at the smelting works up to one hundred tons in any one year, and fifty cents for every ton over one hundred, and up to five hundred tons. That Act it will be remembered was passed for the purpose of encouraging the smelting of ore, not alone by smelting concerns, but by individual parties all over the whole island, who have copper properties and who were not able to do their own smelting, but who might be induced to bring their ore from their locations to the smelters. At the time I introduced the bill I was led to believe that it was sufficiently attractive to induce capitalists to enter upon the establishment of smelters, and I am still hopeful that this result may be accomplished. The representatives of a large firm in England who have an office in St. John's have had negotiations with the Government in relation to the establishment of smelters. There is no reason why I should withhold the name . I refer to the firm of which Messrs. Mowbray are the representatives here. Up to the present I am sorry to say the inducements held out have not been sufficiently attractive, but negotiations are still going on, and they have resulted to this extent, that the Government is now in communication with reliable parties in England who are acquainted with the peculiar mineral conditions in this country, and who are of opinion that the pass-

ing of such a bill as this would lead to the formation of a company in England to come here and put up smelters. For this purpose, then, we have introduced this measure, the previous measure having not proved a sufficient inducement.

The first resolution provides that "there shall be annually paid for the period of twenty years from the date of the passing of the Act hereinafter mentioned to the owner of every smelter for smelting copper in this Colony, a sum of 3½ per cent. on the capital invested by him in the work of smelting copper, provided that no payment shall be made in any year in which the sad smelter is not bona fide and continuously operated, and that no greater sum than an amount equal to 3½ per cent. on $50,000 shall be paid in any year to any one person or company."

In other words, a bonus of 3½ per cent. on $50,000 will be paid annually to a company continually operating for twenty years. The second resolution provides that this money is to be paid on the certificates of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and the Government Engineer.

Now, sir, there is no doubt that in this country we are very rich in mineral resources, but up to the present time, beyond the development of three or four mines we have not been as successful as we might have been. This is fully borne out, not alone by the reports of our own regular geographical staffs, Mr. Howley and Mr. Murray, but also of others. From their reports there is no doubt whatever of the great value of our mineral resources. We have probably on Bell Island one of the finest mines in the world, and judging by the quantity of ore taken out and the quantity of ore in sight, it is unquestionably one of the largest. We have had the Bett's Cove mine, the Little Bay mines and Tilt Cove mine, and there are many indications of mineral deposits in Notre Dame Bay and Placenttia Bay.

This Bill aims at enabling those who have property to develop them to such an extent as will enable them to put their properies on the market. Now my own experience has been, speaking as a professional man and not as the owner of any property, that it is very difficult to interest capitalists in mines which are undeveloped or merely to go to them with specimens and reports.. Shafts have to be sunk, borings have to be made, and considerable expenditure as to be incurred in opening up and developing the mine before capitalists can be got to take an interest in the property. The Act of last year was principally directed towards that end, so that parties with copper properties may work to a limited extent, and meanwhile be paid for their labor by the amount received as a bounty. The present Act goes a little further and agrees to give to a company for a number of years a guarantee of three and one half per cent. on $50,000. This would not be enough to operate a smelter, but it may be an inducement to small companies in various parts of the island. It is the opinion that this guarantee will induce companies in England to come here and go into this business, and if we get but one or two it will be an object lesson as to what can be done and might lead to the development of properties now lying dormant. If this would only lead to one mine being worked it would well pay the Colony to give not

alone the bounty proposed but a very much larger one. With this explanation I beg to move the adoption of these resolutions.

SIR R. BOND—It affords me very great pleasure to support these resolutions, if as I understand, it is proposed to extend the bounty not only to companies that will be formed after the passing of the Act but to companies already in existence. Some years ago, sir. the Tilt Cove company, one of the most successful companies operating in this country, started the smelting of copper and continued doing so for a number of years; and eventually the work was closed down, as it did not pay to smelt the ore here and ship it away. And I understand that this bounty will apply to that company provided that they again do their own smelting. If I am correct in that then I most heartily support this measure. I do not contend for this mining company alone, but I say that it should apply to every company that has been in existence and may have a smelter. (I take the Tilt Cove mine as an example because it operates to-day). But, sir, I shall not support it if it does not so apply because if it does not then it gives the York Harbor mine, with which Messrs. Mowbray are connected, a great advantage over every other mining company in the country.

HON. THE PREMIER—That is our intention, that it shall apply to every one.

SIR R. BOND—Then, sir, I most heartily support this measure I think that this country is very fortunate in having such men as the Messrs. Mowbray doing business here. I know something of them, I know of their firm, of their high reputation, and I can say here that there is no firm of mining engineers in Great Britain or in the world which stands higher than these gentlemen who, I understand, are negotiating in connection with this business. I do not think that the consideration offered by these resolutions is excessive, and I have therefore much pleasure in supporting them.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a bill to give effect thereto.

Ordered that this report be received and adopted, and that the said bill be now introduced.

Whereupon the bill entitled "An Act further to encourage the smelting of copper ores in this Colony," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE, the bill entitled "An Act to prevent the Deportation of Esquimaux from Labrador," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES, the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Potato Canker," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend the Crown Lands Act, 1903," was introduced

and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the HON. PRIME MINISTER, the Bill entitled "An Act to encourage the Manufacture of Explosives," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the HON. PRIME MINISTER the Bill entitled, "An Act to encourage the Manufacture of Peat" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order the House again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Cold Storage resolutions.

MR. SPEAKER left the Chair.

MR. PARSONS took the Chair of Committee.

CAPTAIN WINSOR—As the district I represent will be affected by the Cold Storage Resolutions now before the House, I wish to make a few remarks in support of them. A couple of days ago quite a discussion arose in the House in reference to the Bill but all agreed that the introduction of cold storage would be a great benefit to the Colony. During the six or seven years I have been a member of the House I have always been a supporter of cold storage, and although a Bill dealing with the matter has been introduced almost every session nothing of practical benefit has resulted to the people so far. I am glad to find that another attempt is being made to see if it is possible to bring cold storage into effect, for I am sure that once it is introduced and a number of plants erected it will be a very great benefit to our fishermen. During the past five or six months I had the privilege probably above others of ascertaining what a great benefit it would be to have cold storage plants in our northern outports and on the Labrador coast. It was remarked in this House a day or two ago that the chances were that too many would be erected, but I cannot agree with any member who says that there will be too many erected on the Island and on the Labrador coast, for I think that everybody who takes an interest in the Labrador fishery will agree with me that if we had had fifteen or twenty of these plants erected last year from which bait could have been obtained, it would have been a great blessing to the fishermen and hundreds of families who had to come home without a chance of getting a winter's supply would have been enabled to have secured bait and thus manage to catch enough codfish from which to buy provisions for the winter months. There were plenty of bait fishes on the Labrador in June and the early part of July, but then fish was scarce. Later on there was no bait to be obtained but fish was plentiful, and had there been some cold storage plants it would have changed the whole fishery from failure to success. I presume that some of the plants contemplated under this agreement will be erected in the north and some in the south of the Island, for a plant erected in Fortune Bay would be of no use to the fishermen of Bonavista Bay and vice versa. If erected in different parts of the Island where the fishermen can get to them they will be a great blessing. We were

told a day or two ago that the Company coming here to establish these cold storgae plants will go into the salt fish business, but I cannot understand how any hon. member can say that the Company would come here and spend large sums of money in building cold storage plants for salt cod. It is a well known fact that in this Colony salt cured fish will keep without cold storage.

It was also stated here that it was probable that the Company would take our fresh bait and keep it in cold storage and later on sell it to American fishermen. Is it not possible for any American to go to Bay of Islands to-day and buy herring and freeze it and use it as bait? What is there to preven it? They take the herring away to Gloucester and we do not know what becomes of it, but it is quite conceivable that part of it is used for bait.

Section nine of the agreement reads that the Government agrees to grant to the Company free of charge one or more timber areas to supply lumber for making boxes and barrels. This is only right for the Company will need the timber in connection with this work and we should encourage them to provide labor for our people. We have already seen the great benefits that have been derived from other industries. Where would many of our fishermen be this winter were it not for the labor given on the branch railways and Grand Falls. Many of them would be starving. In my opinion the more labor is given in cutting timber the better for the whole Colony. It will also be a good thing if the timber is made into boxes, rather than be shipped out of the Colony in a raw state. It was contended here that fish casks would be made and that this would take work away from the coopers, but while I am in full sympathy with the coopers there are others whose interests are to be considered as well. As far as I can find out the coopers are kept busy now and there is no reason why others should not be given a chance to earn something by making these casks. The coopers are not the only people and we should not be against this measure because it will give the fishermen a chance to get a month or two labor that he cannot get now.

I believe that these resolutions will meet with the support of the people and I shall not be afraid to stand before my constituents in Bonavista Bay and tell them that when he resolutions were before the House they received my support. I believe the fishermen would sooner see twenty plants than only five erected during the next two or three years. Had we plants on the Labrador last summer not 80,000 but 160,000 quintals of fish would have been sent away. We do not imagine for one moment that these people will come here and not freeze bait and fresh cod, for, as the resolutions state, the plants will have a capacity of not less than a million pounds. The more fish we can export in a fresh state the better it will be for our salt cod. We have been in the old rut long enough and any new enterprise that will result in our fish being sent out of the Colony under any method other than the old one should receive the support of us all. It is time that we woke up and did something for the fishermen.

There is one other matter that I would like to refer to before I sit

down and that is the insinuation made by the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition that I had insulted him, for he said that he had on one occasion last year been insulted by every member of the Government. This is not correct for I have never insulted any man since I took my seat in the House. I was myself insulted time after time during the five years that I sat on the other side of the House. I merely mention this because it is not my desire to be considered insulting to any member of the House, and if the records are turned up it will be impossible to find one instance where I said anything at which offence could be taken.

MR. DOWNEY—In rising to give my support to this Bill it is unnecessary that I should trespass on the time of the House by discussing the phraseology of the contract. I have read it and feel assured therefrom and from the statements of the law officers of the Crown, that our interests are amply safeguardeed therein. I shall therefore confiine my remarks to a word or two on the general advantages which I foresee will accrue to the country from the passing of this measure. First—It has been stated in this House that this Company is not likely to handle codfish. This, I contend, is a very far-fetched argument and one not in the slightest degree sustained by any interpretation of the contract that can be given it. Do hon. members who advance this contention imply thereby that this Company comes here in the guise of philanthropists? It does not do credit to their judgment if they think so. My opinion of them is that they are practical business-like people who see a good thing in this contract for both this country and themselves. They are bound by the contract to erect large and costly fertilizer plants glue factories. Now if they are not philanthropists, and if they do not propose erecting these fertilizer and glue factories for the mere sake of giving our mechanics the benefit of the large expenditures thereon—and no sane person will contend that such is their motive—why are they binding themselves to their erection and continuous operation? The answer is self-evident. Those factories are for the reclamation of the by-products in the offal of the codfish, and to get this offal in sufficient quantity to keep those factories in continuous operation I think it will be conceded that they must buy handle fish pretty extensively.

Why should they not do so, Let me give hon. members a few figures as to the relative values of codfish as bought for cold storage and for dry curing.

The term "a quintal of fish," is a familiar one to every man, woman and child in Newfoundland, but let us subject the term to analysis and see if it will not have a meaning that we never before gathered from it.

A quintal of fish we know means 112 pounds of dry cured salt cod. With the present high price of $6.50 per quintal this means nearly six cents per pound for dry cured, but if we realize that it took 308 pounds of split or green fish to make the 112 pounds of dry cured we find that instead of getting six cents a pound we get less than two cents. In other words, in making dry cured salt codfish, 308 pounds shrunk to 112 pounds. There was even a greater loss than this, but it is one we are so accustomed to

that we look on it as a matter of course till we stop to realize its money value. Instead of dry curing the 308 pounds of fish into a quintal of 112 pounds we had destined it for cold storage, what do we find? In dry curing we remove the heads, entrails, the sound and the bone, and these practically have no value—absolutely none to the fishermen—but in cold storing fish we leave the head on (except in the case of very large fish) and the bone is left in, and are sold as much fish. Consequently the 308 pounds of split fish that went to make a dry quintal would have had the head, sound and bone left attached, and thus its weight instead of shrinking to 112 pounds would have been increased to 502 pounds. And if this were sold at even two cents a pound it means realizing ten dollars for the same quintal of fish that will sell for at most $6.50 if salted. I have paid 3 cents and even more at times, for fresh fish for cold storage purposes, and have been amply repaid even at these prices. The next question is, can we sell cold storage fish. I think anybody who knows anything of the American markets will readily admit that we can. The population of the United States is about one hundred millions, and their own supply is absolutely inadequate to meet the demand of even the Eastern States. It may be argued that with the advent of Canadian Reciprocity there would be no room for our fish. I think this position is untenable. It will, perhaps, surprise many for me to say that Canada has not got the fish to supply the market of the United States. Nearly all of us are aware that the Canadian ..sh is vessel caught fish, and to preserve fish in cold storage it is necessary that the fish must be absolutely fresh when bought. V essel caught fish remaining in the hold for two or three days in ice is absolutely worthless for cold storage purposes. What you want for cold storage is fresh boat caught fish. The Canadians have a very limited boat fishery around Neal's Harbor, Cape North, West Bay and in certain other parts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick there is a small boat fishery, but the codfishery in general is a vessel fishery and the product is worthless for cold storage purposes. Not only could we put our codfish in cold storage and command a market for it, but our other fish could be handled with equally successful results. It is only of comparatively late years that we have realized that we have a halibut fishery, and even yet we do not realize the possibilities of it. I may say for the information of the House that 11 years ago when I was engaged in the fresh fish business at Port aux Basque I could buy halibut for two cents a pound, in fact 1½ cents, but gradually the price went up to 7 cents per pound, and even at that price I found the business remunerative. The most unfortunate part of the business was that there was no continuity in the facilities for getting to market. I once found myself with 17,000 pounds of this on my hands, and no chance of getting to market, owing to the blockading of the railway and removal of the Bruce to Placentia. During recent years this business has been extended, and is really profitable to those engaged in it. I may say that it is quite possible to catch halibut off nearly all parts of our coast. There are large quantities taken at Burgeo

and other places. While I was in the business I knew a craft to leave the wharf one morning at 7 o'clock and return at 3.30 with 11,000 pounds of fish. We can readily see what these men made by such a day's work. I believe that equally remunerative results will be obtained from this halibut when sold to these cold storage plants, and the large market thus offered will largely extend this fishery.

Then there are others of our fisheries which we never think of utilizing at all, except for bait purposes. Amongst them is the caplin. Few know that caplin keep well in cold storage, and that a brisk trade can be done in them. Many hon. members know that owing to the rocky nature of the Port aux Basques coast caplin rarely land there, but on one occasion I obtained some there and put them up in cold storage for the American market, and I received over 15 cents a pound for these fish, and not alone did I receive that amount but I received a basketful of telegrams and letters asking me to send along as much more of them as I could get.

There is still another fish that cold storage would enable us to dispose of profitably, and that is the turbot that are found in large quantities in Fortune Bay and Trinity Bay. They are found there to my own knowledge, and they are probably to be found in other parts of the country as well. The turbot is a very valuable fish, but, owing to its oily character, it is difficult to transport it without damage, but cold storage I have no doubt would overcome that difficulty.

Amongst the smaller class of fish that cold storage would enable us to utilize are flounders and salt water perch. There is one other resource, Mr. Chairman, in the fish line and it is one which probably hon. members have not yet been aware of our possessing. The clam is a very familiar food in the United States. You get in all the big restaurants and hotels, and it is certainly very good. Now there are abundance of these shell fish on the West Coast which would fetch a high price in the United States market. I have often spoken to American tourists about them, and they usually said that the clams were better than they had ever had at home. They are to be had on the West Coast in prodigious quantities. By means of cold storage they could easily be preserved and exported to the States at a profit.

I am not, Mr. Chairman, disposed to anticipate any injury to our lobster packers from the introduction of cold storage. It is a fact that in the early part of the season no more than from 14 per cent. to 16 per cent. of the lobsters caught reach the limit prescribed by the United States fishery regulations, namely, 10½ inches, and they will not be allowed to enter a United States port under that size. One State only—Rhode Island—admits lobsters of less than 10½ inches; fish as small as 9 inches may be marketed there, but the demand in Rhode Island is small.

Again, our local packers pack so economically that it would be impossible for any company to compete with them. The cold storage company will, no doubt, purchase the 10½ inch fish and to get them will have to pay more for them than the fish would be worth to can. The number, however, would be

so few that the pack will not be appreciably lessened.

As to the advantage to the fishermen of the cold storage business: First, there is the always available supply of bait. Many of us in this Committee are practically familiar with the fishing industry. Only those who have had their crafts tied up at the wharf while fish were abundant for want of a supply of bait, can realize the importance of this question. I have been in that unfortunate position. I am, however, sanguine that when this system has been a short time in operation the requirements of a large section of the country will be provided for, against any shortage in the ordinary supply of fresh bait. That would be a sufficient warrantry for this House to expend the money asked for as the inducement to the Company to establish itself in this Colony. At the present moment hon. members know that a large fresh salmon business is being done from Port aux Basque. I was the originator of that business. To give hon. members some idea of the possibilities of extension of that business I may say that the first year I was in it I obtained and exported only 15,000 pounds of fish; five years after there were being shipped 200,000 pounds a year; that was in the year I gave it up. The business has now passed into the hands of other parties, and is still being very profitably run. A difficulty is that all this volume of salmon has to be collected all along a considerable section of the coast; thus some of that from the further parts of the coast does not always arrive in the best possible condition. But if cold storage were employed it could be collected all over the country, as the cold stores would not be more than 100,000 miles apart, and it would be quite feasible to obtain it all in the best condition. What will this mean to the fishermen of this country? The average price of a barrel of salt salmon is about $10. A barrel contains about 200 pounds of fish; and this amount salted represents about 300 pounds fresh or from the water. This is about 3½ cents per pound. Deduct the price of the barrel, freight and salt, and say the net balance is $8.50, or about 3 cents a pound. Put our entire catch at at only 1,000,000 pounds. This at 3 cents a pound would mean about $30,000. But the cold storage company should pay at least 6 cents, because I, in spite of all my difficulties, paid 6 and even 7 cents, and still found it paid me. That makes the catch worth $60,000 or double what it is at present. That additional $30,000 is more than what the country is called upon to pay even if we have to pay the full 5 per cent., the full extent of our liability.

There is one other branch of our fisheries that cold storage will affect, and it is one that would appear the least likely. I refer to our whale fishery. There is at present in South New Zealand a whale factory that utilizes the blubber of the fish for oil in the usual way. It utilizes the bone and the coaser portion of the meat for fertilizer. But by the use of cold storage they can a large percentage of the total meat yield of each whale. The ordinary sized sulphur bottom whale will yield from 2½ to 3 tons of choice meat. This is not hearsay, I have used it myself and I pledge my word that if I did not know what I was eating I could not have told that it was not good meat. And I know that in the markets

where this New Zealand meat is sold the opinion of its merits is of the highest. We cannot utilize this whale meat at present because it decomposes very rapidly. By means of cold storage we could hold that meat chilled until the canners could dispose of it. If we have 1,500 tons a year of this choice meat which is now converted into fertilizer, which only realizes ¾ of a cent a pound, why should we not convert it into canned meat which realizes ten cents per pound in New Zealand? A singular feature of this discussion is that in this evening's Telegram I find the statement that this very project is being entered upon by a German Company which is about to come here. I can only regret that the cold storage system did not come here sooner, so that our own whaling factories could have profited. At present they have contracted to give the choice part of their meat to this company at a rate very little greater than they would realize for it as a fertilizer. The Cold Storage Company might become a competitor for this meat if the contract with the German Company is not a hard and fast one, and thus the price would be raised. I have no desire however to further enlarge upon the merits of this scheme. It is fraught with very great possibilities and advantages for the country, and I have the heartiest pleasure in according it my earnest support.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman, before this is put I should like to ask the hon. introducer of this bill what he means by "ungranted waste Crown Lands." Does it mean land without any timber upon it, or barren land?

HON. THE PREMIER—It is only another description of Crown Lands whether there is timber upon them or not. The phrase has been in former acts of a similar nature, and that is how it comes here.

MR. CLIFT—Whether timbered or not?

HON. THE PREMIER—Yes.

SIR R. BOND—Mr. Chairman, I have a few observations to make upon this measure, but perhaps it would be as well for me to postpone them until we meet again. I have been giving some attention to the Cold Storage Act of last session during the last recess, because I was under the impression that the Premier had intimated that the agreement entered into with this American Company was based upon the bill of last session, 1910. Perhaps I mistook him.

HON. THEPREMIER—No; that is the general sense of what I said.

SIR R. BOND—That was my idea of what the minister said, that the agreement was based upon the 1910 Act.

HON. THE PREMIER—I did say that in the sense that the principles involved were the same. But this is a different proposition. If the contract were one which came entirely under the provisions of the 1910 Act, there would be no necessity to come here now with this one. There would be no necessity to confirm it. But as there are differences, it is necessary to confirm it.

SIR R. BOND—I was going to say that I understood that the contract was based upon the 1910 Act, but if there were no differences between the agreements there would be no necessity to bring in another Bill. After looking carefully into the 1910 Act, which I had done before, I find that there is a very marked

difference between this agreement and the conditions laid down for the guidance of the Government in negotiating for the end that these resolutions have in view. In fact, a perusal of the 1910 Act will convince every member of this Committee that not only is there a very material departure from the general principle as laid down in that Act, but that it gives further force to my contention that the lessees under the agreement contemplated some other and more extensive business than the mere cold storage and exportation of fresh fish for food purposes. Now if we look at Section 1 of the 1910 Act, we will find that the guarantee to be given to any company availing of this Act was to be subject to the terms and conditions as to annual volume of work, class of fish handled, prices to be paid for fish, countries to which fish is to be exported, and location of plants, as to the Governor in Council may appear expedient. Now, sir, I submit that the omission of that section from the agreement now before us bears out my contention that this Company contemplates something totally different from what this House contemplated when they passed this Bill last year. I will go furher and say that the fact that the Government has entered into this arrangement seems to be an acquiescence in the desire of the lessees to engage in other business than mere cold storage. In other words, this Company have in view the handling of our herring and the exportation of bait fishes. Is it the policy of the Government to throw open our bait fishery to Americans ? Under the Treaty of 1818 the Americans had no right whatever to fish in any part of this Colony outside of the Treaty Coast. Under this special agreement this Company of American citizens will have a perfect right to conduct a fishery in every harbor around our coast. It may be said that we can enforce the existing law against them ; still that is not the point. What are we leading the Company to believe that they can do under this contract? A few days ago I asked the Government if they had any knowledge of a breach of the Bait Act by an American citizen in Fortune Bay, and in Burgeo and LaPoile. They repiied that they had no knowledge of it. Well, I can only refer to the Evening Telegram of the 14th of February, in which appeared a statement that a Capt. Corkum had loaded 300 barrels of herring in Fortune Bay. I have been making enquiries and I am told this statement is correct, and further Capt. Corkum expressed his intention of loading 1,000 barrels more. Has the Customs Department any knowledge of this ?

MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes.

SIR R. BOND—I am very glad to hear it. Have they taken effective steps in the matter ?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes.

SIR R. BOND—It is time to do so. I was told some time ago that they had no knowledge of it and had done nothing.

The statement to which I referred reads as follows :

"Thursday last Captain Corkum, " who is now in Fortune Bay with " his schooner, the Coronation, had " 300 barrels of herring shipped on " her, the fish being secured at St. " Jacques and English Harbor. The " vessel is at Pool's Harbor and she " will take 1,000 barrels of frozen " fish. Captain Corkum is buying

"the herring from the fishermen "and will easily secure a load. It "is not known yet if he will get a "clearance from the authorities "when the vessels cargo is on "board."

My question was as to whether the Government was cognizant of this and whether it is correct or not. Again I ask is it correct or not?

MINISTER OF FINANCE—It is not correct.

SIR R. BOND—I am delighted that the information is not correct. I am very glad to hear it. But if on the other hand Captain Corkum is buying herring from our people and attempting to ship herring in a British bottom it is clearly a breach of the Bait Act. I should like to know if the Government has made any enquiries into the matter. We have had no report from the Customs officials.

MINISTER OF FINANCE—I don't know anything about it.

SIR R. BOND—I think that paragraph is sufficient to warrant the Government in taking steps to find out as to whether it is correct that this Captain is shipping herring in his own vessel or in a British bottom. Again, I saw in the Evening Telegram that he has publicly stated his intention of violating our law; and further that he has claimed he loaded his vessel last year at Fortune Bay. If this be true then it must have been either through the concurrence or negligence of the Government. One thing or the other. I would ask the Government to take steps to find out whether it is true or not that Captain Corkum did defy the laws of the Colony.

MINISTER OF FINANCE—That's not the only incorrect statement the Telegram has made.

SIR R. BOND—I am asking you as a Minister of the Crown whether this statement is correct or not. I say that if it is correct it is either through the connivance or negligence of the Government.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Neither.

SIR R. BOND—So much the better. I am delighted to hear it. Now I referred a day or two ago when speaking upon this matter as to the injustice that would be done to the people of this country if this Company were permitted to import their tin, solder and soldering machinery duty free. I was told then by the Leader of the Government that it was the intention of the Government to allow others to do the same. It is perfectly apparent that that was not the first intention of the Government, for the resolutions state that these people shall not be permitted to sell this tin, solder, etc., and there would have been no force or object in inserting that clause if it had been the intention of the Government to place these articles on the free list. In order to put it beyond doubt that everybody shall have the same privileges in relation to the admission of these articles I shall move an amendment to the resolutions; and in addition I shall move an amendment to the effect that this Company should not be permitted to sell bait fishes to others than inhabitants of the Colony. If that is the intention of the Government then I presume they will not hesitate to vote for these amendments or put some paragraph in the Bill that will carry out the force of the agreement. If that is not done it is tantamount to an admission of the correctness of the position I have taken. I shall take this op-

portunity of tabling the amendments.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, for the House and the country I would say in reply to the question which the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition asks me this evening as to Captain Corkum, that I am not responsible for his whereabouts. The Department of Customs has no control over Captain Corkum, and does not know him in this connection. The schooner Coronation about which Sir Robert Bond is concerned is a Newfoundland vessel, her master and owner is Capt. Tibbo, a resident of Grand Bank, and he applied to the Collector of Customs for a license to export herring in his own vessel. Such license the Department of Customs issued to him in the usual way Sir Robert Bond quoted the Evening Telegram newspaper as stating that this vessel was chartered by Captain Corkum, and that the herring she took away really belonged to him. We know nothing of this in the Customs Department, we cannot go beyond Captain Tibbo, a Newfoundlander, his vessel which is registered in the Colony, and his application in the usual form for a license to export, therefore the right hon. gentleman's whole contention respecting this matter falls to the ground, and his insinuations against the Customs' Department are, I submit, shown to be without foundation.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Chair man, I shall avail of the opportunity to endorse the resolution now before the Chair. I do this for many reasons, notably because when I took up the Telegram newspaper this evening my eye was caught by the headline, "Fishermen Take Warning." Well, sir, I am a fisherman, and I was sent here to represent fishermen, and in their interest I should like to put my views forward as to this important matter. I am fully aware that this headline, "Fishermen Take Warning," is only another form of the insinuations put forward here two days ago by the Opposition Leader that the Government were allowing a cold storage company to come into this Island and were giving them privileges of all kinds, permitting them to export bait to the United States and elsewhere, and nullifying the Bait Act. The accusation was promptly met and refuted by the Hon. Prime Minister, who maintained, both in his capacity as head of this Government and of his professional standing as one of our most eminent lawyers, that the Bait Act was not affected in any way and that this cold storage concern was subject to every one of the Colony's laws, in just the same measure and to just as much an extent as any fish trading concern on Water Street or in the outports.

The right hon. gentleman evaded this conclusive reply, and instead, argued that this company under the terms of its agreement might export bait to American vessels on the Grand Banks. I would like him to explain how this was to be done. In the first place these resolutions, if I read them right, do not give the company any concessions to pack squid in cold storage and export them for bait, because that is prohibited by the Bait Act. In the next place, even if they had authority to pack squid, how were they going to take them to the Grand Banks, and how were they to sell them when there? It is very easy for people who have never been on the Grand Banks to

talk about filling a ship with squid and sending her to the Banks to supply the American and French vessels that are fishing there, but the actual facts are that the vessels on the Grand Banks are not in a bunch like boats fishing on the coast, but are scattered over hundreds of miles of ocean, often they do not sight one another for a whole trip, and furthermore the Grand Banks are always shrouded in fog during the summer months, so that this steamer with bait could not get in touch with them, even though very near.

I assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this House, that practical fishermen who know the conditions on the Grand Banks, will only laugh with derision when they are told that this firm intends to establish a cold storage enterprise for the purpose of sending steamer loads of bait to the Grand Banks to supply American, French and Canadian vessels..

There is, however, one feature in this proposal which the fishermen of the country will be very glad to hear of, and which they will welcome very heartily, it is that this provides for a floating cold storage plant, in addition to that established on the land. A floating cold storage plant will be of considerable benefit to the fishermen of the Colony, more, indeed, than we think. It will mean the revolutionizing of our fisheries, because the lack of bait in some quarters, and at some seasons is the great drawback we have now to face.

Captain Winsor has told us here already that if the fishermen on Labrador had sufficient bait last year the catch of cod on that coast would be twice what it was. What is true of Labrador is true of other parts of the coast at times, and yet, now when the Government is trying to do something for the fishermen of this Colony an alarm is raised from the other side of the House that we are selling the birthright of the people of Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record with a declaration that the more outsiders we can induce to come in here to engage in the fish business the better off will our people become. The fishermen of this country have to thank the outsider who has come here the past fifteen years for the better price they have been getting for their fish.

If we get back twenty-five years we find that the price of fish was controlled by a few firms in this city, but that state of affairs continues no longer ; that day is nearly done and the fishermen and everybody else should thank God. Look at the change, for instance, that has been effected on our south coast, where Canadians and others have come every year and bought large quantities of fish from the people, and those people put up the price all over the Island. We are told now by the Opposition that some of our merchants fear that part of our trade will go to Canada, but what does it matter to the fishermen, if he gets $7 for for his catch now instead of an average of $2.50 after being culled, ten years ago.

Sir Robert has criticised the clause under which we guarantee this cold storage up to twenty-five thousand dollars, but I consider this guarantee, which is held out as an inducement for the Company to come here, is one of the best investments the Colony has ever made. If the coming of this cold storage Company brought about

an increase of only ten cents per quintal on our catch all around, it will mean an additional sum of one hundred and sixty thousand dollars in the pockets of our fishermen every year ; and as we estimate that about one third of every dollar earned by our people comes back to the revenue in the form of duties on imports, this will mean that there will be an increase of revenue at least fifty thousand dollars from this source alone, therefore even if the Colony should have to pay out twenty-five thousand dollars every year, the people would have profited one hundred and sixty thousand dollars more and the revenue would have twenty five thousand dollars to the good after paying this guarantee, so that I do not see how anybody can complain of this arrangement If the advent of this cold storage concern increases the price of fish twenty cents a quintal it simply makes the situation twice as profitable for them, they will gain three hundred thousand dollars, and one hundred thousand dollars will come back to the revenue, and after the guarantee fo twenty-five thousand dollars is paid to the Company there will be $75,000 in the public chest which would not be there otherwise and which we can spend amongst the fishermen of the Colony in improving the various public services, from which they derive advantage. I am fully satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that the introduction of these cold storage plants will help this country one hundred fold. The great feature about this project is that it has been enterprised by practical men, and not by promoters like Wright, Doul, Sahistrom and others who came here with such schemes in the past. Messrs. Trefethen and Lord are men whose names are household words in the fishing business of the United States. They have been engaged in this all their lives ; they are actually operating cold storage plants in New England at the present time, and have an assured market for every dollars worth of material they will purchase in the Colony and ship to the United States.

I was very glad to be here to listen to my hon. friend Mr. Downey telling of his experiences in carrying on the cold storage on a small scale on our west coast, and his very clear and convincing explanation of how it was possible to be conducted profitably and comprehensively.

In Messrs. Trefethen and Lord we have, I think, the right people t do this. They can handle, not alone codfish, but halibut, haddock, herring, salmon, lobsters, caplin, smelts, clams and other fish. To be sure, the gentlemen on the other side of the House will tell us that those people are planning to can lobsters, and we are to be berated for allowing them this concession. This is supremely ridiculous. I cannot see how this Company is to can lobsters in competition with our people, because our peoule conduct the fishery at their very doors in the most economical way, whereas these people would have to get lobsters from all parts of the coast by means of motor boats, and this would be more expensive. In my opinion this Company's idea is not to can lobsters but to take them out of the water and ship them to the United States and Canada fresh, where they can be sold for fifty or sixty cents a piece.

Sir Robert Bond also complained here yesterday that this Company

was even allowed to buy salt fish, if it wished. And why not? Why should we not welcome this? Are we not in a better position to-day by outsiders coming in here to buy fish than we were in past years? Look at the state of affairs on the South Coast last year when vast quantities of fish were being shipped to Oporto and glutting the market, because there was no other outlet. You will not find that the coming spring because our fish has gone to Canada and the United States in salt bulk. Our people have been getting good prices for it.

If Messrs. Trefethen and Lord come here I hope they will buy salt cod, and if other firms follow their example and establish cold storage plants in this Colony also, I hope they too will buy salt cod as well. The more that do this the better for our people. Twenty years ago when the fishermen had to depend on the few local merchants the price was low and there was comparative poverty; to-day the fishermen are prosperous with money in Bank. The numerous industries that have sprung up all over the Island have increased our prosperity, and this cold storage project will further increase it.

There is an immense business to be done in caplin, as Mr. Downey has told us, for when he shipped a few barrels from the West Coast when they were scarce they brought very high prices. When this Company brings down its cold storage steamers, I know where she can be filled in twenty-four hours, and that is where the advantage of the steamer will be. She can go about and freeze the fish wherever she finds them; she can do the same with squid. Two years ago we had no squid, and last year also a scarcity, that helped the shortage of our catch of codfish. There has been no two years in the past twenty alike as to squid. Some years abundant on parts of our coast, and some years very few, while other years they can be found wherever there is salt water.

The cold storage steamer will prove a great advantage in this way, and this advantage will be a permanent one to fishermen in the Colony. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I support the measure, and as a fisherman representing a fishing constituency, I set forth my views for the fishermen of the country.

The gentleman who leads the Opposition has, through his organ, called on the fishermen to take warning. I tell the fishermen there is no need to take warning; there is nothing to fear.

MR. EARLE—I have listened with much pleasure to the remarks of the hon. member for Bonavista (Capt. Winsor), and it seems to me that although he approves somewhat of this Bill, his great wish seems to be to have a great number of bait houses erected all over the country. He is keener on that than he is on the Bill and I myself would like to have bait houses all along the coast if the country could afford it. I am very sorry that so far cold storage operations here have not proved a success, for all admit that it must be an advantage to our people. If the Government will introduce a measure that will supply bait free for all, I shall support the measure, but under this Bill such a result is not obtained. The other day when the Hon. Premier introduced the Resolutions I listened to him as attentively as I could, and I must

say I like to hear a gentleman of his capabilities speak. However my hearing is rather weak and when he spoke in those soft gentle tones it is possible that I did not catch his remarks correctly.

HON. PREMIER--The hon. gentleman should come over and sit near me.

MR. EARLE—As far as I could make his words out he said, "No business man will object to this Bill on cold storage." I have been in business for a number of years and I suppose I may therefore lay some claim to being a business man, and I most certainly object to the measure. I do so for various reasons. First I would say that I quite agree with Hon. Premier in his remarks that we should do our best for the country and the fisheries. I remember once hearing one of our leading divines declare in a sermon that the Greeks of old took great pride in their country and every Greek who did not do so was termed a fool, and he contended that every ability which we possess should be used to promote our country's welfare. Now the Premier told us what a great advantage it would have been if we had this cold storage for the past twenty-five or thirty years. As I said before, I agree with him in the main, but I must not run away altogether with the idea that cold storage is to be the panacea for all our ills in this respect. Great stress was laid upon the exportation of fresh fish to Canada and the United States. There are times, no doubt, when considerable quantities of our fish could be sent there and sold, but there are times, unfortunately, when they have a surplus of fish and none of our fish would be wanted in these countries. Captain Winsor has alluded to two or three years ago when fish dropped so very low. If I remember rightly the catch was wonderful everywhere that year, the French, Americans and Norwegians securing large catches, and the result was that nobody seemed to want our fish, hence the drop. If we cannot get a market for our fish we surely cannot get good prices ; if there is no demand then there is no price. Reference has been made to a trade to be developed with Bristol and the West Coast of England. The way that that trade has fallen off has been a matter of much regret to me. I remember when a considerable quantity of Labrador fish went to the west and south of England, and it was only the miserable cure of the article that lost us that market. The people of the northern countries know the Englishmen like a good wholesome article and they give it to them. As I have stated, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of cold storage, but I cannot hold with this one sided agreement, for it seems to me to be one-sided. Under it we are to pay the Company one and one-half per cent. on their capital, and if they lose any money we are to make up the loss. They may or may not lose, but one thing is cerain, we have to pay the one and one-half per cent. There is another point which strikes me and which I throw out for what it is worth. The Company, say, in 1912, will clear ten per cent.; the next year they will not make a dollar, and we shall have to pay them five per cent. Now that is not a business transaction. The Company are getting the best of the bargain. I think it would not be amiss to strike, say, an average of three years in estimating profits and losses ; that is,

if their average earnings in three years equal five per cent. then the country should not be called upon to pay anything. Under the present arrangement if they make ten per cent. in two years in succession and make nothing the third year the Government has to pay the five per cent. That seems hardly fair. I just merely throw this out as an idea of my own. I think it would be unfair to the taxpayers to pay them five per cent. when they lose, and let them pocket the additional five per cent. when they win. Again, the business they are going to carry on is not very clear to me. Are we going to be under the same obligation to them for the business they carry on in their smoke houses and factories as in their cold storage plants? Now, taking up the duty on tin, solder, etc. This seems to be a very serious matter. I am not in a position to go into the matter of the disposing of our bait fishes. I think that the Right Hon. Sir R. Bond made a very clear statement on that the other evening. As I said, I do not profess to be an authority, but if there is any doubt about this matter it should be cleared up before finalizing with these gentlemen. Americans are very shrewd people and nearly always appear to get the best of a bargain. I should be sorry if, through any blunder, they got the better of us. Mr. Chairman, what is the meaning of a "floating plant?" It may mean one vessel, or it may mean a dozen or more in a bay. Should they be permitted to have ten or a dozen vessels there might be considerable difficulty in safeguarding our interests with regard to the exportation of bait fishes. It is not laid down here what this plant shall be. If I were these people I think I should contend for as many vessels as I wanted. There is another point. Section 4 speaks of cases of dispute, where a chartered accountant is to be called in to settle the question. Where is the chartered accountant to come from? They might object to one of our chartered accountants, and would demand one from their own country I think that the words "Chartered Accountant of St. John's, or Newfoundland" would meet the difficulty. All these things seem to be simple enough but I think if we are to safeguard our interests they should be made clear. But, Mr. Chairman, the most serious thing in all this to me is the risk there is to the business man. The Bill seems very iimple, but if you take section 5 it says: "The Govern-
"ment agees to guarantee to the
"Lessees and during the term of
"fifteen years from the first day
"of January next, any sum which
"the net annual profits of the
"Lessees from the cold storage
"plants erected and operated by
"them under the said agreement
"and from the business carried on
"in and upon the said plants shall
"be less than five per cent. upon
"the acthal cash capital invested
"by the Lessees in such plants;
"provided that the total amount
"of such capital shall not exceed
"five hundred dollars. No pay-
"ment shall be made under this
"paragraph except upon the certi-
"ficate of the Auditor General of
"Newfoundland, to be obtained in
"the manner set forth in para-
"graph 4 of this agreement."

I think that that should be improved upon. The concession is too large. Is it fair to a business man in this country who has been established for years that a Com-

pany should be subsidized to come in here and compete with him. It is very easy to do business when you are subsidized by the Government. They know that they are perfectly safe to make five per cent. Therefore I think some change be made in that fifth section. Some people were under the impression that the failure of the last cold storage agreement was due to lack of capital. I have always had a different opinion and I believe the Company would have come in here and worked if we had given them the concessions they asked. It was something in this line they were demanding. I was speaking on it at the time and I think the reason they did not raise the capital was because they did not get the concessions they wanted. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out as well as I can, a few defects in this Bill. A great deal of time might be spent in talking about it, but I think I may as well finish here, as it might only tend to bring up what one of the papers called "some ginger in the House," and I am not a man who wishes to raise any controversy, and I have already in my humble way laid the matter before you. I would support a satisfactory Cold Storage Bill, but I cannot support the present Bill.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. KENT gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, February 17th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, Feb. 17.

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

MR. HOWLEY—I beg leave to present a numerously signed petition from the inhabitants of Oderin in which they ask for the extension of the telegraph system to that settlement. The petition is signed by all the inhabitants of Oderin and sets forth very fully the reasons upon which the petition is based. I ask to have it referred to the proper department and I trust it will receive the very best attention.

MR. DEVEREUX—I beg to support the prayer of the petition presented by my hon. colleague, for I consider that the granting of the petition will have a great effect on the commercial interests of the district. In the past the district of Placentia and St. Mary's has been left out in the cold in the matter of telegraphs, but owing to its peculiar geographical position and the fact that there are a large number of islands, it is necessary that the systems should be extended for the benefit of the business people. I hope and trust that the present petition will receive the best consideration of the department to which it is referred for there are many interests involved and it will be a very great benefit to the people to be able to communicate with other parts of the island.

CAPT. WINSOR—I beg leave to present a petition from William Harris and other inhabitants of Glovertown asking for the allocation of a sum of money for the building of a road. There are some ten families living in this settlement and I know that the road is badly needed, for I have been there myself. I trust that the petition will be favorably received and that the amount asked for, $40, will be granted.

I also beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of New Harbor asking for the allocation of the sum of $70 for the repair of a bridge that enables the inhabitants to get from one side of the harbor to the other. The bridge has been built for twenty years and is in a bad state of repair. The sum I have named will be sufficient to make the necessary improvement now, but if it is not given immediate attention it may cost $300 to repair it later on.

MR. CLIFT—I beg to present a petition from Edward Power and others of St. Patrick's and Little Bay asking for a grant of $100 for the repair of a road leading to the main road. I ask that the petition be referred to the Minister of Public Works.

I also beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Three Arms in the district of Twillingate asking that a breakwater be built at Deadman's Bay, near Cape Freels, Fogo. I understand that there are other petitions from other places and other districts asking for the same breakwater. The petitioners set out the great necessity there is for this breakwater, as it would afford a safe harbor of refuge for all the vessels on the East Side of the Island. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read the petition. (Reads petition.)

I also ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Lushe's Bight and Ward's Harbor on the same subject. Both petitions are largely signed and I trust they will receive the best consideration of the House.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—I have very much pleasure in supporting the petitions which have just been presented by my hon. friend and colleague, Mr. Clift.

MR. EARLE—I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition asking for the erection of a breakwater at Deadman's Bay and beg leave to present petitions from Seldom-Come-By, Change Islands, Fogo and vicinity on the same subject. It is unnecessary for me to add anything to these petitions, for those who have gone up and down that coast know very well how much the breakwater asked for is needed. And I trust that ere long a substantial one will be placed there for the convenience of the shipping masters. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

CAPT. WINSOR—I feel it my duty to my constituents and to the fishermen generally to support the prayer of the petitions just presented. From Pilley's Island to Seldom-Come-By there is no harbor where a vessel can anchor in safety in the fall nights, when there are large numbers of vessels going and coming from St. John's to the northern outports.

Some few years ago there was a petition drawn up asking that a breakwater be erected at Musgrave Harbor, but when it was shown to me I suggested that the place to have it erected was at Cat Harbor or Deadman's Bay. In the

latter place the water is very shallow but in either place there is water enough for schooners to anchor, and any money spent in erecting a breakwater will be spent in the right direction and will be highly appreciated by the people. I am in favor of granting the prayer of the petition, and anything that I can do to have the wishes of the petitioners granted will be done.

Ordered that these petitions be received and referred to the Departments to which they relate.

Notice of Question

MR. KENT—To ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail all amounts paid on account of General Contingencies from January 1, 1910 to date.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The statement is being prepared.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the HON. PRIME MINISTER, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act to Encourage the Manufacture of Peat."

MR. SPEAKER left the Chair.

MR. PARSONS took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Bill without amendment.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the HON. PRIME MINISTER, the Bill entitled "An Act to further Encourage the Smelting of Copper Ores in this Colony," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I beg to move that the Bill entitled, "An Act to prevent the spreading of Potato Canker," be read a second time, and, in doing so, Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a few remarks to the House in connection with this disease that has come amongst us, known as canker, and which has given the Board of Agriculture a considerable amount of anxiety and worry. The first appearance of it in our midst that we can trace was in 1909 at Red Island, Placentia Bay. I may say here that it did not altogether come under the knowledge of the Agricultural Dept. until some months afterwards. The reason of this was that the man who discovered it, not knowing what it was, sent a small sample to the Canadian Government to have it examined, and, upon getting a report, the Canadian Minister of Agriculture and Mines communicated with this Government and later sent down Professor Gussow, who went to Placentia Bay and located the spot and examined the ground. Canada's particular interest in this matter was because this disease was not previously known to exist on this side of the water. It seems to be that it was first discovered about 1900 in Saxony, whence it spread to other places in Europe, and in 1907 I think, it was first located in England, but its existence on this side of the water was absolutely unknown. When Professor Gussow came down here he went into the matter thoroughly and he cautioned our Department in every possible way as to its seriousness; and there is no doubt

in my mind from the information given by him that it is serious. Together with that we had two men here — specialists—men who have made their mark throughout Canada. In the first place we had the advice of Dr. Robertson and then we had Dr. McPhail. These men expressed the great dread there is of this disease, and so seriously does Canada look upon the matter that vessels are prevented from bringing potatoes from our shores into Canada, for fear they would spread the disease. Requests have also come to us to take all measures possible to prevent the spread of the disease, and we are now doing all we can in that direction. Dr. Gussow, in his report, has given us a lot of advice, and I may say that the legislation we are now bringing in is in accordance with his views. The Act gives the Government power to enter on infected lands, and further gives the power of confiscation, if it is necessary. The local Bards have done everything in their power to prevent the spread of the disease, and we have made arrangeents whereby lime, the best curative, can be had at a very moderate rate, and which is to be given out upon the certificate of the Chairman of the Societies which we have in various settlements. I am led to believe, Mr. Speaker, that as far as this disease itself is concerned it has been here for a number of years. We have found it in the East and West ends of the city. We have found it in Trinity Bay and some of the other Northern settlements, and it must have been here for some little time back. The only way it could have reached here is from the European countries and now the task is before us of doing something that will counteract and kill the disease. It was asserted by one of the papers some little time since that the canker was brought here with the potatoes which the Board of Agriculture imported and gave out. That, let me say, is absolutely false, and the reason is, that these potatoes were imported from Canada, where the disease does not exist. Any importations we have made have been of the best kind. We engaged experts and these experts took a great deal of time in purchasing the best seed possible, and I think we got it. The reason I say this is because of the information we have of the crops of potatoes which have grown from the seed which we gave out. I can quote instances where a barrel of seed potatoes yielded thirty-three barrels, and there is even one report of forty barrels to the barrel. But what's the use, Mr. Speaker, of getting good seed if the canker disease is in the ground? It is going to spoil every barrel of seed potatoes placed in the ground, and that will be worse, in my opinion, than the famine which took place in Ireland some years ago. But it is our duty to cope with it and do everything possible to kill it. This disease is so infectious that by walking over infected ground the disease may be carried from one place to another. I was so informed by Dr. Robertson and Dr. McPhail, and they would not make such statements unless they were sure of what they were speaking. It is the desire of the Government in presenting this Bill to obtain power to cope with the disease and I am sure I have a friend on the opposite side who knows a great deal about farming, and who will help us out with his valuable

experience. I refer to my hon. friend, Mr. Dwyer. Probably he has not got the disease on his farm but he has seen the diseased tuber. It is a terrible looking thing. I do not know how to describe it, but we have samples down in the Department, Mr. Speaker, and anybody who has visited the Department and seen them will see the necessity of the legislation proposed. All we ask is power to cope with this deadly and abominable disease.

The Bill was read accordingly and ordered to be referred to committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND gave notice of question.

MR. CLIFT gave notice of question.

MR. CLAPP gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, February 20th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, Feb. 20th.

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

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from C. D. Mayne and others of Twillingate, asking for a sum of $200 to enable them to clear out the channel under the bridge crossing from the main road to South Island. It has become filled up with sediment during the past ten years and it is now almost impossible to get a boat through. They point out that $200 would do what is necessary and save a great deal of labor to them when they have to pass that way with their boats. I have much pleasure in supporting this petition and hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see his way to providing for this much needed work.

During the last session we had an assurance from the other side of the House that any recommendations we might make from this side on district matters would receive favorable consideration. I am sorry to say that this has not been our experience. I hope, however, that this particular matter will receive early attention, as it would be very beneficial to the people there.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of South East Arm, Placentia, and the town of Placentia, and also from the North East Arm of Placentia, on the subject of removing the restriction placed by the Inspector of Fishery Wardens last year upon the people resident in these Arms in connection with setting their salmon nets inside the Main Gut of Placentia. For a very long period, at least 60 or 70 years, the inhabitants of the N. E. and S. E. Arms have put their salmon nets out within 300 or 400 yards from the mouth of the River. Last year owing to this regulation the people of Placentia were unable to procure any fresh salmon. They claim that it is not necessary for the preservation of the fish that they should be restrained in this way. I am sorry that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here to-day, as I should like to have called his special attention to the matter. I beg that this petition be received and referred to the Department to which it belongs.

MR. DEVEREUX—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support that petition; this thing was a great hardship to the people last year, that such an arbitrary law should be enforced and without proper notice. I hope the Government will see its way to allow these people to catch their salmon again in the same way as before. I beg to support the petition.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I ask leave to present a petition from Rev. W. P. Finn, John Lynch and other residents of Bellevue, Collier's Bay and Chance Cove in the district of Trinity, asking that a ferry service be established at Belevue. Petitioners state that there is great need of a ferry at Bellevue, as it is impossible for many to reach the church and school without crossing the water. A ferry would also be a very great convenience for the mail courier and travellers generally. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Public Works. I also ask leave to present a petition from A. B. S. Stirling, Rector of Trinity East, O. V. Laing, and others of Salmon Cove, in the district of Trinity, asking for a grant to construct a branch road on either side of Salmon Cove River to connect with the bridge that spans the river. Petitioners state that at the present time there is only a narrow footpath over rocks and uneven ground, the path in places being almost impassable and exceedingly dangerous to pedestrians. A portion of the road will need to be railed. It was only the other day that a resident of Salmon Cove met with a serious accident, breakhis leg, and it is thought that if the road had been properly constructed the said accident would not have occurred. I ask that this petition be also referred to the Department of Public Works. I also ask leave to present a petition from Jonathan Pitcher, Pierce Bailey and others of Old Bonaventure, in the district of Trinity, asking that Old Bonaventure be included as a regular port of call for the s.s. Ethie. I ask that this petition be referred to the Executive Council in order that it may be given consideration when the question of ports of call for the mail service this season is taken up by the Government.

MR. GRANT—I beg to support the petitions presented by the Hon. Colonial Secretary.

MR. CLIFT—I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Herring Neck, in the electoral district of Twillingate, asking for a sum of money to construct a breakwater at Deadman's Bay, near Cape Freels, in the district of Fogo. Also one from the inhabitants of Twillingate on the same subject. In presenting these petitions, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that a few days ago I presented two petitions on the same subject, and I then pointed out the desire of the petitioners and the reasons set forth for the construction of this breakwater. It is unnecessary that I should repeat now what I said upon that occasion. Suffice it to say that the petitions have my hearty support, and I hope will receive the early attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to whose Department I would ask that they be referred.

MR. EARLE—I have much pleasure in giving my hearty support to these petitions.

HON. MR. EMERSON—I beg to present a petition from Philip Fudge and others, of Pass Island, asking for the sum of one hundred

and fifty dollars to complete a landing slip at that place, and also praying for the sum of forty dollars to repair the bridges in the settlement. I would point out that during my visits to the many settlements in the district of Fortune Bay I was particularly struck with the absence of such public works as breakwaters and small wharves and landing slips. During the past year there has been allocated from the special grant an amount sufficient to commence the construction of a breakwater or landing slips in places where they are most needed. This landing slip at Pass Island was commenced last year, and I am glad to be able to hold out every hope to the petitioners that it would be completed the coming summer, and also that the bridges would be repaired in due course. I ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Ordered that these petitions be be received and referred to the departments to which they relate.

Questions.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement of allocations made in the Electoral District of Twillingate out of special vote during the year 1910, giving following particulars— (1) date; (2) amount of each allocation; (3) to whom made; (4) for what purpose.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS —The statement is being prepared. You will have it to-morrow.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all moneys expended by his department in connection with the disease known as potato canker, including all sums of money paid to Dr. Robertson, Professor McPhail and Professor Gussow, or other persns in connection with their respective visits to this Colony.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—The information is in course of preparation.

MR. CLAPP—To ask the Minister of Public Works whether it is the intention of the Government to undertake the construction of the bridge over Baker's Brook, District of St. Barbe, according to a plan laid down by the Government Engineer, and if the Government is aware that already there is lying on the banks of the river a large quantity of poles and material for the construction of said bridge.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS —This matter is under the consideration of our department at the present time. It is the intention to send the Outport Road Inspector down there to prepare an estimate of the cost of the work.

MR. CLAPP—To ask the Minister of Public Works whether it is the intention of the Government to make provision for a ferry to St. Margaret's Bay, District of St. Barbe, as asked for by a petition presented to this House last session and signed by the Rev. J. T. Richards and a number of others.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS —I beg to say that this matter is under consideration.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the HON. PRIME MINISTER, the Bill entitled, "An Act to encourage the Manufacture of Peat," was read a third time and passed; and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message for the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the HON. PRIME MINISTER, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act further to encourage the Smelting of Copper Ores in this Colony."

MR. SPEAKER left the Chair.

MR. PARSONS took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. SIR ROBERT BOND—I should like to ask the Hon. Leader of the Government if any company is contemplating operating under this Bill.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in introducing this Bill I stated that some English capitalists, represented by an eminent engineer, were negotiating with the Government in relation to this matter. There is no reason that I know of why his name should be kept from the House. The person who communicated with the Government was Mr. Brenton Symons, who is a mining engineer of considerable reputation. He lives just outside of London and he has been in this Colony for the past four or five years. He has been engaged in mining at Goose Cove and Saint Julians. I regret to say that the mine at St. Julians has not turned out very well up to the present; but at Goose Cove they seem to have a good property. He is in England now and has written to say that if such a bill as this were passed he does not think it would be difficult to get English capitalists interested in the matter. As I have said he is an engineer of very high standing, and it is his opinion that a smelter in Newfoundland would mean a great deal, especially in districts like Notre Dame Bay, where there are many copper properties, and no ore from them has been crushed up to the present time. There are very fine surface indications in numerous places, but they are not sufficiently developed to attract capital to invest, and it is really at his suggestion that this bill has been introduced.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Bill without amendment.

Ordered that this report be received and the Bill read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act to prevent the Spreading of Potato Canker."

MR. SPEAKER left the Chair.

MR. PARSONS took the Chair of Committee.

MR. CLIFT—Before this Bill goes through the Committee stage I would like to ask the Minister in charge if he will be good enough to table the information I asked for yesterday in relation to the expenditure in connection with this matter. It may be advisable that we should know what has been done up to the present time in this connection before we proceed to put the matter through the Committee. The Bill is one which I feel sure will receive the support of every member of the House. It is not a matter on which there will be any controversy, but I submit, sir, that in view of the fact that legislation is now pending before this House in relation to the matter before the Chair, we should have that information be-

fore this Bill goes out of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—In reply, I would say that I am not quite sure of the exact amount at present, but I do not think it would exceed $100 or $150. We merely paid the travelling expenses of Drs. McPhail and Robertson, so that they were really no cost to the Colony at all. The only other expense was advertising. The clerks in the Department are preparing the information asked for. Mr. Kent's question, asked a few days ago, is keeping them busy. That is the reason the information is not here to-day.

MR. DWYER—There was another expense. A man was going around showing samples of infected potatoes. I think if the disease is as deadly as you say it is this man should not have been allowed to bring these diseased potatoes around with him. He knew nothing about it. He was going around from farm to farm, and if the disease is as infectious as it is stated to be, I do not think that was a very wise thing.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—The only enplanation I can give is that he did that without any authority from me or from anyone in the department. It was not a proper course to adopt to take the diseased tubers around. He was merely sent to the outlying settlements so that he could come in touch with the farmeis and spread information and if he had samples they were not taken from my department to my knowledge. I think I am correct in stating that the whole of the expenses up to the present time including advertising and sending this man around, does not exceed one hundred dollars.

HON. THE PREMIER—Professor Gussow was sent down by the Canadian Gvernment and his expenses were paid by them. Drs. Robertson and McPhail did not come here in connection with the canker at all. They came on other matters.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Bill without amendment.

Ordered that this report be received and the Bill read a third time on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

MR. CLIFT gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn till to-morrow, Tuesday, Feb. 21st, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, Feb. 21.

At fifteen minutes past three of the clock in the afternoon of this the 21st day of February, the names of the members present being taken down by the Clerk, namely, The Hon. Minister of Justice, the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and Messrs. Parsons and Seymour, MR. SPEAKER declared the House adjourned for want of a quorum until to-morrow, Wednesday, the 22nd day of February, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

the Agreement which these Resolutions are to confirm, beyond all possibility of doubt. I desire now to emphasize what I then said, namely, that I do not consider this definition necessary; but where there is any ground for a construction against the Colony, then we would not be doing our duty here if we passed any Resolutions or any Act or any section of an agreement which did not clearly explain and carry out the intentions of the Government and of the Legislature. The section to which I refer is familiar to all or most of the Committee, and they must have read and construed it. It is the guarantee section, in which the Colony guarantees to the Company, in the event of their coming in here and spending half a million dollars on cold storage plants and failing to make 5 per cent. on their capital, to make up their deficiency from that amount. In other words, it is a subsidy if they fail to make the 5 per cent. When I introduced these Resolutions I pointed out the impossibility of getting capitalists at home or abroad to take up this matter unless there was some special inducement held out to them. These people come here and say, "We are prepared to take the risk, to put up five cold storage plants, and to spend at least half a million dollars in their erection; and if we do not make five per cent. on our capital, we ask the Government to make a contribution." If they make 4 per cent. we have to pay 1 per cent., if they make 3 per cent. we have to pay 2 per cent., and so on. That is the agreement made by the Government, but it has been pointed out that this section is open to another interpretation, and that it might be argued with some success that not only are we liable for five per cent., but any deficit the Company might make. I have given this section very careful consideration, and I cannot see how any Court could possibly place upon it any other interpretation, but that this Colony is liable for 5 per cent. only on the invested capital. We have no interest in this bill as regards the extent of the operations. They may do $1,000,000 of business, or $5,000,000 a year. But if they fail to make 5 per cent. on their invested capital then our liability commences. It is just as if we were subsidizing the Ropewalk, the Boot and Shoe Factory, or any other. We say, "If you fail to make five per cent. on your capital at the end of the year, in the interests of the Colony we will grant the equivalent of that five per cent. If you make four per cent. we will give you one per cent., and so on." In drawing up this agreement the law officers of the Crown followed out the section of the Act passed unanimously by the Legislature last year. It is identical as regards construction with the Acts of 1904 and 1898. It is true that there is a limitation in the Act of 1904, in that this Colony is never liable for more than $25,000. I submit with all

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 22

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg leave to lay upon the table of the House report of the License Board for the session ending October 21, 1910.

HON. PREMIER—I beg leave to table the report of the Internal Economy Committee. I also desire to lay upon the table the correspondence in relation to the loan. There is one letter in original. It is very important. I have put in a copy so that the original may be returned.

SIR ROBERT BOND—I beg leave to present a petition from Robert Young and other inhabitants of Twillingate Island in reference to the erection of a lighthouse and fog alarm at Cabot Island and at Cape Bonavista. I understand from a letter I received forwarding this petition that it is part of a concerted movement on the part of the people interested all along the coast from St. John's away to the north of Twillingate. All who know the dangers of navigation along this coast will appreciate that this alarm and lighthouse will be of inestimable advantage to the people from here to the far north. I beg to move that this petition be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for consideration. I also beg to present a petition Alex. Sanson of Friday's Bay on the subject of a road. They desire $170 for making a road across a brook at Indian Brook. It appears that during the recent autumn storms the banks of the brook were washed away and it is now impossible to cross it. This is the main road for travelling from all parts of the bay to Herring Neck. I hope that this matter will receive the consideration of those who have control of the district grants. I may say that I have not been in any way consulted as to their expenditure. I would ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Public Works. I have also a petition from Uriah Chunn and other inhabitants of Friday's Bay, asking for the sum of $150 to construct a road from Burnt Cove South towards Salt Pan. The petitioners point out that this road is absolulutely necessary for people attending divine service, and also for children attending school. I would ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Public Works. I have also a petition from Richard Keefe and others, of Friday's Bay, asking for the sum of $100 for the completion of a road around Burnt Cove. I would refer this to the Department of Public Works.

MR. CLIFT—I beg to support the petitions presented by the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and particularly do I wish to support the petition asking for a fog alarm on Cabot Island. I may say some of my constituents talked to me about this matter last autumn and I understand that a deputation of captains of schooners and others interested in the erection of

this fog alarm invested to wait on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with a view to laying before him the necessity of this fog alarm. I hope, as this matter is one which affects so many of the people who are engaged in coasting along that part of the Island, that the Government will give it that attention which its importance merits.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—There must be some mistake in that petition if it calls for a lighthouse on Cape Bonavista. There was a lighthouse built there in 1843, and up to the present it has never been discontinued. I think a fog alarm instead of a lighthouse is mentioned.

SIR ROBERT BOND—Both the fog alarm and lighthouse are mentioned.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—There is also a lighthouse on Cabot Island. There was a deputation of shipmasters called on me about a fog alarm on these two places, and I promised them I would acquaint the Government of their wishes. I may say the Government is quite willing to accede to their wishes, and I think by the end of the year these fog alarms will be working. I am surprised that this was not attended to years ago, as the country was so prosperous and the fisheries good. I am sure that if these marine wants had been attended to, there would be no need for the numerous petitions that have been coming in the past two years asking for aids to navigation.

SIR ROBERT BOND—I would just say that in perusing the petition further I find that emphasis is laid on the fact that it is a fog alarm that is required.

HON. MINISTFR OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Henry Hobbs and other members of the Fishermen's Protective Union at Keels asking that that place be connected by telephone with the post office at King's Cove. The distance is about five miles and between the two is Broad Cove; further along is Tickle Cove; and still further along is Deep Cove and Open Hall. The question is now being considered of having all these places connected with the telegraph office at King's Cove by telephone. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary, who has charge of telegraphs. Also a petition from the inhabitants of St. Brendan's asking that it be made a port of call for the s. s. Prospero. I think, perhaps, this would be a matter of some difficulty, because of the number of ports already visited by the steamer. I ask, however, that this be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary for consideration.

Also a petition from the inhabitants of Newman's Cove in the district of Bonavista asking for a sum of money to construct a road connecting it and Amherst Cove with the new branch railway. A shore road would put these three

or four small settlements in touch with the railway. I have much pleasure in giving these petitions my hearty support, and ask that they be referred to the Department of Publlc Works.

MR. DWYER—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in presenting a petition from the fishermen of Outer Cove. These men suffered considerably last fall twelve months when all their stages and places were carried away by a storm. They are under great difficulties in getting a place to carry on the fishery and they ask for a wharf there to help them to do their work. I beg that this petition be referred to the Department to which it belongs.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this petition. The people of Outer Cove have become very well known to me since I have been in St. John's, and I remember well my sad introduction to that place two years ago, when I was called in to give some assistance there. One of the oldest fishermen of Outer Cove, with his son, coming home from his fishing trip, unfortunately had their boat turned over and both were drowned. I went to the assistance of the people of Outer Cove and with the aid of a diver we got the bodies and brought them to land. What struck me more than anything else was that when we got into the Cove there was no public landing place, and the people had to wade into the water and pull the boat right up on the land, so that they might be able to remove the bodies in decency. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition, and I consider the Governmen would be doing a great favor to these people by granting a sum of money for a public wharf. They are deserving of it.

Ordered that these petitions be received and referred to the departments to which they relate.

Questions.

SIR ROBERT BOND—To ask the Hon. the Premier if any American vessel was allowed to take a cargo of herring at White Bay in the autumn of 1910.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Speaker; in reply to the right hon. member, I may say: In November, 1909, one George Doggett, a resident of Newfoundland, applied at the Customs at Nipper's Harbor for a license to export herring for food purposes. This application was refused by the Sub-Collector at Nipper's Harbor, and Doggett telegraphed to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice authorised the Department of Marine and Fisheries to instruct the Sub-Collector at Nippers Harbor to issue a license under the provisions of the Bait Act to export herring for food purposes in accordance with the provisions of that Act.

SIR ROBERT BOND—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he or his Deputy received a

letter from any member of the Executive Government requesting him to grant a permit to certain American captains to export herring to the United States, or to use same for bait purposes.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—No. The answer just given by the Premier covers this question also.

Mr. CLIFT—To ask the Hon. the Colonial Secretary if any petitions has been received by him or by the Post-master General, asking to have the Post Office at Exploits, in the District of Twillingate, removed from the East Side to the West Side of the Harbor, also whether or not a protest against such a removal has been made to him or to the Postmaster General; also to ask the intention of the Government in the matter.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—In answer the hon. member I beg to say (1) no such petition has been received; (2) a protest has been made to the Postmaster General; (3) the matter is still under consideration.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER laid upon the Table of the House the Report of the Commission of Internal Economy of the Legislature for the present session.

THE HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY laid upon the Table of the House the Report of the Licensing Board of St. John's for 1910.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS, it was ordered that Supply be granted to His Majesty.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the HON. PRIME MINISTER, the Bill entitled, "An Act further to Encourage the Smelting of Copper Ores in this Colony," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body on its provisions.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES, the Bill entitled "An Act to prevent the Spread of Potato Canker," was read a third time and passed: and it was ordered that it be engrossed, been entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provision.

Pursuant to Order, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions on the subject of the Establishment of Cold Storage Plants in this Colony.

MR. SPEAKER left the Chair. MR. PARSONS took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, when we in Committee on these Resolutions some few days ago, hon. members will remember that I undertook to submit to the Committee a resolution placing the interpretation of the Government upon Section 5 of

respect that those who take the other view would have to work a considerable time before they could draft a section plainer and clearer than Section 5, a section that would better fix the liability of the Colony. The section says that the Government agrees to guarantee any sum by which the net annual profits of the Lessees from their cold storage plants under this agreement shall be less than five per cent. on their invested capital. Then it goes on to say, provided that the total amount of such capital shall not exceed $500,000. These words are words of limitation. What do they mean if not a limit upon the amount of capital upon which this liability rests? But, as it was pointed out on the last occasion, and as I stated in my opening remarks, this is a matter of sufficient importance to place it beyond all possible doubt as to the liability of the Colony to these people; and if we had to tear up fifty agreements, where there is any doubt as to the provisions, we should be unworthy of our positions here as trustees of the Colony if we did not remove that doubt. I, therefore, propose this amendment as suggested here on the last occasion, and which shall appear as an additional resolution.

Amendment: "The amount "payable by the Government un- "der clause 5 of the said agree- "ment shall not in any year ex- "ceed 5 per cent. on the actual "cash capital invested by the Les- "sees in the said plants and shall "in no case exceed the sum of "twenty-five thousand dollars in "any one year."

In other words our liability is narrowed down in the first place to 5 per cent. on the actual cash capital in the cold storage plants, and in no case shall it amount to more than $25,000. It was suggested here on the last session on which we considered these resolutions, and I have since seen considerable comment in the papers that this agreement goes to the extent of nullifying the Bait Act, in other words, narrows the powers of the Governor in Council in relation to the Bait Act. I am prepared to admit that that would be a serious matter if it were true, but there is not the slightest foundation for such a statement. It is merely a bugaboo brought out to frighten the non-thinking and those who have not had an opportunity of enquiring into and studying the facts in this particular case. What is this agreement? Merely an arrangement between individuals that, in the event of their erecting cold storage plants they will be guaranteed a certain sum. What has that got to do with repealing the Bait Act? Is anybody going to tell me that if this Legislature were to make an agreement with Bowring Bros., or Harvey & Co., or Mr. Baird or Mr. Bishop, to put up cold storage plants and guarantee them a certain amount, that that would ride rough shod over the Bait Act? It is almost too ridiculous and non-

sensical to waste time over and were it not for the fact that some people require an answer to almost every statement no matter how unfounded, and would believe it if it were not contradicted, I should not discuss it at all. I consider now and always have considered, the Bait Act to be the sheet anchor of this Colony, an Act that we would not have had to-day if some people had had their way. One of my first acts in this House was to vote for the Bait Act, and I have stood up for it ever since, and I would risign my seat—and a thousand seats—rather than jeopardize the interests wrapped up in that Act. Everyone knows that we could only repeal this Act in two ways; either by direct or express legislation or by necessary implication. In other words, that it must be expressly repealed or else the words of the other Act must be of such a character that no other implication or meaning can be placed upon them. We had an Act in 1808 almost identical with this, and this House was told by those who supported that measure that its real value was that we would be able to export caplin, halibut, eels, flat fish, turbot and all the other fishes that are practically going to waste to-day. If we can get ten dollars a barrel for caplin in cold storage in the large hotels in the United States, is it not better to export these fish, which come here every year regularly, than put them on the farms for manure? It may be asked what would be the action of the Government if it was found that any of our fish was being exported for bait. The answer is obvious. There is the Bait Act which says that no sort of bait can be exported or dealt with in any way except by license, that has been laid down over and over again. You must have a license, and if these people come here to-morrow they would have to get a license. Any man on Water Street or in any other part of the country wanting to export dried squid to Japan and China would have to get a license. If not he would be rendering himself liable to the law. If there is one thing more certain than another it is the meaning of the Bait Act. You can't get over or modify it in any way except by express legislation. I want the Committee to read this agreement and see if there is anything in it that can possibly affect the Bait Act, expressly or impliedly. According to the contention of some it would be perfectly legitimate for them to pay no light dues or Custom dues, because if this agreement repeals the Bait Act then it must repeal any other law, but of course the Bait Act is picked out as being the most formidable "bugaboo." To debate such a question is not complimentary to the Bait Act or the framers of. No Act of Parliament could repeal it unless expressly inaugurated for that purpose or containing words clearly implying that

repeal was intended. It has also been claimed that this contract is unfair competition with those already engaged in the business. In the first place let me say that is impossible because there is nobody engaged in the business of cold storage. It will be remembered that when I introduced these resolutions I stated that the items here admitted duty free would be placed on the free list in connection with the same works as contemplated in this agreement. These people have been allowed to bring in their machinery free. There can be no loss there because if they did not come there would be no machinery brought here. As to the other items. We are permitting them to bring in ammonia for refrigeration purposes. There is no ammonia coming here now for that purpose. Also vegetable oil for curing fish. I am not aware that there is any fish put up in oil to-day. Then there is tin metal for cans and solder. The total duties paid on the importation of tin into this country amounted only to $1,200, and that not only for canning but for every purpose. That could not work any hardship to the people, even if we did not give them the benefit of the free list, but it is also proposed to put this on the free list. Then there is gasolene and gas engines and oil for lubricating machinery. None of these are used to-day to any considerable extent. But the position is this, that if we want to do anything large or special we have got to give some inducement to the people who are going to risk their money. I do not think there is any risk. I think that if cold storage is properly applied, without even touching codfish, halibut and the other fish can easily supply millions of dollars to the owners and people of this country. I am quite satisfied that, without interfering with the business of the country, cold storage will gradually work a revolution in relation to fish and the by-products of fish that are now serving no purpose whatever. I hope that this explanation will be satisfactory to the Committee on these two points. The first resolution should also be amended hy the addition of these words—"Subject to the provisions of the resolution hereinafter contained. This agreement is hereby ratified," etc.

These amendments were adopted.

On motion of the RT. HON. SIR R. BOND, seconded by MR. KENT, the following amendments were moved, but upon being put to the Committee they were lost:

1. Resolved—The agreement hereby confirmed is subject to the following conditions and limitations, namely:

(a) The lessees shall not during their continuance of the said contract sell herring, caplin, squid, or other bait fishes to any fishermen except those *bona fide* and domiciled in the Colony;

(b) The provisions of Cap. 129 of the Consolidated Stntutes, 1892, (Second Series), entitled "Of the Exportation and Sale of Bait Fishes;"

2. (Which was to be added to Resolution 3.)—Provided always and it is hereby enacted that the admission of any or all such articles into this Colony free of duty under the agreement hereby confirmed or under this Act shall only apply when and so long as the article or articles so admitted free of duty shall be included amongst the articles admitted generally into this Colony under the Revenue Acts for the time being in operation without the payment of any duty thereon.

HON. J. C. CROSBIE—Mr. Chairman, before these Cold Storage Resolutions pass, on behalf of the district which I have the honor to represent, I would like to say a few words in reference to them. I don't think that any resolutions that have come before this House have given me more pleasure to support. I feel that they bring the dawn of a newer and brighter day for the fishermen of this country. The organ of the Leader of the Opposition says: "Fishermen take warning." Warning for what? It sounds to me something like an expression we heard in the fall of 1908: "Hold back yonr fish; you are masters of the situation." Now what do these resolutions mean to the fishermen. They mean a lot. Not only will our fishermen more readily be able to sell their fish, but they will be able to sell it fresh and green and at a good price. I have received a letter from Mr. John B. Patten, of Grand Bank, in which he says that if the Cold Storage Bill is passed the fishermen will be able to sell (green) codfish and enhance the pricce of the dry. It will be a great day. Think of the caplin swarming about our coast. Instead of being thrown out as a fertilizer, under this Cold Storage Bill they will be put up for food, and instead of realizing the paltry sum they do at present they will sell for from $4 to $5 a barrel. What does the Leader of the Opposition mean by saying, "Take warning?" It is simply his Opposition tactics. If he were on this side of the House he would be shouting out what a grand Bill it is, instead of trying to condemn it. He seems to be worried just now over the fishermen. What has he ever done for the fishermen, I should like to know. If I remember rightly, he was born with a silver spoon in his mouth and left a fortune. Has he ever had the pluck to put one dollar of it in the fisheries of this Colony. Not likely. He never did and never will. He lives at Whitbourne and the best I have known him to do is to sell his milk to the Butterine Factory and take away business from the farmers. There is another point in this Bill to which 1 should like to refer, and that is the floating cold storage plant. What will this mean to

the fishermen of Labrador? It means that if they had this cold storage last year, from which to get fresh bait, the fishery, instead of being 80,000, quintals, would have been double that amount, which would mean from four to five hundred thousand dollars more to the fishermen; and there would have been no necessity for them to have sought railroad work wnen they came home. I am sure there is not a fisherman here to-day who understands these resolutions who would not be glad to throw his hat in the air in favor of them, and in his interest I stand here to endorse the resolutions now before the chair and I hope, sir, that when this Bill shall pass this House the time will have come for which we have been looking for and more prosperous times for our fishermen. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have great pleasure, on my own behalf and on behalf of the fishermen whom I represent, in giving my support to these resolutions. I do not think that they need any more explanation than that already given by the Prime Minister, and I feel sure that everyone will feel proud today at the way in which he has brought about this Bill.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES — Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my support to this Bill. Since the time when Newfoundland was first found out by Cabot this has been a fishing Colony. At one time our banks were fished upon by Portueguese, then by the French and the Welshmen and others, as also by our cousins, the Americans and Canadians. In the earlier days it was not much fished by Newfoundlanders, but of late years our fishermen have learnt from the Americans and Nova Scotians that there is a great deal of wealth at their very doors. Some of our merchants have been sending their vessels to the Grand Banks, as the Americans and Nova Scotians had been doing for a number of years. And when one considers the advantages that our fishermen have over the American and Lunenburg fishermen I am sure that it is surprising that no more of our merchants have gone into the business. Of course they have their reasons. But I remember the time —and I am not a very old man— when there were no bankers at Grand Bank or Burin, but to-day we find the Newfoundlander keenly competing in that fishery. And why not? There is no reason why they should not. Our fishermen are just as good as other men, if not just a little bit better. It is the Newfoundlander, sir, that skippers the Gloucester fishing boats and supplies them with their crews. And I am proud to know that although they have to leave their native shores, they still remember the hononed name of Newfoundland and keep it to the front. What, sir, have the Governments of the past done for the fishermen? It is true that I am quite a young politician and that I do not know

much of past politics except, of course, what I have read, but it is true also that years ago the Bait Act was passed and carried out up to the present day and, sir, in the same way as this Cold Storage Bill it was opposed by the then Opposition, although everyone knew that if it was carried through it would be a great thing for the country. That is the business of the Opposition. We understand that and so do the people. But, sir, has there been anything done in the past for the fishermen to secure them better prices? Have they been given any chances of getting these prices themselves? I do not know of anything done by past Governments. I am sure that when the late Government was in power it was like the seven years of plenty in Egypt. There was abundance of fish and yet we find that in 1908 that you could buy fish on Water Street at $1.50 and $2 a quintal. And did the Government step in and remedy this? There were promises of agents to find new markets and give the men the benefit of the information that these agents gleaned while abroad. I do not think that this ever amounted to anything and I am sure it never put one dollar into the fishermen's pocket. There was also a Bill for cold storage in 1904—practically a *fac simile* of this one. I wonder whether anyone can tell the reason why the people for whom this bill was passed never came to the country to operate? I wonder what there was in the bill that hindered them from coming? The bill is on the Statute Book and it remains there to-day. I wonder why none of the monied people of the country have thought it worth while to take advantage of that bill and spend their money in Cold Storage. Every year there have been cries from the Labrador and West Coast that there is no bait. What is the reason and why, sir? The bait is simply swarming round the Island and yet no one has taken advantage of the bill, which, I think, pays them twenty per cent. The only two cold storage plants that I know of are the one at Fogo, owned by Mr. Earle, and the one owned by Mr. Hodge. They are the only two known to the department of which I have the honor to be the head. I have made enquiries from Mr. Earle, jr., and he tells me that the fishermen of Fogo would not be without the plant there for any money. It has been the greatest blessing to them. They have reaped great benefits from it and are glad to pay the small sum which is charged them for the bait. They speak in glowing terms of these plants. If that is what is being done by a plant that only costs a few hundred dollars to put up, what will result from a cold storage plant capable of holding four million pounds of every kind of fish. I am personally acquainted with one of the parties to this contract. I met one of them twenty years ago when I was sailing out

of Portland—Mr. Trefethen. He was then interested in the fishery. His father was a fisherman—an independent man. Since that time he has built a cold storage plant in Portland equal to the one in Gloucester, the one which has been the making of Gloucester and their one boast. Last year was the first time that these two gentlemen visited Newfoundland. They did not come for the benefit of their health, but like those sent out to view the promised land, they came for a look round and like shrewd Americans to see it there was any advantage to be gained by working in connection with our fishermen. The halibut round our coast is the great fish. Our fishermen could catch quantities of it and the reason they do not do so is that they cannot find a buyer. It is to be found to a great extent about George's Bay, Bay of Islands, Bonne Bay, and I am sure that on Port au Port they are as plentiful as flatfish in the summer They can be caught in great numbers, but what is the use when there is no market. Why, sir, only last year I had to order a dory of them to be buried in the sands because I could not sell them. It is all right for people to get up and talk about the fisheries, but most of them know nothing about that great industry. How would it be, sir, were I to get up to speak on law? I do not know anything about it. And neither do most of those who get up to speak about the fisheries know anything about them. They have never pulled a fish in over the gunwhale of a boat nor tended a trap on a foggy morning, and how can they expect to be able to talk about the fishing question. They think they know all about it, but there are boys in their teens tending the fishery from the stern of a dory who can give them points.

As I said before, this is only a fishing Colony and what we want are markets. We have been marketing the dry products for a number of years, some years at a good price and others very poor. But it is principally our codfish, with a little salmon, a little trout, a little halibut and a little turbot that are exported.

These gentlemen, as I have said, came over to the West Coast, landed at Channel and went from there to Burgeo. They talked with the fishermen and asked if they could catch any halibut. The fishermen said yes if they could only sell them. They guaranteed them three or four cents a pound landed from the dory. There are tons of this fish sent in cold storage from the Pacific Coast into the States, where there is an unlimited market. But, sir, it is said that the Newfoundland halibut is a better halibut than this. It has a nicer flavor and people prefer it to the other. Now, sir, these gentlemen made this agreement with the fishermen and the consequences were—and one cannot argue against

figures—the consequences were that those men made from $100 to $250 from catching this fish alone. And this work did not, as one might expect, hinder them from carrying on their codfishing. These gentlemen left behind them some $50,000. Sir, is that fishery worth looking after? But how are we to do it without cold storage? These men came to the Government—the people's Government — the Government whom the fishermen have elected—the Government in whom they have put every confidence to do what is right for their benefit—and they are going to do that. And this agreement is the result. The Prime Minister and Minister of Justice formed this agreement, and I have every faith in their ability as lawyers. I have no reason to doubt either the Premier or the Minister of Justice in that capacity. I know them both to be able men and I do not believe they would do anything detrimental, so far as the law is concerned, to the interests of the fishermen of the country. I would not stand here, sir, as the representative of the District of Harbor Grace, and vote for anything that I thought detrimental to my district and the laboring classes of the country. I have read through the bill and I have considered the cold storage problem in the country while many objections have been made to it both in the House and in the daily press, it is only from those from whom we expect nothing else. Hon. Mr. Crosbie has said that we could be better off. I have no doubt about it and I feel sure that after our four years are up both the country and the people of all classes in it will be more independent and better off than they ever were before. The benefits to be derived from cold storage have been very forcibly put by the Prime Minister. He says that these people are not going to confine themselves to the cod, but that they will catch herring, halibut, salmon, turbot, eel and all the various fish that we do not at present make use of. We know that there are a number of fish that the fishermen cannot avail of simply because they have no ready market, and it would be useless to catch it and it would be useless to spend any time at it. But I believe that when this bill passes the fishermen will avail of the opportunities which it will afford to put more dollars into their pockets by catchlng these fish, because they will have some people ready to buy and a good market. This market will be found not only in the United States, but also in Great Britain and other places.

I have, therefore, much pleasure in supporting this bill. I might say that when I had the pleasure of speaking with this gentleman about the floating refrigerator he said that their intentions are that while the West Coast and South Coast might be benefitted by having a plant erected there they consider that the close season on the

East Coast and North West Coast could only be properly worked by having a steamer of from twelve to fifteen hundred tons with cold storage apparatus on board, so that according as the fish moved from one place to another they would move along and give the people the advantage of being able to sell their fish to the steamer.

I think, sir, that the Government is to be congratulated on this measure. It will mean a lot for the fishermen of this country, as it will put up the price of the fish, and it will give them means of employment. I heartily endorse this measure. It is one that should be supported, not alone by the Government members, but also by the Opposition.

MR. CLIFT—It is not my intention to make any lengthy observations upon the measure before the Chair, suffice it to say that I have given it my earnest consideration. I believe that the Hon. Prime Minister in introducing this measure considers that it will be the means of carrying out his long desired object of establishing connection between this Colony and Canada and the United States by exporting our fresh fish in cold storage and a fresh frozen state to those markets:

I have not heard anything in this House, neither is there anything to this agreement which would convince me that this desired object would be accomplished by this bill. The prime object so far as can be gathered from the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Government, is for the preservation of our fresh fish, chiefly in cold storage, and exporting same to the American markets, thereby relieving our present markets of so much fish and consequently its price, but I have listened to the observations of other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and one would think from their remarks that the main object of this bill was to supply bait to our fishermen at all times and all places wherever they happened to be. Indeed, sir, not only would one imagine that they were going to supply our fishermen with bait, but that they were going to carry their benefactions to the extent of putting it on the hooks for them. No, sir, I do not see anything in these resolutions which would in any way compel the contractors to supply bait to our fishermen. I take it that these people are coming here for the purpose of securing fresh codfish from our people, cold storing it, and sending it to the markets in the United States. If that be the main object then what reason have we to suppose that they are going to supply our fishermen with bait for the purpose of catching fish for our own merchants. Again, sir, our fishermen often find themselves unable to purchase bait and therefore are we going to bind ourselves to a payment of $32,500 a year for the purpose of subsidizing a company that will come in here and

enter into competition by means of this cold storage with the fishermen of this Colony. We are called upon by these resolutions to pay altogether too much for the benefits we are likely to receive from this industry, and I am not convinced that this measure is going to be such a great advantage, and to be of so great a benefit to the fishermen of this Colony as the hon. members who have spoken would desire us to believe. I congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the very interesting manner in which he has treated the subject this afternoon, but I am sorry to say, sir, that I cannot cougratulate the hon. gentleman who has preceded him. The hon. member rose for the purpose of giving some reason why he was supporting this measure, but he failed to give any reason that I could see, and contented himself with saying that a better day was dawning for the fishermen of the country, and he took advantage to cast reflection upon the right hon. gentleman who sits on this side of the House as the Leader of the Opposition. I was pleased, sir, I was more than pleased tnat the right hon. gentleman treated his comments with silent contempt. It is not necessary for me to make any reference to the right hon. gentleman for the purpose of vindicating him against any remarks that would come from a member of this House and particularly one whose seat is hardly warm. The hon. member thought to disparage the work, the life long work of the right hon. member, but the record of Sir Robert Bond is too well known in this House and in this country to make it necessary for him to reply to the unwarranted attack. That he has devoted himself to the best interests of his country cannot be denied by anyone, and I think that there is not any man who has had experience in the public life of the Colony can cast one word of reflection upon the character of Sir Robert Bond, or on the manner in which he has performed his duties. It ill becomes the hon. member to cast reflection upon Sir Robert because he has never invested any money in the business of the country. What has that to do with it? Cannot a man be interested in his country without investing money, if he has it, in the fisheries? The Right Hon. Sir Robert Bond has given his time and his talents to his country. I submit that his thirty years of service, during which he has given his time and his talents, are of far more benefit to this country than if he had invested in her fisheries.

MR. BENNETT—Before these resolutions pass I would like to make a few observations in relation to them. I have listened attentively from the time when the Hon. the Premier introduced these resolutious up to the present, and I can assure you that I listened to him and other speakers with a great deal of interest.

It cannot be denied, either in this House or outside of it, that a system of cold storage would be a great benefit and a great boon to this country. The Leader of the Government in his opening remarks when introducing those resolutions gave very strong reasons for supporting them. He referred at some length to the great amount of good that the system of cold storage had done for industries in other countries. He referred particularly to the great work done in Australia and New Zealand in connection with the freezing of meats. The establishment of this system raised those countries from a state of bankruptcy to one of opulence and prosperity. Twenty years ago as to-day Australia and New Zealand were the greatest sheep-raising countries in the world, but these people had to dispose of these animals for little or nothing, almost for less than it cost to rear them. In fact the sheep were slaughtered merely for their skin for making woollen goods, and the fatty matters for making oils, etc. And what are the conditions now in these countries. Instead of slaughtering these animals wholesale and allowing the meat to go to waste, they are now killed, put into cold storage and transmitted to London and Liverpool and other cities of Great Britain. Hundreds of thousands of carcasses are carried in cold storage steamers 4,000 miles, and arrive in as fresh a codition at their destination as when shipped. If this can be done with the principal industries of these countries it can surely be done with ours, and I submit that under these resolutions, it will be done.

We have heard in this country during the past twenty years a great deal as to the desirability of having cold storage here. Politicians on both sides of the House have spoken with hope of the day when cold storage would be introduced into this country. Well, sir, that day is about to dawn, if we can take these resolutions as a sign of the times. My learned and esteemed colleague, the Premier, in his manifesto at the last general election had as a plank in his platform, the introduction of cold storage and promised that if he and his party were returned to power they would take steps for the establishment of this utility in the Colony. I think that he is to be commended for taking up the matter so promptly, and I think that these resolutions are a credit to him, and when adopted will prove of lasting advantage to the Colony.

Now, sir, let us look at this matter as a regular business propositon. The first thing to find out is whether the people we are dealing with, viz., Trefethen and Lord, are reliable men, men of repute and men of good standing in the commercial world, or are they men of straw. The Government, in the early stages of the negotiations, had taken the neces-

sary steps to find out if these men were such as were desirable, and in this connection they satisfied themselves, and I think they have satisfied the Leader of the Opposition by the correspondence tabled, that these are men of high financial standing, of high character and of financial enterprise. It is such a class of men as this that we want in this Colony. Men who are capable of carrying out great commercial enterprise, men of brain, men of action. It is to such as these that we turn to assist us. I am quite satisfied as to the first part of these resolutions, that these gentlemen will carry out their contract, and that point not being disputed, we can take it for granted that all are satisfied as to the *boaa fides* of these gentlemen. Now as to the terms of the contract in relation to the admission of material duty free. That matter has been taken exception to by the Opposition. They say that on account of this the revenue will suffer. Well if these people do not carry on these industries then they will not be imported. If they do, then the general revenue of the country will not be affected. After all we get a company to come in here and invest five hundred thousand dollars in a venture that may be very uncertain and is actually experimental. Therefore I think that the argument that they should not get concessions, or these articles should not be admitted free of duty, has not weight or force.

Now, as to the bounty or guarantee. First, the Government agrees to pay one and one half per cent. interest during the 15 years on the actnal cost of the construction of these buildings; it also guarantees five per cent. on the Company's paid up capital, which shall not exceed five hundred thousand dollars. After all it is reasonable to suppose that men, carrying on a large business in the United States and coming here to risk a large amount of money, it is only reasonable that they should ask for a certain bounty or guarantee. We merely are pledged to a certain degree. If this industry is successful, the Government will not be called upon to pay a single dollar. Even if they are called upon, will it not be offset by the great benefits that will accrue to our people? Messrs. Trefethen and Lord agree to put up five cold storage plants in this Colony, each of which plants shall have a capacity of not less than one million pounds of fish. And for this we guarantee them five per cent. on the capital invested. No sane man would think we are paying too much, or would doubt the benefits that would result to our fishermen.

Now, Sir, as to the point raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, in regard to the bounty or guarantee. I think that the hon. gentleman, of course in his anxiety to have the clause beyond doubt, has put an interpretation on it which common sense does not give

it. The Premier, in the opening of his remarks, said that in his opinion there was no reason whatever why this clause should be altered. So this is an answer to the Rt. hon. gentleman, and closes that part of the argument.

A few days ago I heard the hon. the Leader of the Opposition say that he was against reciprocity with the United States. That came as a great surprise. He, who worked so hard for it for years, he, who regarded it as an ideal, was now against reciprocity. But he gave us his reasons for it. He said that if Canada had reciprocity with the United States, then reciprocity between us and the United States, too, would not be of any benefit whatever to this country. That argument may be sound. The Rt. hon. gentleman further stated that, whilst this was the case, we would be benefitted by Canada's reciprocity with the United States, for this reason, that Canada sending a large amount of her catch to the United States, would mean a greater market for our salt fish. That argument may also be sound. Well, Sir, if that argument stands good, how does the hon. gentleman claim that cold storage will not act in the same direction! If these contractors can find a ready market either in the United States or Canada for fresh fish in a frozen state, will it not follow that the price of our salt fish will be enhanced in value. Those gentlemen have cold storage plants with a capacity of 5,000,000 lbs. of fish, and, if they export this, it necessarily follows that our salt fish will have a higher value owing to restricted competition. That is the position as I see it, and I think that it is a sound, reasonable and strong argument in favor of cold storage.

Another matter is, a few days ago, strong objections were raised against some of the conditions laid down in a bill as regards continuous operation. Can any objection be raised by the Leader of the Opposition to this matter in this bill. He cannot. These contractors will have to operate their plants continuously for a period of fifteen years. They have to do that or forfeit the contract. That condition has been inserted by the Government in order to safeguard the Colony. If those people come here, invest five hundred thousand dollars, and operate continuously, it follows that this Colony and its fisheries must be benefitted to a considerable extent.

Another point, and one which has hardly been touched upon. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries made out a strong case in this matter, with reference to the price paid for fresh fish as compared with the price of salt. Mr. Downey also referred to the same. He stated that it took 308 lbs. of fresh fish (cleaned and gutted) to make 112 lbs. of salt, or it took 500 lbs. of fish, with head, entrails, etc., to make 112 lbs. of salt fish.

I have not had the advantage, like the Minister of Marine and

Fisheries, of being a fisherman. That is more my misfortune than my fault. That gentleman stated that a very high figure, namely, 6 cents a lb. for our salt fish, was paid. Now, 112 lbs. of our salt fish at that would be $6.72 a qtl. Now, as I said before, it takes 500 lbs. of fresh green fish to make 112 lbs. of dry salt cod, and would it not be reasonable to suppose that the fishermen would rather sell their 500 lbs. of fresh fish to the cold storage plants at 3 cents a lb., which would bring them in $15.00, than to turn it into salt cod, which would at the most bring them in about $7.00, or one-half the amount of the former. This, in my opinion, is a very strong argument in favor of cold storage. Therefore, it follows that the installation of this system will mean increased prices all around. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries spoke of the great amount of halibut around our coasts. This is a fishery, I may say, the value of which has not been appreciated, and which nas not been utilized as it should be. He stated that the halibut from the Pacific had a foothold in the United States, but it was not half as good as our halibut. I have eaten of this Pacific Coast halibut in New York and other places, and I must say that it does not compare in the faintest degree.

There are other fisheries that can be developed and bring hundreds of thousands of dollars into the Colony and we must not forget that besides our codfish we can catch halibut, turbot, lobsters, salmon and other fishes. The waters that surround the Island are teeming with fish of all kind and so far we have done very little towards getting the proper value that can be derived from them.

It is with very much pleasure that I support the resolutions now before the chair, as I did the resolutions that were introduced a few years ago, and that resulted in the inauguration of the great industry now carried on at Grand Falls. Hon. members will remember how when the resolutions were passed, the cry went up that we were giving the country away. Public meetings were held in different places and the people were up in arms over the matter, but the action of the Legislature in granting liberal concessions to the Harmsworths has been justified, and it can be seen now that the tabling of the resolutions dealing with the contract was the first step towards opening up the interior of the Colony and converting the wilderness into a hive of industry, as Grand Falls is to-day. Large as were the concessions granted to the Harmsworths, the Colony is being paid back year after year for the annual revenue derived is about $150,000. As I have said, I support the resolutions now before the Chair on the same grounds, for I am convinced that what has been realized from the policy with regard to the Harmsworths will be

realized to a similar extent from the Government's present cold storage policy, and that in five years time we shall speak of Trefethen and Lord as we speak of the Harmsworths to-day.

SIR ROBERT BOND—I just wish to say a few words before the resolutions which are now before the chair are passed. I have listened very carefully to the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, which have been worthy of consideration. I listened with much pleasure to the speech of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and with very much pleasure to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. The other remarks caused me more amusement than anything else. When I get mosquitoes pecking at me I am reminded of a distinguished gentleman who occupied a seat in this House many years ago. He was at one time Receiver General of the Colony, and in that office and in this House did splendid work for the Colony. He was a fine old Scotch gentleman, and his sterling honesty and bluntness made him the butt of the political mosquitoes of that time. He stood it for a long time, and on one occasion, when they were more irritable than usual, he told a story of a Highlander who was attacked by mosquitoes while fishing in one of the streams of his heather-clad homeland, and, after brushing away again and again these pestiferous insects with good-humored industry, patience ceased to be a virtue, and turning up his grey tartans and exposing his ample proportions in their naked simplicity, he exclaimed: "Now, then, you vicious little blackguards, peg away." I say, sir, I am reminded of that story when I get political mosquitoes biting at me, and I am very much inclined to follow the Highlander's example.

Now to business. It seems to me that my hon. friends opposite have lost sight really of what I consider to be the great objection to the measure before us. One would think from the remarks of my friend, Mr. Bennett, that I was opposed to cold storage. Not at all! There has been no more consistent supporter than I am. On every possible occasion have I advocated it. I think that a cold storage project properly carried out will mean a great deal for the Colony, and, as I have already said in this debate, relieve the situation when there is a surplus of our salt fish in foreign markets. If you can send away in cold storage 100,000 or 150,000 pounds of codfish you will of necessity relieve the congestion in our salt fish markets and by that means increase the price of it. But is there anything absolutely certain that under the agreement this will be brought about? Can it be interpreted in the correspondence that has passed between the Government and the contractors? I have gone very carefully through the

correspondence, but I have been unable to find any undertaking on the part of the contractors to export fresh codfish. What are they entering into this agreement for, then? From reading the correspondence I know that they wanted to secure a monopoly of the herring trade and asked to have it granted them. That is one thing. I know, further, that embodied in the correspondence there is the information that they will can lobsters and herring and other fish, but I have not seen there any reference to the export of fresh codfish. They may export codfish, and I presume that they will, but my poiut is that while hon. gentlemen opposite lay stress on the export of fresh codfish there is not even a hint of it in the correspondence, nor is there anything to show that it will form a large part of the enterprise.

My objection to the resolutions as they stand is that under this agreement it is possible for the company to devote the whole of their business to the exportation of bait fishes. It is possible, I would point out, by the fact that there is nothing in the agreement whereby the contractors are limited in the sale of bait fishes to our own people. I have heard it thrown out that this cold storage scheme is likely to be of value to the people of the country because it will place beyond peradventure supplies of bait to the fishermen. Let me emphasize the fact that there is nothing in this agreement that holds out even a hope that our people will be supplied with bait for their fisheries, and the contractors are under no obligation whatever to supply them. Under the 1904 Act there was a distinct obligation that the bait fishes to be caught were to be sold to our people, but there is nothing in this Act that will compel the contractors to sell one herring or squid or caplin to our people. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that it was the duty of an Opposition to oppose. It is not except where wrong is being done. "Nobody expects anything else," said the Minister, but he is entirely wrong if he thinks that I oppose this bill because I am on this side of the House. I said at the commencement, and I repeat, that I am criticising the measure as a friend, and because my views on it differ from those of my friends opposite, they must not be taken as objectionable. I firmly believe in fairness of debate, and if my criticisms are not based on sound argument, as I submit they are, then there is no harm done. If my views are wrong, does it give members opposite a good cause to indulge in blackguardism and abuse? Does not that alone indicate a weak cause?

Again, I repeat that my chief objection to the measure now before the Committee, now that my amendment as to the guarantee has not been accepted by the Government, is that there is no provision wherby

we have a guarantee that our people will be supplied with bait. Only a few days ago I read an address given by Prof. Somers, of Truro, in which he says, "the great drawback to the fisheries of Nova Scotia is the necessity for bait." Here is a declaration from a very high source that Canada has not sufficient bait to meet the requirements of her fisheries and the fact should be of great importance to us. If Canada and the States have not sufficient bait then we are the masters of the situation and it behoves us to see that we have a firm grip on the whole North Atlantic fishery. I take this position honestly that under this agreement these cold storage depots and plants that we are subsidizing may be exclusively devoted to the storing and distribution of bait fishes to our competitors. That is my point. There is nothing in the agreement to prevent them from doing so. I did not say, as the Prime Minister thought I did, that this agreement was a repeal of the Bait Act.

HON. PREMIER—I did not say "repeal" but "nullify."

I am not under the impression that the agreement repeals the Bait Act, but I say that it practically, and I use the word advisedly, nullifies the Bait Act. From the correspondence, I observe, first, there was actually a demand on the Government by these people that they be given control over the herring and other bait fishes. That was their desire. I next come to the fact that this agreement was not entered into under the Act of last year. because it was the intention of the lessees to seek privileges in excess of those given by the Act of 1910. What were the privileges that they wanted? I know they wanted control of the herring and other bait fishes, because they put this in writing. I know that the Government has not inserted a clause in this agreement setting forth that these people shall not engage in the bait traffic. In fact, it is quite clear that they can. The Hon. Premier has said: "You can't expect people to enter into a great undertaking without being given liberal concessions." While I agree with the policy of inducing capitalists to come here and granting concessions to them, yet in the agreement before us, if there is the faintest possibility of its being used as an engine of destruction of our fisheries, surely it is our duty to protect our people. If it is not the intention of the Government that the contractors shall have the right to dispose of bait just as they please, what harm can be done by the insertion in the agreement of such an amendment as I suggest.

The Government claims that the contractors cannot sell bait to foreigners any more than anybody else, but if this is their contention why do they not put it beyond all peradventure and dispute? The learned Leader of the Government being a lawyer, knows that it is

our duty, standing in *loco parentis* to the public, to guard them against legislation that may injure them. There is a doubt that these contractors may sell bait to the competitors of our fishermen and consequently the plants may be used as an engine of destruction of our fisheries and if that doubt exists, as it does exist, then it is the duty of the Government to make it absolutely beyond doubt. There was a doubt as to the guarantee clause ahd the Hon. Premier has agreed to amend it and I need say nothing further about it, but the same doubt exists as to the selling of bait to the Americans and he should amend this also for this is a question of far greater magnitude. I have not only to look at the agreement for something to lead me to a correct understanding as to what will be done under the agreement before us. I have to go a little further: in fact, I have to be certain of the Government's policy as to bait supplies. What is their policy? I have not been able to discover it and I defy any person to know it when he has taken up this bill and considered what has occurred during the time that the Government has held office.

It will be remembered that when I was last debating this question I drew the attsntion of the Government to an article that appeared in the *Evening Telegram* under the date of the 14th of February, in which it was alleged that Captain Corkum, an American fisherman, had 300 barrels of herring shipped on the schooner *Coronation*, the fish being secured at St. Jacques and English Harbor, and I asked the Minister who represented the Customs Dept. in this House if the allegation was correct, for if correct it manifested either negligence or connivance on the part of Customs officials. The House will remember the exceedingly rude manner in which I was answered by the Minister. I was told that it was a lie, and it was not the first lie that the *Eveuing Telegram* had published. Since then I have turned up the back fyles of the *Daily News*, the principal organ of the Government, and under date the 27th January I find it alleged in that paper that Captain Zimmerman, of Gloucester, had shipped a cargo of herring from Fortune Bay a few days previous. This is the paragraph from the *Daily News*:

"TWO HERRING CARGOES FROM FORTTNE BAY.

"Within the past few days two cargoes of herring have been shipped from Fortune Bay, one by N. & M. Smith, of Halifax, and the other by Zimmerman, of Gloucester, who had a Canadian vessel chartered. Both were cargoes of the frozen article, and were taken at Rencontre, where the fish are very plentiful, and the largest ever seen at that place. Besides these cargoes, the fishermen are freezing large quantities for the banking fleet, and it is expected that other schooners will arrive from Canada

with the next few days to secure cargoes."

Was that an incorrect statement, I would ask? If not then it points to either negligence or connivance on the part of the Customs authorities. Again, in the Daily News of date the 31st of January, I find published a communication from Inspector O'Reilly to the Assistant Collector of Customs, dated the 28th of January, from St. Jacques, in which he informed the Customs Department that Capt. Corkum, of Gloucester, was there purchasing frozen herring which he was storing and intending to ship to Gloucester in the schooner Coronation owned by Tibbo of Grand Bank. This is the communication:

CAPTAIN CORKUM BUYING HERRING.

"The following message was received yesterday forenoon by Mr. H. W. LeMessurier:

"St. Jacques, Jan. 28th, 1911.

"Assistant Collector, St. John's:

"Captain Corkum, of Gloucester, is here purchasing frozen herring at two dollars a barrel, which he is storing, and will charter the schooner Coronation, owned by Tibbo, of Grand Bank, to take them to Gloucester. The schooners Pearl Evelyn, J. D. Young, and Renown, of Lunenburg, are ready to sail, the former two with frozen and the Renown with salt herring. The Gladys B. Street, of Burgeo, has cleared for Halifax with a cargo of frozen also. Three locals with frozen western shore herring for bait have left Connaigre. The Jennie May, of Lunenburg, the Hispaniola and Excelda, for Job Bros. & Co., are awaiting cargoes. Herring are fairly plentiful for nets, but only one seine has any now. will wire from Placentia Bay.

"(Sgd.) O'REILLY."

Was that an incorrect statment, I would ask? If not, then there was clearly connivance on the part of the Customs' Department in a breach of the Bait Act, which says, "No person should export, or cause or procure to be exported, or assist in the exportation of, or purchase, or sell for the purpose of exportation, or sell or purchase for the purpose of sale, any herring, etc., without a license. Every person guilty of a violation of any of the provisions of this Act shall be liable to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, and in default of payment of any such penalty, to imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months . . , and in addition to the penalties provided in the 5th Section of the Act shall be liable to have his vessel, or the vessel used by him, seized and sold."

Now, Inspector O'Reilly is a most judicious official; a detective officer by training, and a man who would be particularly careful not to transmit to his superior officer an incorrect or misleading statement. Mr. O'Reilly declared that Capt. Corkum was purchasing herring in St. Jacques on the 28th of January. He was doing so, as we know,

without a license and in contravention of the Bait Act. Mr. O'Reilly also declared that Capt. Corkum was then storing the herring and intended exporting them in the schr. Coronation, chartered from Tibbo, of Grand Bank. The Minister of Customs in reply to a question from me said that Capt. Corkum did not receive a license from the Government to export these herring, but that a license was granted to Capt. Tibbo. This Capt. Tibbo was master of the schooner Coronation which Inspector O'Reilly had warned the Government that Capt. Corkum proposed to charter. By granting a license, then, to Tibbo the Customs was aiding Corkum in exporting the herring he had unlawfully purchased because he could not lawfully purchase them without a license, and, as I understand the Government, in the first instance, when applied to by Capt. Corkum for a license to purchase herring in Fortune Bay, had refused to grant him one. Now, then, is it possible that this wily American skipper hoodwinked the Customs, or was Inspector O'Rielly entirely astray as to Capt. Corkum's doings in Fortune Bay? There is not the slightest doubt in my mind as to the accuracy of Inspector O'Reilly's report to the Customs' Department. But, as if to put the question beyond all doubt, I have the testimony of another witness.

On Friday afternoon last I received a letter from Capt. John Young, of St. Jacques, who was then in town, in which he declared that Capt. Corkum had purchased herring in Fortune Bay; that he employed men to freeze them; that the herring were stored in St. Jacques and at English Harbor; that in all he got about 300 barrels; that he, Capt. Young, had complained to the Customs' officer about Corkum being permitted to purchase herring for export; that he complained to Capt. Corkum because he, Capt. Young, had to "go short of bait"; that Capt. Corkum chartered the Coronation and took on board the herring he had purchased; that he then proceeded around the bay to buy more herring, and, failing to get any, returned to Belleoram and took in salt bulk fish to the amount of about 300 qtls., part of which was his. Capt. Young's; all of which he says he is prepared to swear to as absolutely true. This is the letter:

(Copy.)

St. John's, Feb. 17, 1911.

Dear Sir Robert Bond,—

I am Capt. J. F. Young, of St. Jacques, Fortune Bay, and owner of the banking schooner Norman O. I have been a herring and cod fisherman all my life, and I am acquainted with Capt. Corkum's doings in Fortune Bay. I know that Capt. Corkum bought herring there in January last. He bought herring in my presence at St. Jacques. He paid two dollars a barrel Imperial measure. He said to the herring fishermen he would

take all the herring he could get, if money could buy them. He had men to freeze them, and the herring were stored in St. Jacques. Some were bought and stored in English Harbor. In all he got about 300 barrels. He wanted 1,000 barrels. I heard him say he wanted to secure all the herring he could come at. I complained to the Customs' officer against Capt. Corkum being allow ed to purchase herring for export while we were baiting. I met Capt. Corkum on the road and complained about having to go short of bait. He offered to exchange with me fifteen barrels I had in English Harbor for fifteen barrels from his stock in St. Jacques. I had said before I would not take herring from a foreigner if I could not buy them myself for baiting in my native land. He tried to charter a vessel in St. Jacques for the herring and failed. I asked him afterwards what he was going to do with the herring. He told me he had the Coronation chartered and she would arrive soon. When the Coronation arrived he went on board at St. Jacques and sailed for English Harbor. He took on board the herring he had purchased before the charter. He returned in the Coronation to St. Jacques and took on board all the herring he had there. He proceeded round the bay to try and secure more herring. There was none to be got. He returned to Belleoram and commenced taking in salt bulk fish. Last Tuesday he sailed in the Coronation to St. Jacques, and took on board about 300 quintals of fish, part of which was mine. At St. Jacques everybody knew the herring belonged to Captain Corkum. He even got the fifteen barrels I had secured at English Harbor, and the Norman O. had to sail fifteen barrels short. I am prepared to swear that this statement is absolutely true.

I am, sincerely yours,

(Sgd) JOHN F. YOUNG.

Now, then, it must be quite apparent to the House that there is "a nigger in the wood pile" somewhere. Let us try and get him out, for this matter, as I shall perfectly indicate, may have a material connection with the fishery outlined in the Resolutions before the House. Capt. Corkum applied to the Government for permission to purchase a cargo of herring in Fortune Bay. He was refused permission, but in defiance of the Government, apparently, went there and, according to the testimony of Inspector O'Reilly and Capt. John F. Young, purchased a quantity of herring and exported them in a schooner chartered from Tibbo of Grand Bank. Tibbo was granted a license to take on board and export these herring. Did Tibbo make an affidavit that the herring were his and as to the purpose for which he was exporting them? The Bait Act calls for that to be done before a license issues. If such a declaration was made could the Customs' Department, in view of Inspector O'Reilly's statement, accept it as a correct declaration?

Was it the intention in granting a license to Tibbo to permit Corkum to get away with the herring?

If so, was such permission the Act of the Governor in Council?

If it was, then we have a reversal of the policy of the Bait Act, and it is part and parcel of the policy that I contend is embodied in the Resolutions before the House. The Government has denied that such policy is embodied ln their Agreement with the American firms mentioned in these Resolutions. I propose to put their intentions to the test by the amendments I have tabled.

It is the duty of the Government standing in *loco parentis* towards its subjects to make such effectual provision that no person shall suffer through its legislation. Therefore, if they mean what they say they will not object to my amendments.

HON. J. C. CROSBIE—Mr. Chairman, before this debate closes I should like to say a few words in reply to the Leader of the Opposition. He evidently finds the truth hard to stand. He looks across to this side of the House and calls me a political mosquito. Let me tell him that this political mosquito helped to place him where he is to-day and where he is likely to remain for some considerable time —in the cold shadows of opposition. He speaks of unfair debate and says "even if you have a losing case it is no good to insult your opponent"—

RT. HON. SIR ROBT. BOND —Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to the fact that it is half past six and according to the Rules of the House you must raise the Committee.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—I was going on to say when interrupted—

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Mr. Chairman, I again draw your attention to the time, and must insist that you now raise the Committee-

MR. PARSONS—I am only according to the hon. member for Bay-de-Verde the same courtesy extended to the hon. Leader of the Opposition already on two occasions this session, when I permitted him to continue his speech till within five minutes of seven o'clock.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—The cases are absolutely dissimilar. On the occasions referred to I was simply continuing my remarks and was doing so with the unanimous consent of the House. Is the Chairman so dense that he cannot see that? I object to the hon. member continuing and demand that the rules be enforced.

MR. PARSONS—I have already ruled that the hon. member for Bay-de-Verde—

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Sir, I protest that this is an unwarranted breach of the Rules of this House. We shall be sitting after tea and the member can speak then if he wants to. Have you no respect for this House, for your own position that you permit the Rules to be broken in this manner? What are rules for if they are not to be carried out? For more than a

quarter of a century I have been a member of this House and I have never seen such a disgraceful scene as this. If you do not know the Rules of this House, then I will teach you and while I am a member of this House I will not submit to them being overridden in this disgraceful manner. Are you so stupid or so ignorant that you do not know your duties as Chairman, or if you do, that you won't discharge them with all fairness? Sir, as Chairman of this Committee you are not to be a partisan. You are not an employee of the Government, to do as you are bid, you are a servant of this House, and you are to show fair play to Government and Opposition alike.

MR. PARSONS—I know my position as well as the hon. Leader of the Opposition can tell me. Since I have occupied this Chair I have been fair to all. And in extending the time to-night I am only giving the same fair play to the hon. member for Bay-de-Verde as previously extended to the Leader of the Opposition.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Sir, I have already told you that the cases are dissimilar. I spoke with the unanimous consent of the House. That is not given now and I protest against this Committee sitting contrary to the Rules of the House. If you will not perform your duty as you should then we may have to call upon the Speaker to enforce the Rules.

At 6.55 MR. PARSONS left the Chair of Committee, resuming it again at eight o'clock.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—Mr. Chairman, I think I may by pardoned if I begin where I originally started before I was interrupted by the Leader of the Opposition just previous to rising for tea. Evidently, Mr. Chairman, my speech this afternoon disturbed that hon. gentleman and he found my refe-rences to his past follies almost unbearable. He has had his little joke about what he calls political mosquitoes, but let me tell him that if he means to apply the term to me I am happy to be known as one of the political mosquitoes who put him where he is on the Opposition side of the House, and where he will remain. We are told by the Leader of the Opposition that when a man shows bad temper and insolence it is a sign of a weak case. Well, if that be so, he has very often had a weak case; very often indeed, for his exhibitions of bad temper are frequent in this House. We are also told by one of the junior members for Twillingate that the country knows what Sir Robert Bond is and what he has done for its welfare; that he has given his talents to his country for the past 25 years. Yes he has —for the small sum of $100,000. Would not any of us be prepared to take on the job for the same money. That is what is grieving him, that he is not here now to partake of the sweets of office. To listen to Mr. Clift's praise of his

revered leader reminds one of some familiar words used in some telegrams sent in the last political campaign—"What fools these mortals be!" Everybody in this House is ungentlemanly when Sir R. Bond gets the worst of the argument. History repeats itself. What happened in this House in 1907? Did he not insult the Attorney General, who everybody knows has earned his bread and passed his law examinations by his own ability? He must have presumably been getting the worst of the argument then. What did he say about the late Capt. C. Dawe, a man esteemed and respected by everybody? Was he not a man who had put all that he possessed into this Colony? Was not his abuse of this good man another show of a weak case? Yes, sir, the hon. gentleman frequently loses his temper and then his sayings become wild. Who does not remember his famous statement on the floors of this Assembly that "Water Street is tottering to its ruin?" It was as he wished it; but what is it now, Mr. Chairman? It stands firmer today than it ever did before. How did he behave when he was on this side of the House? Did he not ride rough shod over everybody? And does he fail to realize that positions are now reversed and that we are "masters of the situation? Not he! He has shown his true colors to-night in his attack upon you, Mr. Chairman; a cowardly and scurrilous attack when you were in the chair and not able to defend yourself. He had been treated with the greatest of courtesy in this House. It was only the first week of this session that the hon. member, Mr. Clift, requested the Prime Minister to have the Cold Storage Bill put off until his Leader could appear on Tuesday, and it was only last Friday he again had that Bill put off because he could not get in from Whitbourne. And what do we find? Because I ask for five minutes extra he stands upon his dignity. He imagines he is master of the situation. As pointed out by you, Mr. Chairman, he had been given the same privilege more than once, but because I asked for a few minutes he gets upon his dignity. His only plea that he had got the unanimous consent of the House. The man who was allowed such a favor ought to be the first to give it to another; but he is not manly enough. As a matter of fact, he did not get the consent of this House to exceed the time, but the members on this side were too courteous to interrupt him, and the way he attacked you was no credit to a member who boasts of 30 years parliamentary experience. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is objecting to the measure now under consideration; but he is the man who advocated the famous Fog Free Zone, on which he proposed to spend $75,000 a year. Then there was Mr. Flett, whom he paid $14,000 for three

years service, and a Mr. Mair who got $17,000. Then there was that famous man—Mr. Wright. I do not need to tell the country what happened to Mr. Wright. He has gone never to come back, and the hon. member's projects have gone up in smoke; he is jealous of the possibilities which this measure assures. He realizes that this Cold Storage Bill now before the House is one of the best bills ever brought in here. He realizes its value more than anybody; but he is too small to admit it. He sees the good in this, but is really too small to admit it, and, like those of old, cannot believe that any good man can come out of Nazareth. In conclusion, I may say that I am perfectly satisfied with this Bill. I may not be a lawyer; but I never tried to be one and failed. If I had I would have passed. I do not believe, however, that our Bait Act is in any way affected by this agreement. And I am prepared to let the Hon. Prime Minister and Attorney General look after that part of it, for, as has been said by Mr. Piccott and Mr. Bennett, nobody can teach them their business. And I feel that in supporting this Bill I am doing so on behalf of the fishermen whom I have the privilege of representing. I hope that in the not very distant future we will have the Leader of the Opposition getting up and saying that this Bill is a good one for the country, when he sees what it will do. We forgive him for not seeing the good points now, but he will in the near future appreciate this Bill when he sees the advantages which the fishermen have obtained from it. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of supporting the resolutions now before the chair, and whilst I have listened with particular attention all the time that this Bill has been discussed and what has been said, nevertheless I think it is the duty of every member to give some expression of opinion with regard to the subject because of its importance. I have noticed that when a question such as this comes up for discussion there are always parties who seem to think that the country is to be given away and that all the privileges we possess are going to be sold. Now this Bill concerns the fishermen of the Colony and wherever a question concerning the fishermen arises, there are always some parties who become particularly interested.—They never object to subridizing certain factories and institutions, but when it comes to a matter of subsidizing anything that the fishermen are interested in they are always up in arms. Now, why is this? Do they want to go back to the conditions of a quarter of a century ago, when everything was completely in the hands of a few mercantile men? But the fishermen having had an opportunity of speaking for themselves through

the agency of the ballot box, have placed their friends in this House ; and in doing so they have made it possible for a bill to be put through that will enable them to place thousands of quintals of fresh fish in the American market. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has said that by the introduction of this Cold Storage Bill we would probably bring about undesirable competition with the merchants of this Colony. But why should our merchants be afraid of competition? There are merchants on Water Street of international repute, who are powers in the financial world. Now this Bill will help the merchant as well as the fisherman, and everybody knows that unless it will be of mutual benefit it is of no use. That is the reason why former Bills have been placed upon the Statute Book with no result. I say this Bill will help the merchants because fish will be kept on this side of the water. It will relieve the markets of the Mediterranean and South America and make it possible for our merchants to procure a better price for salt cod, and that will give a better return to those who supply as well as the fishermen of the Colony.

Another remark made by the Leader of the Opposition was to the effect that it would be possible for this Company to use these plants exclusively for the purpose of selling bait to Americans and Canadians only. I cannot help reminding the House that that is something like a statement made by him last year in connection with the Railway Extension Bill, when he told us that the Reids could build the five branch railways in one season. One statement is as absurd as the other. He will find that it is impossible for these men to deal in bait only, because it is inconceivable that a company with a capital of half a million dollars would dabble in bait only. And with regard to cold storage for our fishermen, it would have been quite possible and easy for the late Government if they had taken interest in the fishermen of this Colony, which is to be implied from their speeches this afternoon, to have established at least fifty cold storage depots all over the Colony, which would be a paying investment to-day. That these cold storage depots can be run successfully is shown by the fact that there are three in use in the District of Fogo, one of which, I am assured, has been operated with great advantage to the fishermen in that section. I did not have the opportunity of hearing the hon. member for Fogo speak on this subject, but I am told that he damned with faint praise these bait depots. I have here a telegram from the manager of one of these freezers, a gentleman who has given special attention to everything that appertains to the benefit of the fishermen, which justifies my position on this question, and is evidence of the possibilities of what could be done by a Government that had the interests of the fishermen of this Colony at heart.

MR. EARLE—Where is that telegram from—Joe Batt's Arm?

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. This telegram should be laid upon the table of the House.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I have no objection to complying with the hon. member's request. It merely emphasizes the statement I have already made that if the late Government had taken that interest in the fishermen which they professed we might have had fifty cold storage plants along the coast to-day. These cold storage plants about to be erected under this agreement will not only be a benefit to those who catch codfish, but to those who may engage in the other fisheries, such as halibut, herring, turbot, etc. So far there has been no opportunity for our people to attempt anything of this kind, but this company, having had experience of placing these products on the American and Canadian markets, will give our people an opportunity of earning thousands of dollars in a way that was impossible before. As to these resolutions nullifying the Bait Act, I am prepared, like the majority of this House, to take the opinions of the Prime Minister and the Attorney General on this matter. I congratulate the Government for not attempting to tinker with this great measure, which is the bulwark of our fisheries. For, sir, if they followed the advice of the Opposition, and attempted to buttress the Bait Act by a clause in the present agreement, it would simply be implying a weakness were none existed and an impression that this Act is not the instrument of strength we believe it to be. The man who would interfere with that Act is no friend of this Colony or the fishermen. It's all very well to get up here and through the reporter's box to tell the people that the Government is giving away the heritage of the fishermen; that we are giving away the water power of the Colony. But is it not better to open the door of opportunities to our people, even though we have to give something in return. What is the use of going on as heretofore with the people suffering through lack of labor. If we pass a bill giving capitalists permission to come here and harness our water power, it will mean labor to our people, and give them an opportunity of earning thousands of dollars which would be quite impossible otherwise. Why can't we try to do this, and for one hour sink our differences, and give our earnest and honest consideration to this measure. I appeal to both parties in the Legislature to allow these Resolutions to pass this House unanimously, for they can have but one result—a new industry will be created which will ultimately be the means of bringing about a condition of affairs which will not alone benefit the fishermen, but will enable our merchants to carry on the staple industry of the Colony without those enormous risks with which

they had to contend in the past. The effect of this contract will be two-fold. Not alone will it give to our men fishing at Cape St. Mary's, Cape Bonavista, the Labrador, and other prominent fishing grounds, the opportunity of readily disposing of their fish for ready cash, but it will also result in relieving the congestion in foreign markets, such as the Mediterranean, South American, and those other countries where we have been shipping fish for centuries, and thereby bring about a large increase in the price of the salted and dried article. Never again I hope will the time come when there will be too much fish. There will never again be the need to say to the fishermen, "Hold back your fish for two or three months and you will get a better price for it." That time let us hope will never come again. The subsidy to be paid under this agreement has come in for a deal of criticism. Why, sir, that money will all indirectly return to the revenue again, for it will be paid out by the Company to the fishermen, who will become greater contributors to the revenue by the fact that they will be enabled to provide greater comforts for themselves and their families.

Why, sir, if patriotism means anything, why cannot we in this House agree one and all together to help on the community and by passing this agreement give an opportunity to those 75,000 people outside this House an opportunity of staying in the country and earning a livelihood at home. Those who are arguing against this Bill emphasize questions which have been agreed upon in this House for over 50 years. I stand here, sir, as a representative of one of the largest fishing districts in the Colony, and everyone here knows that I would not raise my voice in support of any measure that would bring injury to that class to which I myself belong and am proud to be associated with. There are two phases of the question with regard to bait, that with reference to those freezers erected by private individuals, and those that may be erected under the provisions of the present Bill. I have already shown that freezers can be operated with advantage and profit to our people, but those in operation were not sufficiently encouraged by the late Government, and the result there are but three in existence to-day, where there should have been twenty. I hope, sir, that when this Bill passes there will be fifty or more of these cold storage plants around the Island; but I think that the floating plant will be the best of them all. For instance take the conditions which existed on the Labrador last year. In August the fishermen there were without any fish, without a cent in their pockets to bring home to their families. If such a floating plant had been in existence, instead of going home with empty schooners they would have pro-

cured a fairly good voyage. Why, sir, if it were possible by the passing of this Bill to give those people who go down to Labrador an opportunity of getting bait throughout the season, it would be worth all the percentages and all the subsidies land and water powers and property that are given by this Bill. It is all very well to tell us that we have water powers and certain things not in other countries, but what is the use, sir, of having all these things if we cannot use them? Mr. Chairman, I will not detain the Committee any longer by any more remarks other than to say that these resolutions have my hearty and unqualified support.

MR. EARLE—Mr. Chairman, I should just just like to make an explanation with reference to the Fogo plants. In the course of my remarks, I said that cold storage in Fogo had not been a success. Mr. Devereaux is slightly in error as to the number of plants in Fogo. There are two in Fogo and one in Joe Batt's Arm. The one in Joe Batt's Arm has been taken to more quickly than those in Fogo, and has been more appreciated by the fishermen. The statement made by my friend, Mr. Piccott, as to my son, is quite correct, but he has made a great mistake in the plant about which he has been talking. My cold storage plant at Fogo has not been a success. The fishermen seldom avail of it. When I tell you that there were only fourteen persons getting bait from me last year you will appreciate my remark. I would not wish it to go abroad that I threw cold water on this question. I approve of cold storage on proper lines. With regard to the bait, I repeat what I said the other day that if the Government can afford to pay to have this bait go to the fishermen. so much the better for the country. I have already spoken in connection with the Bill, and I raised some objections to it, which the press has taken notice of. I spoke from my experience at Fogo, and merely in the interests of the Colony. I may say that I would agree with the resolutions if amended. I am glad that the section dealing with the subsidy will be altered, and I hope the Government will take into consideration the other amendments. Any objections I have raised have been in the interests of the Colony, and I look upon anyone in this house or out of it who does not think or act in these interests with the greatest contempt. I trust that the operation of the Bill will not be detrimental to the country, and I trust that the Government will see fit to give more consideration to the matter than has already been given, and that a Bill more on the lines which I have laid down will be introduced, when I shall be very glad to vote for it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Just one word of explanation, Mr. Chairman, on a question asked by the

Bond Government I asked its leader whether he intended to compensate the fishermen, but I was sneered at for this proposition. The Rt. Hon. Gentleman, however, seemed to forget that this evening; for the excuse he gave just now for opposing the Bait Act when it was first brought down here, when he was member for Fortune Bay, was that he asked the Government whether they were going to compensate the fishermen, and they refused to do so. Why had I not the same right as he? When the signal went up that my people were to be sacrificed I left the Government and crossed the floor of the House. But, sir, I am now back here. And why? Because I was true to the people who sent me here, and Sir Robert Bond was not. That is the principal reason why I am in office to-day and he is in Opposition. What did he do during his nine years in power? Nothing that I can recall except collect the revenue and spend it. There is not one measure on the Statute Book for the whole term or anything else in favor of the fishermen or anybody else. This cold storage measure is one of the promises of the Manifesto of Sir Edward Morris. I told in the House the other day what I thought of this project, and that I considered it a move in the right direction. When it was submitted to this House an alarm was raised that we were going to sacrifice the fishermen. I fail to see it. Any man in this Island can get the same advantages from the Government as did Messrs. Trefethen and Lord. What is there in it to alarm our fishermen? Nothing at all! We simply promise this firm a bounty of $25,000 a year if they do certain things. I consider that if we were to pay a larger sum than is stated in the agreement, it would be money well spent, for it would benefit this colony by increasing the price of fish all round.

The Premier surrounded this contract with every possible safeguard and there was nothing for the Opposition but to raise an alarm that our bait for our own fishermen was not sufficiently protected. How can Trefethen and Lord sell bait to outsiders while the Bait Act is in existence. They cannot override it, and if this firm having bait in cold storage cannot sell it to outsiders, well, they must sell it, and it will be to the fishermen of this country that it will be sold. The cold storage agreement provides for four permanent cold storage plants, and one floating cold storage. This steamer will go around and collect bait and fish of all kinds. It will carry bait around in cold storage, and, for instance, it can go to Fortune Bay, where there may be a hundred vessels belonging to Newfoundland, and it could supply these with bait. At present most of our vessels go to the Magdalen Islands for bait in the spring, and they will be there before the first of May to get their supply. Why, sir, for years, every

vessel from Grand Bank took her bait from those Islands, and never took one herring off the West Coast. It was stated here this evening by Mr. Downey and Capt. Winsor that, if this company sees its way clear, it will fill this steamer up with bait and take it down to the Labrador to supply the fishermen. In my opinion these floating cold storage plants will be the means of instituting new ventures and developing some of our fisheries now dormant. Take the halibut fishery for instance. We do not go in for that much, yet halibut are very numerous on the West Coast, and, if these fish were taken and put into cold storage, they would keep years, not alone months. Take that cold storage to Labrador or to any of the places where salmon are numerous. It would be able to put any number of tons of salmon in cold storage, and it would be the same with several other kinds of fish. Again, one of the objects of this floater would be to go around to the several depots and collect the fish and bait and bring it to headquarters, for what is the good of the cold storage plants if the fish is not to be had in the vicinity to fill them. It is to supply these that the floater will come in usefnl. That is one of the principal reasons why floating cold storage was put in the agreement.

The gentlemen on the other side hold up their hands in horror at the guarantee of $25,000. I believe we will never be called npon to pay it. I believe that the firm is in earnest, but if we are called upon to pay it, it will be paid cheerfully, because I believe, as I stated before, it will enhance the price of our fish, and even if it increases this only five cents a quintal we will be more than repaid, and if it increases it fifty cents a quintal does that not mean nearly three quarters of a million dollars to our fishermen? Sir, very little was done in the past in the interest of the fishermen of this country and anyone who stood up for them was laughed at. I have been eighteen years a member of this House, and never has such a measure come before it, for the benefit of the fishermen. This has been the first measure that has been introduced in their interests. This agreement looks to me as a genuine business agreement, and I am quite confident that the people of this Colony will reap their reward five hundred fold.

We are told that these cold storage plants will drive the people who are now engaged in the lobster fishery out of the business. Well, now let us get down to that point. The very fact that these people are going to deal in lobsters will tend to increase the price. Again, those people have to hire men to catch the lobster for them; they will have to hire men either to can them or put them in cold storage, and this, I submit, is going to increase the price of lobsters 25 per cent. Lobsters are $17 a case to-day, and surely competition is not going to lessen the price. Competition is

the life of trade and if Trefethen and Lord deal in them, the people will get more for their fish.

This agreement will mean higher prices all around. I can go back to thirteen years ago, when merchantable codfish was selling at $2.40; to-day it is selling for $6.50 or $7 a quintal. What caused this? There must be a cause. The reason is that outside people came in and bought up the fish, and this gradually forced the price up to $7. Well, in the same way this cold storage plant will increase the price of cod by reducing the quantity of salt fish to be marketed; thus enhancing the price of the remainder. Take, for instance, what happened in Oporto last spring. Before the first day of May 20,000 quintals of fish left the West Coast for Oporto. As a result the markets there became glutted, and as a consequence we had low prices. This year American and Nova Scotian buyers were on the West Coast buying up all the fish they could and paying cash for it, and as a result there will not be 5,000 quintals to send the first day of May, as compared with 20,000 last year. This must mean increased prices. We have to get out of the beaten path. Twenty years ago a few merchants on Water Street dictated the price of fish, but competition ensued, and they were forced to give higher prices.

Our well-informed friend, Mr. Devereux, told us how the price of fish could be enhanced, and I will continue his illustration a step farther. We could certainly sell fresh fish for three cents a pound. It takes 300 pounds of fresh green fish to make a quintal of dry fish, and the owner after taking time and trouble with this is just as likely to receive only $2 or $3 for it as in 1897, and if the average price is taken—allowing for the cull—it will be found in most cases during the past two years not to exceed $4.50 or $5.

We were told from the other side of the House that this project would disorganize the fishery business altogether. That if a merchant supplied a man for the fishery, he would not get the fish from the one he supplied, bechuse the fisherman could sell it to those cold storage plants. Why should the fisherman be compelled to sell his fish to the merchant at half price, when he has a chance to sell it for double to these plants? Thirty years ago nearly every man in the Island was a fisherman, and if he did not get enough to pay his supplier he had to get out of the country, and very often he could not get out of the country so he had to live on Indian meal. But that state of things is fast disappearing. New industries have sprung up and are springing up. Last year 5,000 were employed in other industries, such as paper making, lumbering, mining, etc. All these men taken away from the fishery, helped to make it more valuable to the remainder and to increase the price.

Conditions are changing every day and we must be ever on the alert if we are to promote the interest of the Colony and of the fishermen.

I hope the explanation I have given Sir R. Bond in reference to this enormous quantity of 300 barrels of herring taken, or supposed to be taken, from Fortune Bay will satisfy him.

I endorse this agreement, for the reasons I have given this House to-night, because it will be a great benefit to the fishermen of the Colony, and if this firm operates here the benefit will be felt from one end of the Island to the other. I congratulate the Premier upon this agreement. It was one of the promises in his manifesto. No sooner did he take office than he proceeded to fulfill them. No Premier who ever occupied that position has done more for the fishermen of the country than the present occupant. I state from experience and without fear of contradiction that the policy of Governments in the past was to collect the revenue and spend it, but this Government consists principally of fishermen, men who are not ashamed of their calling. I congratulate the Premier, and when he goes to the country for its endorsation he will receive it, and he will be sent back with another lease of the power of the conducting the affairs of this Colony.

MR. DWYER—Mr. Chairman, I suppose that it is in order that the farmer should have something to say on the question of cold storage. I know the Premier has promised that we farmers would have cold storage for our products. Well, sir, I think that there should be a vote of thanks given to the Leader of the Opposition for the manner in which he has brought to bear upon this question of cold storage his very expert opinion, and I think that if the Government would take his advice there would be some chance of making wrong right. I have seen contracts made by the present Premier and the result afterwards was that the Colony had to pay the bill. That has been done many times, and if there are mistakes now more credit is due to the man who saw them and pointed them out. Now, sir, I think that when a man has a few words to say here on a bill he does not do so for the sake of argument. I do not want to throw cold water on cold storage, but when the whole thing is settled and it is found to be a mistake it will then be too late.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, I merely desire to ask the hon. member who has just sat down to name the contracts to which he referred which I made and the country had to pay.

MR. DWYER—Oh! the telegraph and railway contracts.

HON. THE PREMIER—It just shows what the hon. member knows about it. I never made a contract that the Colony had to pay for. I challenge the hon. member to

name any contract for which I was responsible for which the Colony had to pay one cent. I never saw the '98 contract until it was tabled. I pledge my word that I never saw it. I did not know its contents until it was brought down here and tabled. I was in the Opposition at the time, and had nothing to do with the '98 contract, or as a matter of fact the 1901 contract either. The next time the hon. member comes down here with such charges against one, he will please to prove them. I am not going to submit to such slander from him, or from better men than he. He can make no mistake about that. His charges are totally and absolutely false.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE— Although this is one of the most important measures that has been brought into this House this session, I did not intend to speak on it, because I knew that the fishermen of Bonavista district had sufficient good sense to see for themselves the benefit wrapped up in this measure, without my pointing it out to them. I feel sure that they would be just as well satisfied with my voting for it, without speaking to it. I do not intend to trouble the Committee with any lengthy remarks, but simply to give one or two reasons why I am strongly in favor of it, and to reply to a few points raised by hon. members on the other side. In the discussion which has taken place two subjects have been particularly dealt with. First, there is the general subject of cold storage, and then the erection of bait depots for the providing of bait for our fishermen. With regard to the latter, I am entirely in favor of the erection of these in convenient places all around the whole Island, because it is most important for the fishermen to have bait when the fish is running. But that is entirely different from the general principle in this Act. Now, it appears to me that not enough attention has been paid to the other industries that will be conducted with those cold storage plants. The contract is not altogether confined to cold storage plants for the purposes of freezing our fresh fish, for there will be, in addition to those, fish packing factories and herring packing factories. Besides these, according to the terms of this agreement, there will also be erected two glue factories, and two fertilizer plants; and all these plants have to be kept in continuous operation during the term of 15 years, as laid down in the contract, and if this is not done the contractors cannot claim one cent of subsidy under the agreement. Look at what this means! The company will erect five cold storage plants, five smoke houses, five fish packing factories, two glue factories, and two fertilizer plants. First of all, this means a very large increase in the market for our fish products. This point has been brought forward prominently during the debate, and members have spoken at length upon the great benefit that must accrue

to our fish business from the establishment of cold storage. This stands to reason, for every fish caught must be either cured or go into cold storage. In addition to what goes into cold storage, a large quantity of codfish will be put up in attractive packages and sent to the American markets. Then, again, a tremendous amount of fish will be made marketable that at the present time is not taken out of the water, because the fishermen can find no market for it. In this debate we have talked so much of the effect of cold storage on our codfishery that we have overlooked to a certain extent the effect it will have on our other fisheries. Next in point of importance to our codfish is our herring fishery, and we can see the benefit of cold storage in this business. The American comes with cash in his hand to purchase our herring, and we have seen the price increased from 50c. to $1.25, and this year to $3.00 a barrel, on account of the increased competition. Now, if we have in the Colony in addition to those now buying herring, up will go the price to the benefit of our fishermen. This will mean that they will be able to make a decent living at the fishery, and it follows that the more our fishermen get for their products the better it is for every other man on the Island.

Next to the herring in importance is the lobster fishery. It has been contended that the coming of this company to the Island will be a hardship to the men now engaged in lobster packing. Let us see how this contention works out. If the packer suffers any hardship at all it will be because he will be compelled to pay more for his lobsters than he does now. If he pays more than the company he will get the lobsters, but in any event it will not mean any hardship to the fishermen, for they will benefit by the increase in price. Next in importance is the salmon fishery, and every member of the Committee knows that with an effective cold storage system the value of this fishery will be tremendously increased. Next is our halibut fishery which will run to very large figures as soon as a market can be made for it. Then there are turbot, eels, flat fish, trout and other fish which are practically valueless at the present time, but which can be turned into value under cold storage.

Another point which the hon. gentlemen did not notice is that the contract is going to give a great deal of labor. In addition to the fisheries, it will make labor, for when you put up a factory somebody must run it, and hon. gentlemen will notice a section in the agreement which provides that the contractors must employ Newfoundland labor in connection with their different industries with which our men are not familiar. I look forward to a great increase in labor as a result of this agreement. It seems to me that there is not a word of sound argument to be ad-

vanced against the plea of putting up plants and factories and other labor giving industries as contemplated by this agreement. The next point to be considered is this: "Are we giving too much for what we are getting when we guarantee 5 per cent. profit on a capital of $500,000 and 1 1-2 per cent. interest on an amount not exceeding that sum when expended by the company in the erection and equipment of its buildings and machinery." If you figure it out you will find that when these five plants are in operation, if only filled once a year, there will be approximately $250,000 worth of fish in them, that is 50,000 quintals at $5 per quintal. You will be justified in putting both quantity and price higher than this. Out of this sum a large percentage will come back to the Colony in revenue for the money must be spent, and out of every dollar which a man spends thirty cents comes back to the Colony in revenue. Therefore out of this $250,000, the Colony will get back thirty per cent., or $75,000. Even if we have to pay all the subsidy we shall get back more than we pay out, but I am convinced that we shall not be called upon to pay the subsidy, certainly not after the first year. I would not advocate the measure if I thought we should have to do so. In the first year there may be a call for a portion of the amount, but I feel sure that once the contractors are on their feet and in proper shape for doing business we shall not be called upon to pay anything because these men are not coming here from Portland to invest a million dollars in this enterprise unless they see a chance of making more than 5 per cent. on the money they invest. If they do not make 15 or 20 per cent. upon their investment they will not consider that they are doing much of a business, and as I said before, I am inclined to the opinion that we shall not be called upon to make good the guarantee after the first year.

I would like now to say a word or two in reference to the four objections against the agreement raised by the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition. The first point raised by the right hon. gentleman was that this agreement did not contain certain provisions which were contained in the Act of 1904, and he contended that on this ground the agreement ought not to be accepted. As between the two contracts, I am entirely in favor of the one now before us, and I shall tell you why. The contract of 1904 was a promoter's contract, while this is a business man's contract. The former was with Wright, who was not in the cold storage business at all, but when he received the contract he had to look for the capital necessary to carry out the project. When he secured the capital he had to look for a market for his fish. In this contract we are dealing with men who have been in

the fish business for many years, and who are to-day doing a large fish business. They have built up a very large business, and have a market for any fish that may be stored by them. This is a great advantage, for the trouble is not to put fish in cold storage but to find a market for it after it is stored. These contractors have all the accessories for putting their products on the market and disposing of them. It will be seen, then, that the two agreements from this point of view will not stand comparison, for they deal with two different classes of men, with the advantages distinctly in favor of the present contractors. Another objectionable feature of the 1904 contract was that it contained so many hampering conditions to be performed by the contractor that it was practically unworkable, whereas the contract before us gives the contractor a fair chance to do business. It contains no impossible conditions, and is as business-like as we can possibly make it. The fact that the 1904 contract was unworkable is proved by the fact that, although it was ratified seven years ago, no factory has been erected. It has been seven years on the Statute Book. It has been tried and found wanting, and remains a dead letter to-day. If we come here in seven years time and find that this is in the same condition, then I will be prepared to take back all I have said in its favor. Even now we have advanced further than the contractors under the 1904 Act, as I am given to understand that, pending the ratification of the contract, Messrs. Trefethen and Lord have secured an option for the purchase of the whale factory at Lark Harbor. with the intention of making it one of their cold storage stations. If this be correct, Lark Harbor, in my opinion, will prove one of the most profitable stations, as I understand that there is abundance of cod, halibut, herring and salmon to be caught there. I look forward under this agreement to seeing stations erected at Burgeo, St. John's, and other parts of the island, and to see the floating plant provided for in the agreement collect the fish from the different places where there are no stationary plants. Another objection that was raised was that the agreement was worded in such a fashion that we might be called upon to pay more than the five per cent. That objection has already been dealt with. All I can say is that in my judgment the Colony is safeguarded under Section 5 of the agreement as it stands. However, there is no need for further discussion of this point, as a new section has been inserted in the Act which provides in so many words that the Colony shall not be called upon to pay more than $25.000 in any one year. The next objection raised by the Leader of the Opposition is that, if we accept this contract, it will nullify the operation of the Bait Act. His contention is that if the agree-

ment under discussion is confirmed Trefethen and Lord will be in a position to defy or evade the provisions of the Bait Act, and to export bait fishes in such a way as to nullify the beneficial operation of that Act. If I supposed that the Act had that operation I should not be a party to bringing it into the House, and it is because I am absolutely convinced that the present Act can in no way affect the Bait Act that I am ready to support it. The day after this agreement is confirmed and goes into operation what position will the contractors be in? They will be in precisely the same position as regards the Bait Act as they are to-day. They will merely be foreigners doing business in Newfoundland, and when they come here to do business they will be subject to all our laws to the same extent as British subjects.

Under the Bait Act the Governor in Council has control over the sale and export of bait fishes and there is nothing in the agreement that will enable the contractors to evade or defy the law. The Bait Act will operate against these contractors in precisely the same way as it operates against our own citizens. If hon. gentlemen opposite can secure any reputable lawyer who will give them an opinion that the agreement now being discussed enables the contractors to evade or defy the Bait Act or that by the contract the operation of the Bait Act is in any way nullified, I will cheerfully pay the cost of the opinion. Hon. gentlemen must notice that although the editors of the Opposition papers are both members of the legal profession, neither of them has committed himself to any statement or opinion that the proposed contract will nullify the operation of the Bait Act. Those who read the editorial in the Evening Herald last night must have noticed how carefully the editor avoided expressing any opinion upon the point. The editor, Mr. Summers, is a lawyer of experience and with his desire to make a point against the Government, if there was the slightest foundation for the idea that the contract nullified the Bait Act you would have seen it brought out clearly in last evening's editorial. Instead of this, Mr. Summers carefully avoids expressing an opinion. Side by side with the Leader of the Opposition sit two lawyers of experience--Messrs. Kent and Clift, neither of whom would commit himself to the position which has been so rashly taken by Sir Robt. Bond. Another objection raised against the agreement by Sir Robt. Bond is that we are giving free entry to certain articles that will be used in connection with the operations of the contractors. This is true and it is quite justifiable. They come here and we bind them to operate large and expensive plants for fifteen years. If any business man enters into an enterprise of this kind what is his first care? Does he not ask himself

how he is to obtain the articles which are necessary and incidental to the running of his plant and the carrying on of his business? If he finds that it is absolutely necessary for him to send abroad to get these articles does he not want to be sure that later on he may not be compelled to pay excessive duty on them? Does he not wish to be protected on that point and is it not fair that he should be? We remember the Reciprocity Agreement of 1874, when the Americans agreed to allow our fish and oil to be imported free into the United States. Nothing was said about the packages in the agreement. The Americans allowed our fish and oil to enter free of duty, but they imposed a most unrighteous duty on casks and tins containing fish products, and in this way unfairly hampered our exporters of fish products.

These men come here with a clear business proposition, and say that they will require ammonia and oils and other articles which are necessary and incidental to the conduct of their business, and which are not produced in the Colony put on the free list. Ammonia is necessary for refrigerating purposes; oils are essential for curing certain kinds of fish; tin is needed for cans, and, consequently, they ask that no duty be imposed on these goods during the term of their agreement. They also ask that gasolene and gasolene engines be admitted free. Gasolene engines are free now when used in connection with the fisheries, and it is obvious that men will be required to look after the gasolene engines, and that under the agreement these men must be Newfoundlanders. There has been a complaint against labels being allowed entry duty free, but they have to be specially prepared, and cannot be printed by any of the local printing establishments. We have, therefore, allowed them to come in duty free, as well as mineral and other oil to be used in connection with the company's machinery. Complaint has also been that the contractors are to get timber areas to supply wood for boxes and barrels. Under the terms of the agreement they are simply to obtain a timber area on exactly the same terms as any other person. The same applies to the water power agreed to be granted the company. Our water powers have been running idle since Sir Humphrey Gilbert set up the Queen's Standard away back in the specious times of good Queen Bess, and is it not better to put them to use? The company must have power to run their machinery and light their premises, and it is only fair to grant it to them, for before they can use it they must expend money and labor in harnessing the power and making it available. On the whole the objections to the conrract made by our friends opposite seem wholly untenable, and, as I said before, if it had not been that I have been challenged to give my opinion on

it, I should have been content to allow it to pass without troubling the Committee with any observations on my part. Any intelligent person has only to read the agreement to see the advantages to be derived by the Colony from its operation, and I only hope that the adverse discussion raised by our friends opposite, both inside and outside the House, may not have the effect of deterring the contractors from proceeding with a contract which seems so fraught with benefit to the Colony.

MR. KENT—I am sorry that I could not attend the previous sitting of the House, and hear the debates on this important matter. However, I have given the agreement now before the Committee my best attention, and one thing that has struck me during the course of the debate, so far as I have heard it this evening, was that the majority of the members on the Government side of the House did not appreciate what the agreement was and what the lessees are empowered to do or what business they propose or intend to introduce under the agreement. I think in the first place that the majority of those who have spoken from the Government side of the House based their support of the measure on the ground that the contractors would supply bait fishes to our fishermen for bait purposes in the prosecution of the fisheries. As far as I can see, there is not one word in the agreement which calls upon them to supply our people with bait. On the contrary, these people are coming here to do business and to make money, and once the agreement is signed they will not be actuated by any sympathy for our fishermen or any feeling of self-sacrifice in their interests. If they give our men bait they will want money for it and because it pays to do so, and they are not going on the Labrador to supply our fishermen with bait unless it pays them on business principles to send a steamer there, and are paid by the fishermen for the bait sold them a price which will give them a profit. These people are business men, and not philanthropists, as the Government would have us believe them to be. If the fishermen go to these plants looking for bait they will not get it unless they are satisfied to pay the price that the contractors ask for it. Our fishermen are not going to pay for bait which they can catch themselves. The occasions in which they will have to resort to purchased bait will be very rare indeed, and it is nonsense to tell sensible men like the fishermen of this country that this huge contract is undertaken because under it the contractors will supply them with bait whenever and wherever they may need them. They are not bound to supply bait, and they won't supply bait to our fishermen, because there are other, and financially to themselves more attractive, rights given to them by this contract. There has been no question raised, and

there has been no issue joined from this side of the House as to the advantages of cold storage—of supplying bait to our fishermen, and of developing our great fresh fish industry. None of these questions have been put in issue from this side of the House. It is this agreement which is in issue. The question of cold storage and the advantages to be derived from it has been debated over and over again, and all sides and all parties have agreed on the principle that if cold storage can be made properly and economically applicable to our fisheries, then it ought to be encouraged. If, when there is a shortage of bait, it is possible to economically and properly supply it through bait depots, or through floating bait supply steamers or crafts of any kind, then I think that as a general principle the matter has been accepted by both sides of the House. But that is not the question here, Mr. Chairman. The question here is the creation of a subsidized company receiving an annual interest of 1 1-2 per cent. on its capital up to a certain amount for 15 years, and a guarantee from the Government of the Colony that its profits will not be less than five per cent. in any one year. Now, as to the question of the guarantee, I might deal with that right here from my point of view. I state here unequivocally and without the slightest hesitation that the guarantee clause as it was originally inserted in this contract was a guarantee by this Colony to the lessees that their profits would amount to five per cent. In other words, that at the end of their year's business they would come out with a profit of five per cent, upon their money invested, and, sir, that that included the making up of any loss which the company might sustain is, I think, as plain as language can put it; and I think that the strongest evidence that is necessary to convince the House and the country that that was the interpretation that reasonable minds would put upon it is given by the fact that the Prime Minister has amended the agreement, and has, I understand, substituted a clause limiting the liability of the Colony under this head.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—Not substituted.

MR. KENT—What then?

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—Added a clause not limiting the liability of the Colony more than it was but stating it in a dlfferent way.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Pardon me, it is limiting.

MR. KENT—The original contract stated that the Colony would guarantee a profit of five per cent. Then, when the effect of that guarantee was pointed out to the Prime Minister, he immediately—and properly, I say—saw the effect of such a clause, and that it was necessary in some way to limit the liability of the Colony, and he added another resolution which was a limitation and a qualification of that clause of the contract.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—That is perfectly true. The hon. member was not here when the Premier spoke and explained the position. The Premier stated that he was perfectly convinced that the agreement, as it stood, was absolutely safe, and did not require any addition or amendment of any kind, but out of abundant caution, and as the matter had been suggested to him, he added this clause, not that he had any feeling of doubt about it.

MR. KENT—The only thing that I can say to the hon. member is this, that if the hon. Premier said that then his acts do not confirm his words. If he assured the House and the country that the agreement as it stood was absolutely safe, then there was absolutely no necessity for this additional clause, and if he had not the courage of his own opinions, he should not be where he is. The following clause is added as Resolution 4—"The amount payable by the Government under Clause 5 of the said agreement shall not in any year exceed five per cent. on the actual cash capital invested by the lessees in their said business, and shall in no way exceed the sum of $25,000 in any one year." That, I submit, is as clear and plain as it can be put, a qualification and limitation of Clause 5 of the agreement. Now, sir, I refer to this particularly as the the Hon. the Attorney General referred to is for the reason that he was challenged, and I express my opinion unhesitatingly that if that agreement had gone through in the form in which it was at first proposed that this colony might in the future have to face a position which would be very serious to it. The object of this agreement is to create a huge subsidized company, operating for fifteen years under an actual cash payment of 1 1-2 per cent. on its capital and a guarantee of five per cent. profit, not exceeding the limitation in this amendment. If this company is successful and carries on business in Newfoundland for fifteen years, with the assistance of this subsidy and guarantee it will practically exclude all competition by our own people in the conduct of the fresh fish, lobster and other businesses which they intend to operate. A company with a guarantee behind it, and with a subsidy of 1 1-2 per cent., is at a great advantage, and by means of that subsidy ane guarantee will be able to secure a position in the trade which under legitimate and ordinary competition they would never get. On a previous occasion before this Committee I commented upon the method of legislating by contract except in the matter of large public services and other kindred subjects. I think that to give advantages to people under contract of this kind in connection with our fisheries is bringing around a condition of affairs which will ultimately work for the benefit of the people them-

selves—a benefit which cannot be participated in by the general trade and business of the country. Now, Mr. Chairman, the subject of our bait supply and the Bait Act, and the effect which this agreement is likely to have upon the Bait Act, is one which deserves, I submit, the greatest consideration at the hands of this Committee. If there is any position possible under which the operations of the Bait Act is nullified or the hands of the Government are in any way weakened to enforce it, then I say that precautions ought to be taken now, and not when the difficulty arises and we are in the midst of trouble. Now is the time, for, if the Act embodying this contract passes, it will be too late then to consider the effect upon our Bait Act. There is an amendment before the committee which asks to further limit this contract by affirming that it shall be subject to the provisions of the Bait Act. I think, sir, that in considering this question of the relations between the men who are operating under this contract and the Bait Act, it should be borne in mind that the Bait Act is not in the position of an ordinary Act of this Legislature. The Bait Act is an Act which can be enforced or otherwise absolutely at the discretion of the Government of the Colony. The Government have full control over the enforcement or the non-enforcement of that Act, and it is here, Mr. Chairman, that the difficulties will arise in connection with the enforcement of that Act against the men who are operating under this contract. These men are at liberty to develop their business in whatever way they think best. Now, supposing, Mr. Chairman, that that they found it was practicable, as they probably will, to go largely into the export of herring, and supposing that after four or five years their business entirely depended upon their power to export herring, and that while their business was in that position the Government of the day were to come in and enforce the Bait Act against them and destroy their business, this, I submit, no government could honestly or properly do ; and you are asked to-night, in the amendment which the Leader of the Opposition has proposed, to give these people warning that they must so develop their business as not to put themselves in the position where they can afterwards complain if the Bait Act should be enforced againt them. The proposition is that it be declared in this Act—whether it is a declaration or an enactment does not matter—that the Bait Act shall be enforced against these people. If the hon. the introducer of the measure found it was necessary to take the precaution of limiting the guarantee clause, I think that under the circumstances he should also take the precaution of inserting a clause putting it beyond the slightest doubt in the minds of these people that the Bait Act is there and

may at any time be enforced against them in the same way as it may be enforced against any other person. I think, sir, that if these people were given to understand that the Bait Act would be enforced against them, they would so shape their business that at a future time the enforcement of that Act would not hamper them, but at the present time, without that clause being inserted, I submit that the Government of the Colony puts itself in the position of not being able, by reason of the equities and morality of the situation, to enforce the Bait Act against these people if it interferes in any way with their business. Of course, Mr. Chairman, it may be that it is not the intention or the policy of the Government to enforce the Bait Act. And I think in this connection that the position regarding Capt. Corkum in St. Jacques is very illuminating. That Capt. Corkum, from the facts and information before the Department of Customs, has committed a violation of the Bait Act I don't think that any person can have any doubt. There is a report—which, I think, the Leader of the Opposition has already referred to—by Inspector O'Reilly to the Assistant Collector, of January 28th, stating that "Captain Corkum, of Gloucester, is here purchasing herring at $3 a barrel." Now, Mr. Chairman, if Capt. Corkum had not got a license to purchase these herring for exportation then he was committing a violation of the Act; and with that information before the Customs Department, I think that in the interests of the people of this Colony an enquiry should have been made, first, as to whether Captain Corkum was buying herring or not, and, secondly, as to whether the application of Capt. Tibbo for a licence was not in reality a subterfuge on the part of Capt. Corkum to endeavor to get around the provisions of the Bait Act. I don't say it is, Mr. Chairman, but I say that the evidence before us at the present time would point to the conclusion that it is. When information of this kind comes before the Customs Department, I submit that it is the duty of that department to enquire fully into the matter, and ascertain whether the facts constitute a breach of the Bait Act or not. That the purchasing of herring by Capt. Corkum for export without a license is a violation of the Bait Act there there is no doubt.

Mr. Chairman, there are other portions of this agreement which are open to objection. The advantages granted them in connection with the making of packages practically means that all the coopering and other work of that kind will be taken out of the hands of the ordinary people who employ coopering as a trade, and that these people will go into the manufacture of these packages on a large scale entirely at their own factory. Again, I think that the admission free of duty of the various items

which are mentioned in Section 10 of the agreement is open to objection. We have industries here in this country, such as that which Mr. Clouston carries on here in St. John's, which, if that clause goes through, will be entirely destroyed, because they cannot compete with a company such as this, with its Government subsidy and its free grants and benefits and franchises of all kinds. The same would apply to the lobster fishery. They cannot possibly compete with a company such as this. I understand, however, that the Prime Minister has given an assurance to the House that these items which are now admitted free to this company are to be put upon the free list. If that is so, then a certain amount of the objection to this clause is removed. But the Prime Minister, the other day, in answer to an objection from this side of the House, pointed out the difference between agreeing with a company to put articles on the free list over a stated period and the putting them on the free list under the Revenue Act this year it may be removed next year, but under this agreement it means that as long as this company does business they get these articles free of duty, no matter what circumstances or conditions arise in this country. It is not limited to fifteen years, as is the guaranteeing clause, but as long as they are doing business they have the right to get these articles in free of duty. This, I think, is objectionable. They ought to be put in the same position as other people. If these articles are admitted free of duty to other people, and the way to do that, I think, is to provide that as long as these articles are on the free list, they can have free entry, but no longer.

Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to delay the Committee any longer, but I wish to repeat the fact that if those members sitting on the Government side of the House who think that this bill is one to encourage the distribution of bait amongst the fishermen of this country will read the Act carefully they will find in no part of it any provision or agreement on the part of these men to supply any bait to any fishermen, or to handle any bait for the benefit of the fishermen of this country. It is not an Act for the supplying of bait to our fishermen ; it is an Act, as I said before, establishing a large, subsidized company in the fish business of this country, which, in its ultimate working out, if it is ever successful at all, will mean that your fresh fish business at least will be in the hands of these people, and no person will be in a position to compete with them, because of the unfair advantages which they obtain under this contract.

HON. PRIME MINISTER— Merely a word or two in reply to the hon. member with whose criticism of the bill, from the standpoint of a member of the Opposition, I

can find no fault. I congratulate him on the way in which he has worked around the Bait Act. It is a masterpiece, and I hope that the hon. member will carefully correct his notes on that and let us have a copy of them. He takes very good care, Mr. Chairman, not to say that this in any way affects the Bait Act. I repeat, in any way, directly or indirectly. He has too high a regard for his reputation to make any such statement. He knows the law too well to give any such opinion or throw out any such hint. He did not say that it would be well to put something in this agreement to notify these people, but I don't think you will find any precedent in any legislation in the world for that, and I hear it now suggested for the first time; but I do not consider it to reflect on the hon. member, and merely identify it with the fact that he is making the best out of his criticism as a member of the Opposition. Of course, it is all very well to take high grounds here as to the principle which should guide us in our acts and the criticism of measures which come before this House; but we are all human, all very human, and it is only to be expected that we should occasionally allow ourselves to unconsciously give way to the desire to attack the Government. I know what it is to sit over on the other side of the House. I sat there for years, and I know the principles by which the Opposition are guided in their criticism of measures which come before the House. Now, as I said, Mr. Chairman, there are only one or two words that I wish to briefly refer to. First, as to the guarantee. I wish to emphasize it here again that the definition of that section which I have given is one for which thousands of precedents can be found, not alone in foreign legislatures, but in our own, and in relation to contracts similar in all respects to this. I am not shaken in my opinion of what that clause means, but, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, as it is stated that the clause is open to more than one interpretation, we ought to make it clear. I am not admitting that there is more than the one interpretation, but if we can safeguard the interests of the Colony by the insertion of any clause, why by all means let us do so. It is no reflection upon those who hold the contrary opinion that they should differ from us. Legal minds of the greatest ability will often differ on points of law. Take the Privy Council or the Appeal Courts in England. They are doing nothing all the time but turning down the judgments of the highest courts of the whole Empire. So we need not feel cast down if hon. members of the Opposition differ from us in their interpretation of the clause.

Now, as regards the Bait Act, there is no necessity for any such suggestion as has been made here this evening. If there was any

intention to nullify the Bait Act, there are only two ways in which that could be done—either by a positive enactment or by what we call a necessary implication. Neither of these appear in this case. You will get no lawyer to take any such view. We are ready and willing to give the Opposition a chance to criticise this bill, but hon. members on the other side will remember that not long ago they sat here and night after night listened to precisely similar criticism. It is one of the duties of every Government to be entertained by the Opposition. I have no objection to that.

As regards the hon. Leader of the Opposition's statement that these people are getting free grants for their boxes, that is not so. They are getting those grants subject entirely to the Crown Lands Act. They get free factory sites, but otherwise they are just like ordinary individuals, and have to pay all the rents, etc., under the Crown Lands Acts. As to what the policy of the Government is in relation to the Bait Act, no doubt hon. members would like to know what our policy is, and not alone as regards that, but reciprocity and everything else; but we are not going to put our cards on the table. When we negotiate an agreement we are not going to do it on the house tops. But we will take care to get something satisfactory all the same. The country is divided to-day on the question of reciprocity. Men who have formerly been prominent in its advocacy advocate it no longer. I say the country is divided on this question to-day; but I am not prepared, notwithstanding the invitation that has been thrown out from the other side, to make any pronouncement on the subject. But I can say that the interests of the country are being attended to and watched, not alone here, but elsewhere as well. When the proper time comes the position of the country in relation to reciprocity or any other international matter will be properly dealt with. Every one in the country knows how vital it is to us to preserve our bait. That is why the Bait Act was passed, and why it is kept on the Statute Book since 1887. As I said, if this agreement in any way affected that Act, if there was the slightest doubt as to its meaning, I would tear it up, and a dozen agreements, before I would be a party to lessening the value of the Act. The position of the people is precisely the position of everyone else. Everyone has to conform to the laws of the Colony, whether as to bait or anything else, unless the contract or the ratifying Act contains some clear expression to the contrary. It must be clear that they are exempt, or else the Bait Act remains in full force against them. My learned friend has pointed out that this company has some advantage over other companies. He says that this subsidy would be an assistance to these people to unfairly compete with our

own people. I say the Government will be glad to give the same subsidy to any other company, local or foreign, that will do the same thing. We are asked, "Why not embody it in the Act?" The hon. member knows perfectly well that if we were to assent to the unnecessary dotting of an "i" in the Act, we would have flaring headlines in the Opposition papers to-morrow, announcing that the country was saved by the Opposition. I have listened to every word of criticism spoken in this House, and I have read every word of criticism printed in the papers, because I was anxious to make it clear that my opinion was a carefully considered one. For these reasons I have no hesitation whatever in recommending the confirmation of this agreement to the Committee.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Mr. Chairman, just a word on the subject which we have been discussing. It appears to me that the closing remarks of the hon. the Prime Minister were not exactly happy. I do not think they do justice to himself or to the Committee. What I have special reference to now is this, he said, "We are not going to accede to the request of the Opposition because we shall have flaring headlines in the papers to-morrow stating that the Government were forced into that position by the Opposition."

THE PREMIER—I did not say that.

SIR. R. BOND—That was what I understood. That was the gist of what my hon. friend said. I do not think, sir, that that does justice to himself as leader of this House or of this Committee, because if that is the reason which actuates the Prime Minister in his course of action, I submit with all respect that it is not a worthy one. What matters it whether the papers declare that the credit of an amendment is due to the Opposition or to the Government, if the amendment is in the interests of the country? Again, the Premier said, further, that he did not propose this new section to the bill because he deemed it necessary, but because there was a difference of opinion in respect to it. Does he not appreciate as a lawyer that the same line of argument applies to the other amendments that I have proposed? Does it not apply to the bait supply section? He says the amendment in the guarantee section is unnecessary, but he will put it there. Surely the same argument must apply to the other amendment. It might not appear to the majority of the House that it is necessary to put it there, but should we not put it in to make sure no question should arise? It can do no harm, unless it is the intention of the Government that this company should have the privilege of buying and selling bait to whom they choose. The Prime Minister commented upon the guarded manner in which my hon. friend the member for St. John's East had dealt with the matter. Why, sir, every-

thing I said he bore out to the letter. I say if this agreement comes into force as it stands it amounts to a nullification of the Bait Act; and my hon. friend, the member for St. John's East, bears that position out. He says that the Bait Act is in some respects an extraordinary measure. It can be suspended at any moment by the Governor in Council. They can suspend it for the time without coming to this Legislature for permission. That is the difference between the Bait Act and ordinary acts on other matters. Now I contend that this agreement nullifies the operation of the Bait Act. How, you ask? You have to read the whole correspondence to find out. Let any impartial man take up this correspondence and read it. I say, sir, he will see that this company had in view the control of the bait supply of this Colony. If not, why is this clause in the 1910 bill, which gives the Governor in Conncil power to control the operations of the company, stricken out? In other words, the whole bill of 1910 has been cast aside, and we have now a new bill, brought in in order that that provision of the 1910 Act should not apply. There is no limitation in this agreement as to the countries to which fish is to be exported, the quantities handled, the prices to be paid, and the persons to whom it may be sold. There is no condition, no stipulation whatever. They can do what they please in the disposition and the acquirement of the bait fish. What, then, is the position of the company? From the general tone of the negotiations it looks as if they expected to be able to manipulate and handle the fisheries of the country as they choose. They do not oblige themselves to give bait to our fishermen, but they can give it to their own. That would be their line of argument. Now, supposing they do this, what is the position of the Government? By reason of the fact that they have placed no limitation as to the conduct of the fishery, the price, the volume of operations, or the parties to whom it may be sold, the natural inference for the lessees was, "There is going to be no restriction placed upon our operations, and if now, after we have sunk $200,000, you come in and limit our business by stating that the Bait Act is in force, that is a limitation of our business that we never contemplated, and we will force you into a court of law and get damages. We will stand upon our agreement." The hon. the Premier may be satisfied that this agreement safeguards the rights of the Colony, but would he get the courts to agree with him, for legal opinions differ. In view of the admission of the hon. the Premier just now, that law opinions do differ, surely, if we desire fully to protect the interests of this country as regards bait fishes, it is our duty as business men and politicians to put the clause in such

form as will prevent any .question arising in future as to what was meant by the agreement. At least it will do no harm, and it may do good. Should the mere fact that the papers to-morrow will give the credit to us debar the Government from taking such a precaution. I do not want credit from the papers. I think my hon. friend has known me well enough to know that, after all these years, I do not care whether we get credit or not. In fact, I am prepared to withdraw these amendments and let the Prime Minister frame his own amendments to the same effect. Then it will not be said we have driven the Government into it. I am glad to have another assurance from my hon. friend that all criticism is appreciated. But do not keep on repeating that and at the same time throwing insults across the floor in reply. Don't say that you invite criticism and the next instant fling across this House the most contemptible insults. It has been stated that I failed in my law examination. I never tried to pass a law examination; how then could I fail? I was offered a certificate by Sir Hugh Hoyles and Sir William Whiteway if I chose to go away for three years and come back again. Sir Hugh Hoyles came to my house and begged me to accept the offer; but I was advised not to do so by my physician. I think the profession of the law is one of the finest and most honorable in the world, and it was a keen blow to me to have to give it up. Why then is that insult thrown at me? There is not a grain of truth in it. Again, I was told that I had called my learned friend the Minister of Justice a knave. As a matter of fact I said, in a jocular sort of way, that we used to call my hon. friend, in the old days when I went to school with him, "sappy-head Morison." It was not used as a term of disrespect. The man with no "sap" in his head is no good, he is not clever. I never abused the late Captain Dawe in my life. What I did do was to defend myself against a vile statement made at that time. And when I am put to it I can defend myself. I can strike a blow when I am insulted, but I never insult a man. I merely refer to these to show how unmanly and unjust such tactics are, and because the Prime Minister has said we court the fullest criticism on the part of the Opposition. I have not insulted anybody. I am told that I insulted the Chairman, because I insisted on my rights. I simply stood upon my rights, and I told him he did not know his duties as Chairman. That is not an insult; it's the truth. He did not know his duties or he would have complied with the request I made. I might have insisted on the enforcement of the 130th rule of this House, and had the Speaker enter the chair and tell him he did not know his duty. I did not do that. I had mercy and tempered mercy with justice. He

will never get any abuse from me or anything unworthy of a man who has occupied the position he now fills, and has had the same responsibilities, and can sympathise with him in the ingratitude of the public for the man who attempts to discharge his duty.

HON. THE PREMIER—Just a word in reply to the hon. member. I wish him to believe what I have previously said, that we are only too anxious to have the fullest criticism in relation to every matter that comes before the House, and I hope that now that we have got over this little flurry we will all be better in future and not lay ourselves open to any charge. Of course it doesn't do to be too sensitive; we have to give and take, and make allowances for persons who have not, like the hon. member, acquired the art of thinking on their feet. It is perfectly amazing the amount of criticism this Bill has evoked. I don't know what has created such a dread and fear in the minds of the members of the Opposition. The hon. member has referred to a remark of mine in reference to statements from the Opposition. I was merely pointing out—giving the Opposition credit for all sincerity—that I knew the ropes too well and what they were up to, and that if I gave way to those merely doubting the agreement, it would be misconstrued to-morrow. I did not say that I was not prepared to consider any reasonable suggestion. I want to empasize the fact that there is no connection between the two matters that are now bringing forth this discussion. I am firmly convinced in my own mind as to the meaning of the original section in the agreement dealing with the subsidy—that it limits our liability to $25,000—and I am confident that if this were to go before the Court to-morrow that that would be the decision. But there may be room for doubt, and in order to nullify that doubt I have made the amendment. But the question of the Bait Act is entirely different, for there is no justification whatever for the position taken by the Leader of the Opposition, and if he were to pass his proposed amendment it would simply be passing legislation which is unnecessary and foolish, and which could not be justified, or for which there would not be the slightest necessity. The hon. member then went on to point out not that in this agreement nullified the Bait Act it could be suspended by the Governor in Council. Well, we must suppose that the Bait Act will go on; we know of no suspension. It is not contemplated by the present Government, nor was it ever intended or suggested. As regards anything appearing in the correspondence leading up to the agreement, that can in no way effect the settled terms of this agreement. It is only natural that people should ask for more than they expect, and if they ask for a monopoly they will promptly be told

that that is impossible. As I have already stated I am quite prepared to admit that if the question of liability were to go before a court to-morrow, whether of original jurisdiction or of appeal, there might be a difference of opinion on it, though personally I don't think so; but in the other matter there is not the slightest doubt. There could be none whatever. I shall undertake to say that if anyone in this Committee or outside of this House should choose to try, he could get an opinion from the Attorney General of England that this contract not even remotely in any way affects or modifies the Bait Act, and that is a pretty strong statement.

SIR ROBERT BOND — Mr. Chairman, the emphasis that have been expressed by the leader of the Government have been laid upon this point: that these resolutions do not nullify, repeal or modify in any way the Bait Act. That is perfectly true. But it is not the point. The point is this, as to whether under this agreement the privileges prohibited by the Bait Act are not granted to this company. Is this not tantamount to a license to these people to procure bait fishes and dispose of them as they please. Again, he says that this is stupid and ridiculous. Now, let his mind go back a moment. Was it so ridiculous that it could not find a place in the Act of 1904? What was it put there for and endorsed by this House without a single division? Because the Legislature of that day determined that the contractors or lessees should not procure bait to sell to foreigners. Now, if it was necessary to make that provision in 1904, is it not necessary to put it in here? What is there in this agreement to say "thou shalt not procure bait and sell to foreigners." The question of the repeal of the Bait Act is not the point. The Legislature of this Colony considered it desirable to put in this provision, and if it was necessary in 1904, if the united House had favored it, why is it not necessary to-day? How can it be absurd and ridiculous if it was not absurd, but essential, in 1904. There can be only one conclusion (I hate to doubt the statement of any member of this House)—there must be some reason for not putting it in. The only reason that can suggest itself is that the lessees may take fright if it is put in, if we dare to put in a provision that "thou shalt not sell bait to foreigners."

HON. PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, the only answer that can be given to the hon. member is that which I have already given, and that is that there is no necessity for this provision. It is perfectly true that in 1904 there was a clause that the bait cold stored by that company should be sold only to Newfoundland fishermen, and the reason was this, that practically seven-eighths of the work of the company was in connection with bait. I think there were to be 18 cold storage plants for bait. It

was merely a bait contract. There were other provisions for the cold storing and exportation of fish, but I think I am quoting correctly when I say that in that Act there was a provision for 18 cold storage plants for bait pure and simple. Large concessions were given to that company. We gave them free sites all over the country, and it was really a bait agreement. Incidentally they were going to export fish ; but the cold storage of bait was the main point of the agreement, and naturally the Government was not going to subsidize a company to carry on a large bait supply business and not put in such a necessary provision that selling that bait should be confined to the fishermen of Newfoundland.

SIR R. BOND—Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the Act of 1904, to which the Premier has alluded, was not an Act specially designed for bait. I introduced the Act, and I took special care to emphasize what it must mean to the country, and that, instead of these people confining their operations to dealing out bait around this coast, we were looking forward to their relieving the salt fish market of Europe of an overplus of 150,000 quintals per annum. But the explanation of the leader of the Government is not a satisfactory one. My learned friend said that there was nothing in the Act of 1904 to prevent the export of bait fishes.

HON. THE PREMIER—That is without a license. I might point out to the Right hon. gentleman that that meant for food purposes. They could not do that without a license.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—It is perfectly true that the intention was to permit the exportation of fish, but it was for food purposes, and this was clearly and distinctly defined in the bill. There was no limitation. The herring and other bait fishes which these people intended to store under that agreement could be exported for food purposes.

HON. THE PREMIER—I do not think there is any such section.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—I think I am correct. I am speaking from memory.

HON. THE PREMIER—The hon. member's reference is to the Bait Act, not to the contract of 1904.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—However, it is no matter of consequence. Let us take it that it is not so. I will drop the point. Then, sir, it was pointed out that the reason for not having any restriction is that the Act of 1904 was to provide bait depots round the country, and that was why we put in that clause. The reason was, sir, to protect the people of the country. While it is true that the Act of 1904 provided for bait depots, yet these people were going to carry on similar business to that of the lessees here, and under this agreement any number of bait depots may be erected. However, I have said all

I have to say about this agreement. I trust that my anticipations will not be realized. I trust that there will be no litigation over the matter, but I fear there will be. I think that if I were in the place of the lessees with that contract, and I wanted to enter into the export of bait fishes to the Americans, I would make the attempt, and if I were proceeded against under the Bait Act, I could hold up that agreement as tantamount to a license, not under the Bait Act, but a guarantee contract by the Government that I could deal in bait fishes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and passed the Resolutions with some amendment, and recommended the introduction of a bill to give effect thereto.

On motion for the adoption of this report, Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond proposed an amendment, seconded by Mr. Kent, that the Report of the Committee be amended by the addition of the following to section 3 of the Bill :

"Provided always, and it is "hereby enacted that the admission "of any or all such articles into "this Colony free of duty, under "the agreement hereby confirmed "or under the Act, shall only ap- "ply when and so long as the "article or articles so admitted free "of duty shall be included amongst "the articles admitted generally "into this Colony under the Rev- "enue Acts for the time being in "operation without the payment of "any duty thereon."

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared for the amendment : Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond, Messrs. Kent, Clift, Shea, Gear, Clapp, Dwyer, Earle (8); against it : Hons. Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Crosbie, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Bennett, Devereux, Goodison, Grant, Howley, Moore, Murphy, Parsons, Seymour, and Whiteway (18).

So it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the RT. HON. SIR ROBERT BOND moved in further amendment, seconded by Mr. Kent, that the report of the Committee be amended by adding to the Bill an additional section to stand as section 5 :

"5. The agreement hereby con- "firmed is subject to the following "conditions and limitations, viz. :

"1. The lessees shall not during "the continuance of the said con- "tract sell herring, caplin, squid "or other bait fishes to any fisher- "men except those bona fide resi- "dent and domiciled in this "Colony.

"2. The Provisions of Cap. 129 "of Consolidated Statutes, 1883, "(Second Series) entitled : Of the "Exportation, Sale, etc., of Bait "Fishes."

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the amendment: Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond, Messrs. Kent, Clift, Shea. Clapp, Gear, Dwyer, Earle (8); and against it: Hon. Prime Minister, Hon. Minister of Justice, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Hon. Minister Finance and Customs, Hon. Minister Agriculture and Mines, Hon. Mr. Emerson, Hon. Mr. Crosbie, Minister Public Works, Minister Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Bennett, Devereux, Goodison, Grant, Howley, Moore, Murphy, Parsons. Seymour and Whiteway (19).

So it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion, for the adoption of the report of the Committee of the Whole, was put, and there appeared in favor of it: Hon. Prime Minister, Hon. Minister of Justice, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Hon. Minister Finance and Customs, Hon. Minister Agriculture and Mines, Hon. Mr. Emerson, Hon. Mr. Crosbie, Minister of Public Works, Minister Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Bennett, Goodison, Devereux, Grant, Howley, Moore, Murphy, Parsons, Seymour and Whiteway (19); and against it: Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond, Messrs. Kent, Clift, Shea, Gear, Clapp, Dwyer, Earle (8).

So it passed in the affirmative and it was ordered that leave be granted for the introduction of the said Bill.

Whereupon the Bill entitled, "An Act to Encourage the Establishment of Cold Storage Plants in this Colony," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

And it being now midnight, the remaining orders of the day were deferred.

MINISTER OF FINANCE gave notice of motion.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND gave notice of question.

MR. CLIFT gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Thursday, February 23rd, 1911, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, Feb. 23.

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

MR. GOODISON—Mr. Speaker I beg to present a petition from some hundred residents of the south side of Carbonear, asking for a grant of a sum of money to construct a road and bridge to enable them to reach some peat bogs in the neighborhood, These people are endeavoring to utilize this peat for fuel and agricultural purposes, and if they are enabled to build this road it will be of material assistance to them. In asking that it be referred to the Department of Public Works I trust that due consideration will be given to the prayer of the petition.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Bay Roberts asking for a sum of money for the purpose of building a public wharf. A wharf there was in course of erection a few years ago when it was carried away by a storm. I hope the petition will receive the consideration it deserves.

MR. SEYMOUR—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting that petition.

MR. CLIFT—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Little Bay Islands, in the electoral district of Twillingate, on the subject of a breakwater at Deadman's Bay. Already several petitions have been made on this subject, so that it is unnecessary for me to make any remarks beyond simply asking that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Questions.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the Hon. Piemier if it is correct, as stated by the Newfoundland correspondent of the Standard of Empire, in the issue of that paper of date the 3rd of February, that "a very big pulp and timber deal has been concluded with British capitalists, embracing nine thousand seven hundred square miles of timber country in Hamilton Inlet, Labrador," and that "the lessees have paid the Government a rental of $38,400 for the same, and have now sold it to an English syndicate at a big profit."

HON. THE PREMIER—In relation to the first portion of the question I may say that I have no information as to whether a very big pulp and timber deal has been concluded with British capitalists, embracing 9,700 square miles of timber country in Hamilton Inlet, Labrador. As to the other part of the question, whether the lessees have paid the Government a rental of $38,400 for the same, no amount corresponding to such a rental has been paid. The only transaction resembling the subject matter of the question was an application for a license to cut timber at Hamilton Inlet, Labrador, containing an area of 9,700 square miles, which was approved on the 5th January, 1910, to Messrs. W. C. Job, R. F. Goodridge, Jordan Milley and M. A. Duffey. The fees in respect to this would amount to $38,800. No fees, however, were paid on account of this property, and the applicants' rights under the approval lapsed on the 5th February instant. With regard to the last part of the question, as to whether lessees of property at Hamilton Inlet, Labrador, have sold out to British capitalists, I am unable to say if this is the case or not.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the table of this House a statement showing :

1. The number of timber or pulp

licenses issued since the 1st of January, 1910;

2. The area in acres of each license;

3. The names of the persons who licensed the licenses;

4. Where the lands embraced in the said licenses are situated;

5. When such licenses were applied for;

6. The date of approval of the same;

7. The amount paid by the lessee;

8. The date of payment;

9. What amounts are now owing by lessees;

10. What licenses have been forfeited since date aforesaid;

11. The date of notice of forfeitures;

12. Whether lands forfeited have been since approved for same or other persons.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—In answer to the hon. member's questions I beg to say the answers are in course of preparation and will be ready for tabling this evening.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the hon. the Premier if the statements made by the Newfoundland correspondent of the Standard of Empire, and which appeared in that paper under date the 3rd of February are correct, viz: That $40,000 damages have been claimed by the United States "on account of light dues, and fines and penalties imposed upon them for breaches of our law;" that "the Hague Tribunal reduced the claim by one-half" and that the Government has "decided to settle the remaining claim of $20,000 by direct negotiations with the United States Government."

Also to lay upon the table of the House a copy of all Minutes of Council made by the late Government in respect to such a claim; of all correspondence between the late Premier and Sir William MacGregor on the subject, and of all Minutes of Conncil and correspondence that have emanated from the present Government in relation to the matter.

Also if the claim is still being pressed by the United States, and, if so, whether it is the intention of the Government to admit a liability or leave the United States to prove the justice of their claim through the Supreme Court.

HON. THE PREMIER—The schedule to the pecuniary claims convention transmitted to the Newfoundland Government in 1908 by the United States Government amounted to $37,533.16. The proceedings at the Hague did not specifically deal with these claims, except in so far as the finding on the questions submitted to them will affect the decision of the Court to which these pecuniary claims are to be submitted. The Government has not decided to settle any claims by direct negotiations or otherwise. The Government had no knowledge of the source whence the statement referred to emanated.

The subject of the pecuniary claims and the schedules of the claims are at present under discussion by the United States Government and His Majesty's Government, as well as the Government of Newfoundland, and it would not be in the interests of the Colony to at present make public any Minutes of Council or correspondence in relation to the same. I hope, however, that during the course of the session, the matter will have reached a point when I shall be in a position to table the whole of the correspondence and Minutes of Council asked for.

The claim is not being pressed by the United States Government, as it has been provided that the matter shall be decided by a competent tribunal. It is not the intention of the Government to admit any liability, but to leave it to the United States Government Tribunal, which may be ultimately adopted by the parties.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary if within the past three months he has signed any licenses under the Bait Act permitting the export, purchase or sale of herrings in the district of Fortune Bay; and if such were signed by him to lay upon the table of this House a copy of the authority of the Governor-in-Council for the issue of such licenses.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the hon. member's question I beg to say that no such licenses have been signed by me.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of the money expended on the breakwater at Port-de-Grave, and also whether or not the work on said breakwater has been completed.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to say that the Government Engineer has not yet handed over his returns to our department.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary to state who is the Quarantine Officer at Port aux Basque and what is paid to him for his services.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the hon. member I would say that Dr. Grant is the Quarantine Officer at Port aux Basques at a salary of $200.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who is the Observer at the Meteorological Signal Station at Port aux Basques and what salary does he receive.

MR. CLIFT—The Minister has kindly furnished me with the information required.

MR. KENT—To ask the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement from March 1, 1910, to date, showing in detail amount expended upon the public wharf at Kelligrews; also upon the wharf known as Ryan's wharf at Holyrood; also public wharf at Chapel's

Cove, all in the district of Harbor Main, including amount paid for supplies, commission, superintendence or otherwise, with vouchers.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to say that these statements are being prepared.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS by command of His Excellency the Governor, laid upon the table of the House certain Estimates of Expenditure of the Colony for the fiscal year 1911-12.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES laid upon the table of the House :

Report of Department of Agriculture and Mines for the year 1909-10.

Return of Licenses to cut timber for the year 1909-10.

Return of mining licenses for the year 1909-10.

Return of 99-year mining leases for the year 1909-10.

Return of fee-simple mining grants for the year 1909-10.

Return of leases of water powers for the year 1909-10.

Return of saw mills operated with licenses for the year 1909-10.

Return of saw mills operated without licenses for the year 1909-10.

Return of saw mills operated with and without licenses for the year 1909-10.

Report of W. Noel, first surveyor, for the year 1909-10.

Report of H. Duder, second surveyor, for the year 1909-10.

Report of E. Howe, chief woods ranger, for the year 1909-10.

Report of D. Thistle, timber inspector, for the year 1909-10.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE and CUSTOMS, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER left the Chair.

MR. PARSONS took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to submit to this Committee to-day the Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year 1912. They make a grand total of $3,272,545.20, as compared with $3,055,055.22 for the fiscal year of 1910-11.

I might say, in the first place, that while there is an apparent increase of some $217,000, as compared with the current year, the actual increase in the vote is really only about $170,000, because under the heading of Interest on Public Debt, where there is an increase of $109,000 (the total amount under this heading being $1,042,180.00), there is included the interest payable on the whole Railway Loan of $4,000,000 raised by the Prime Minister in London last summer. But, as the Committee is already aware, the unexpended portion of this loan is now lying at interest in the banks in this city, and bringing us in the same rate of interest as

we are paying, besides what we gain by compounding interest quarterly, so that there really will be about $50,000, I estimate, returned to the Colony during the next fiscal year on this account, and for this sum it should get credit in your minds, against this total amount, when considering the grand aggregate.

Under the head of Civil Government, Page 5, the increase shown is $37,980. The chief items making up this increase are a vote for $20,000 for taking the census and a vote of $12,000 towards the Old Age Pension Scheme, which the Government proposes to inaugurate. The remainder of the increase is accounted for as follows: In the vote for the Department of the Prime Minister, on Page 6, is an amount of $300 for a messenger; in that of the Department of Justice, the typist's, Miss Kelly, salary is increased by $60; in the Department of Finance, it is proposed to allow the first clerk, Mr. Bursell, $100, as he has been given the work of issuing cash notes, authorized at the last session, for the payment of various public services; under the Department of Agriculture and Mines, Page 7, is provision for a typist to the Museum, $300, a Miss O'Mara, and for Examiner of Mill Accounts, Mr. Thistle, $450.

The Director of the Geological Survey has represented to the Government that, owing to the great increase in the applications from abroad for data, it is impossible for him to supply all the information and dispose of the correspondence involved without clerical assistance, so a typist was provided. The Examiner of Mill Accounts will be an official charged with the duty of visiting every mill in the Colony, and satisfying himself as to the details of their output, that is to say their cut of logs, and what marketable products, such as laths, boards, shingles, etc., they have been converted into.

Under the Department of Marine and Fisheries, it will be seen that the Quarantine Officer's salary is increased from $150 to $400, and an assistant typist, Miss Calpin, is provided at $300. The reason for the increase in the Quarantine Officer's salary is that formerly, he being a medical doctor, he was allowed to hold other public appointments, but it has been felt better, in the interest of the public, to restrict him to this work alone, and to make him an additional allowance. The increase of clerical work in the Department accounts for the extra typist, and the same under that of Public Works Department, the appointee in that case being Miss Fitzpatrick.

On Page 8 will be found the new vote of $20,000 for the Census, and $12,000 for Old Age Pensions. On the same page will be found an increase of the Museum vote from $200 to $1,000, rendered necessary by the transfer for the Museum material to the new building, and

the equipment and fittings for the place, also an increase for maps and advertising abroad of $300. The Department of Marine and Fisheries asks for another $100 for telegrams and telephones. On Page 9 it will be seen, under the heading of Fuel and Light, that $2,000 is required for Post Offices and Telegraph Offices, due to the increased number of these public accessories provided lately. The Harbor Grace departmental building requires $300 and that at Carbonear $200, for the same purposes. The insurance on public buildings is increased $100. A janitor for the Harbor Grace building is provided at $50, and one at Carbonear at $120, and the sum for keeper and fireman for the Customs Building, St. John's, is increased $50, which the Council of Higher Education contributed while in that building. The explanation of the difference as between Harbor Grace and Carbonear is that in Harbor Grace the janitor gets a part of his salary from the Department of Postal Telegraphs. The upkeep of the Departmental Building, St. John's, is decreased $120.

Under Head 3, Pensions, a vote will be asked for six persons—Mr. Shortis, Postal Clerk; Mr. Murray, late Magistrate, Harbor Main; Mr. Tuff, late Magistrate, Perlican; Mr. Wheeler, late Postmaster at Musgrave Harbor; Mr. Christian, late Collector at Trinity; and Mr. McEchren, late Collector at Curling, the total amount for the six being $2,186.66.

Under the heading of Administration of Justice it will be found that no votes are changed until that for Magistrate for Harbor Main is reached, where an increase of $250 is given Mr. O'Toole, making his salary $550.

The Constabulary vote, on page 15, shows an increase of $54.69 under annuities; and $100 under the Fire Department, on page 16. On page 17 it will be seen that the Turnkey at Harbor Grace is increased $46. Dr. Keegan, as Physician to the Penitentiary, is allowed $100, and a local constable is voted at Harbor Grace $50. He has been there five years but paid till now out of contingencies. The Education vote, on page 21, is increased $300 to supplement the interest on the deposit making up the Teachers' Pension Fund.

The Department of Public Charities, beginning on page 25, shows an increase of somewhat under $6,000. The principal items are an extra $1,500 to the Labrador hospitals and a similar amount for extra doctors and medicine on Labrador, and $1,500 extra for the needs of the Lunatic Asylum. The relieving officer at Carbonear is increased $50, page 25, and the one at Trinity increased $20, page 26. Page 28 shows the increase to the Grenfell hospitals and page 29 the distribution and addition to the Lunatic Asylum votes. There is a slight increase in the salary list of the Asylum, due to re-organization. The vote for rations is

increased $1,000, that for clothes $250, and that for incidentals the same amount. Under the General Hospital, Dr. Fraser is voted $600 instead of $300, an addition which the Government considers his length of practice and varied experience, coupled with the greater work to be done in the institution owing to its enlargement, justly entitles him. The vote for the nursing staff, page 30, is differently distributed this year, as the printed statement shows. On page 32 will be found an increased estimate of $1,700 for Labrador, due to the providing of the physician and nurse on the second steamer to ply on that coast. This increase is made on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Public Charities. On the same page is a vote of $100 for the physician of the Lazaretto, and the resident nursing staff at the Fever Hospital has been increased so as to be put on the same basis of that at the General Hospital.

The vote for Lighthouses is increased by $7.000, and it will be seen by the details on the succeeding six pages that it is made up wholly of appropriations for new lighthouses and maintenance.— Under head of salaries there is one increase at Fort Point, Trinity, due to the providing of an assistant keeper for the new fog alarm. Under the heading of maintenance there are several increases, but hon. members will find on the printed slip with which they are furnished details of the expenditures under reference.

On page 40 appears the vote for Agriculture and Mines. The expenditure under this Department it is proposed to increase during the next fiscal year by $25,000. Of this amount $20,000 is to be devoted to widening the scope of the movement for encouraging agriculture, in according with the provision of the Act passed last year for that purpose. The amount provided in that measure was $20,000 per year ; it is now intended to double this amount and a bill will be introduced to amend the Act accordingly. As the Head of that Department, Hon. Mr. Blandford, will doubtless avail of that occasion to fully explain to this Committee the reasons which justified the Government in embarking on this expenditure, I shall not anticipate him in this, but content myself with merely saying that I think the people of the country, of all classes and conditions, are sufficiently well satisfied with the success of this movement so far, to approve of the increased outlay and to feel confident that it will yield the country a return a hundred fold.

Another expenditure under this head is that for the fire patrol committee. Last year, after this House closed, a convention was held, at the instance of the Government, to devise a method of coping with forest fires, which had been destroying potential wealth of incal-

culable value. All the holders of forest areas were represented, and a plan was worked out by which everyone interested was to contribute financially towards an experimental scheme for last year. The experiment proved completely successful, and the Government's contribution of $4,000 it is proposed to continue this year. The other increased expenditures under this head are $300 for mineral and other assays, the present vote of $300 being inadequate, owing to the greater interest in mineral prospecting; and $400 for expenses under Forest Fires Act. This applies chieby to fires off the railway line and is not altogether within the scope of the patrol committee's work. Another increase is $300 for timber inspection, to pay travelling expenses, etc.

The only increase in the vote for the Department of Marine and Fisheries is $950 for travelling expenses, making $1,650 in all, which amount is subdivided as follows: Departmental. $600; Boiler Inspector McLachlan, $400; Assistant Inspector McFarlane $300; Pickled Fish Inspector, $350.

Under the heading of Roads and Bridges the only increase is $170, made up thus: Ferry at South West Arm, Pool's Island, $120, an increase of $20 in the ferry at Britannia Cove, a similar increase in the ferry at Highland River Brook, St. Georges district, and $10 for the ferry across Crabbe's Brook in the same district.

Under the heading of Postal and Telegraphs Department, page 48, it will be seen that there is an increase of $18,000. The most important items are $2,400 for railway mail clerks for the proposed daily express train and the Bonavista branch trains, about $1,800 for outport postmasters, new and increases, and $4,000 for couriers, whose work, as the Committee is aware, is done by tender and contract. There is an extra $1,000 for the manufacture of postage stamps, and $7,000 for steam subsidies. The foregoing amounts are in the Post Office Department, while in the telegraph department there is an increase of nearly $8,000 for general maintenence, due to the opening of new offices and the increased outlay for salaries and equipment. and $1,000 for Marconi royalties on the new wireless stations which it is proposed to set up this year. Hon. members will be able to see for themselves, by reference to the printed estimates and the schedule of changes which lie on their desks, the nature of the various alterations in this department. Most of the amounts are very small, and represent new offices in different parts of the island, so I shall only refer to the principal ones.

In the General Post Office, an assistant clerk, Mr. Coady, is increased $100; a tpyist, Mr. Kennedy, is provided for at $240; and the Postmaster General is supplied with a clerk at $400. The railway

mail service, or travelling Post Office, is augmented by a clerk at $780, and an assistant at $480 for the Bonavista Bay branch, and three extra mail clerks at $400 for the daily cross country trains. Among the outport postmasters the one at Bell Island is increased $100, making his total $300; and one at Bell Island Mines $250, making his total $300 also. The item "Bishops' Falls" is a new office at $360, necessitated by the growth of the Albert Reed Company's works. Carbonear is to get a letter carrier at $200, and at Millertown, owing to the additional work arising out of the Harmsworth operations, the salary is increased from $30 to $80, while the postmaster at Placentia gets a similar increase, that place being a forwarding and receiving station for mail by the Portia, Glencoe and Argyle. Under the head of Couriers will be found a number of new services, the most important being one between Bear Cove and Western Cove at $100; one between Blanc Sablon and St. Modeste at $120; one between Bonavista and Cape Shore at $96; one between Newtown and Wesleyville at $95; one between Carbonear aud Freshwater at $100; one between Middle Arm and Summerside at $100; an increase in the one between St. John's and La Manche of $250, this being the lowest tender; one between St. Joseph's and St. Mary's at $150; and one between Sally's Cove and Rock Harbor at $105.

Provision is made for an important new service between Three Arms, Little Bay, and the Railway, at $714; another between Tilt Cove and Davies Camp, at $476; one between Trayton and Railway at $390; and one between Wesleyville and Fair Island at $400. There is also an increase of $490 for Mr. Coughlan, who does the transfer of the mails in the city, and whose work is increased so much that this sum no more than pays him. There is also an increase of $1,060 in the vote for the manufacture of postage stamps, due to their extra cost. Under heading of Steam Subsidies is an increase of $1,000 for the Bell Island service, this being the figure provided in the contract. For the Fogo district service there is a similar increase, due to the steamer making more trips. The Fortune Bay service is increased by $3,500. The increased vote for Labrador of $3,000 is for the second steamer. The Straits of Belle Isle vote is increased $300 for the Home making an extra trip.

On page 73 there is, as already stated, an extra $1,000 for Marconi royalties for the proposed new stations, and $4,000 for telegraph contingencies, due to the extension of the system. In the telegraph staff in this city the chief clerk, Mr. Garland, is increased $100, and an assistant is provided at $200, and the appropriation for messengers is increased $240. The changes in the operating staff outside St. John's are very few, and are chiefly

due to new offices. There is only one item in repairs, $180 for Hermitage Cove.

In the Customs Department only one change is proposed, involving a sum of $20 more for the coxswain of the day boat. This amount has been paid to that official for years past out of contingencies, and we are simply putting it in the estimates.

Under the head of Surveys for Branch Railways, page 88, there is an increase of $1,000, necessitated by the surveys for branch railways.

The foregoing review covers the whole of the change proposed in the Estimates, and I trust I have made my explanation sufficiently clear to the Committee. If, however, there are any points on which hon. members desire further explanation I shall be glad to furnish them with it. I do not propose to ask the House to proceed further with the consideration of this matter to-day, as I appreciate that the hon. members on the opposite side will no doubt desire a further opportunity to familiarize themselves with the details of the papers which have been laid in their desks, so I move that the Committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again on Monday next.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Might I suggest to the hon. minister that it would greatly facilitate us in the consideration of the matter if he would have the explanation he has just made to us printed forthwith, so that we may have the advantage of having it by us for reference when studying the proposed changes.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I shall have much pleasure in doing so, and hope to be able to arrange for its publication to-morrow.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

The Chairman of the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Committee have leave to sit again on Monday next.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the HON. MINISTER OF AGRICTLTURE AND MINES, the bill entitled, "An Act to Amend the Forest Fires Act," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the HON. PRIME MINISTER the Bill entitled "An Act to Encourage the Establishment of Cold Storage plants in this Colony," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

MR. GEAR gave notice of question.

MR. CLAPP gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn

until to-morrow, Friday, February 24th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, Feb. 24th.

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

MR. EARLE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Joe Batt's Arm on the subject of a road. The petitioners ask for a sum of $80 to make a road round the upper part of the harbor. I ask that this petition be received and referred to the Department of Public Works. I also ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Fogo on the subject of a well. Petitions on this subject have come from time to time from Fogo. Anyone who has visited this place knows the inconvenience suffered from the want of water. The petitioners in this case want a well dug at the upper part of the harbor. I hope that this petition will receive the earnest consideration of the Government, and I ask that it be received and referred to the Department to which it relates. I also beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Seldom Come Bye on the subject of dogs. Petitioners say that every owner of sheep and goats at that place is suffering from the ravages of this animal, and they find it impossible to do anything in that line. They ask that the Government will put into force the Dog Act in parts of the Island. I ask that this petition be received and referred to the proper Department.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from William Turner and others of Salvage Bay, Happy Adventure, and Sandy Bay, asking that it may be arranged that the coastal steamer Dundee call at one or more of these ports during the season. They also ask that these places be connected with Salvage Bay, where there is a telegraph station, by telephone. Both the steamers Prospero and Dundee call at Salvage. These are agricultural and fishing settlements, and they do a good deal of business. They have a good amount of freight, which they are obliged to send seven or eight miles to connect with the steamer, and vice versa, when freight is shipped to them and left from the steamer. They suffer great inconvenience for want of telegraph connection, and it handicaps their business in competing with other places favored with these public utilities. I would ask that this petition be received and referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary. I have also a petition from Arthur Moss and others of the same place, asking that a grant be made to complete the road from Salvage Bay to Alexander Bay. For the past twenty years this road has been unfinished, and for four or five miles it is prac-

tically impassable. There is an important bridge on the road that is in a bad condition, and it will require a considerable sum of money to repair, or rather to complete the road. I ask that this petition be received and referred to the Departl ment of Public Works.

HON. MIN. AGRICULTURE AND MINES—As my learned colleague has so clearly explained these matters, there is no need for me to say anything more than to give them my hearty support.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Spaniard's Bay on the subject of a road. Petitioners are greatly inconvenienced by the want of this road connecting the main line and the public wharf. I might say, in connection with the wharf, that it is used by the steamer from Bell Island which calls there, and there is great necessity of having the road good at all times. I would ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

HON. MR. EMERSON—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Harbor Breton, praying that a bridge may be constructed across the harbor at that place. The petition is signed by nearly all the inhabitants of both sides of the town, which is sufficient in itself to show that it demands the greatest consideration at the hands of the House. Harbor Breton has of late years made rapid strides in the direction of progress and development; its population has materially increased, and its business has been enlarged to a very great extent. The north side of the harbor has undergone a great change, owing to the increased activities of its business men. The bridge now asked for is for the purpose of connecting the north side with the south side, for the time has now arrived when an uninterrupted communication between these two places is absolutely necessary. It is not, however, from the standpoint alone of its business people that this public work is required, but its construction will be the means of encouraging educational advancement to the children. It will mean the erection of two high schools to replace the four schools of a lower grade which exist at present, besides giving the inhabitants of the north side advantages for religious worship during the autumn and winter months. It has been repeatedly pointed out to me that on several occasions, owing to weather conditions, the people of the north side of the harbor have been deprived of the services of a doctor, which is certainly a very serious state of affairs. In addition to the reasons I have mentioned, I might add that a bridge spanning this narrow harbor will be of immense value to the people living between St. John's Bay and Pass Island, who are daily trading and doing business on both sides of the harbor. The petitioners ask for the sum of $400 to build this bridge,

and they point out that the interest on this outlay would not amount to more than the salary paid the ferryman at present. Grand Bank, Lamaline, and other places, have received large amounts for public works, but former Governments have not conferred any substantial benefits on Harbor Breton. Some years ago, when a petition was before this House asking for a bridge to be placed across Placentia Gut, I ardently supported it, and I feel sure that the hon. members now representing that district would see the justice of the prayer of this petition and give it their cordial support. In asking that this petition be referred to the Department of Public Works, I trust that every consideration will be given to it by the Government, and that at an early date the people will be enjoying this means of communication.

MR. CLIFT—I ask leave to present a petition from the Rev. A. Kirby and others, of Boyd's Cove, District of Twiillingate, asking that Boyd's Cove be made a port of call for the steamer Clyde; also, a petition from the same place asking for telephone connection with Beavertown. I would ask that these petitions be received and referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

MR. GEAR—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary for statement of amounts paid for Messrs. Daniel Bishop and George M. Goddard for signing quarterly cheques for poor relief during 1909-10 in Epworth, district of Burin.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply, I beg to say that I have been in communication with the Commissioner of Public Charities, and I hoped to have had the desired information this afternoon. I shall table it on Monday.

MR. CLAPP—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary whether it is the intention of the Government to make provisions for the putting on of a steamer to call at certain points in White Bay at present not touched by the Prospero running thence through the Straits to Flower's Cove and returning to Griquet, where she will connect with the Prospero.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply, I beg to state that the routes referred to have been within the past twelve months discussed by the Government with residents from the district. The Government recognizes that something will have to be done. Unfortunately in the past, in all coastal contracts made, there has been a total disregard to the wants of White Bay, and the Government find it most difficult to get anyone to tender for the section so overlooked.

Ordered that these petitions be received and referred to the Departments to which they relate.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Com-

mittee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Encourage the Establishment of Cold Storage Plants in this Colony."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the same without amendment.

On motion for the reception of the report the House divided, when there appeared for the motion, Hons. Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, C. H. Emerson, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Bennett, Devereux, Downey, Goodison, Moore, Murphy, Parsons and Whiteway (16); and against it: Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond, Messrs. Kent, Clift, Gear, Clapp, Dwyer and Earle (7).

So it passed in the affirmative.

On motion for the adoption of this report the House divided, when there appeared for the motion: Hons. Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, Minister of Agrtculture and Mines, C. H. Emerson, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Bennett, Devereux, Downey, Goodison, Moore, Murphy, Parsons and Whiteway (16); and against it: Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond, Messrs. Kent, Clift, Gear, Clapp, Dwyer and Earle (7).

So it passed in the affirmative.

On motion that the Bill be read a third time to-morrow, the House divided, when there appeared for the motion: Hons. Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, C. H. Emerson, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Bennett, Devereux, Downey, Goodison, Parsons, Moore, Murphy and Whiteway (16); and against it: Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond, Messrs. Kent, Gear, Clapp, Dwyer and Earle (7).

So it passed in the affirmative.

And ordered accordingly.

ESQUIMAUX BILL.

Pursuant to order, the Hon. Minister of Justice moved that the Bill entitled, "An Act Respecting the Esquimaux Residents of Labrador," be read a second time.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to prevent the deportation of Esquimaux from Labrador for exhibition purposes, and to make it an offence for any person to enter into an agreement with them for the purpose of performing any services outside this Colony without first obtaining the permission of the Governor in Council. In recent years it has been the practice in connection with large exhibitions to procure natives from some remote places for the pur-

pose of attracting visitors to the exhibition. On several occasions Esquimaux have been persuaded to go away, with almost disastrous results so far as the Esquimaux were concerned, both as regards their morals and health. Most of the hon. members have perhaps read Mr. Gosling's book on Labrador, wherein he records several instances where Esquimaux have been taken abroad, on a promise of large wages, only to find themselves in the end with no means to get home. In one case, I know, the Government had to carry the cost of sending them home. Another reason why this measure should pass into law is that the Esquimaux seem to be particularly liable to certain classes of disease, such as smallpox, typhoid, etc. They catch these diseases abroad, and when they come back they spread it among their people, and the result is an awful mortality amongst them. T1e first instance set forth in Mr. Goslln g's book is that Captain George Cartwright, who was trading on the Labrador, took two men, two women and a little girl to England. There they contracted smallpox and all died, with the exception of one woman. Again in 1881 Hagenbeck, the well known wild animal exhibitor of Hamburg, sent to Labrador and induced eight Esquimaux men, women and children to go to Europe for exhibition purposes. The brethren at once saw the probable evil consequences and used all their persuasive powers to prevent them from going. But the attraction of good pay easily earned outweighed the warnings of the missionaries. forebodings were only too quickly realized. After appearing at the Zoological Gardens in Berlin for a few months they toured through Germany, and finally reached Paris. Here they contracted smallpox and all died.

In 1893 a colony of Esquimaux, consisting of fifty-seven men, women and children, were taken to the Chicago Exposition. They were recruited principally from Southern Labrador, but some few went from the Moravian Stations. Of their adventures in Chicago little has been learned, but at the end of the exposition the survivors were returned to Newfoundland in an absolutely destitute condition, at the expense of the Colony. The money due to them was never paid. A schooner had gone to Labrador and taken them from their homes, but they were left to get back as best they could. They brought with them the infection of typhoid fever, to which a very large number of Esquimaux, from Hopedale to Hebron, fell victims. At Nain, out of a population of three hundred and fifty Esquimaux, ninety died during the winter, their dead and frozen bodies awaiting burial at the one time the following spring. In 1898 another lot of Esquimaux, thirty-three in all, were induced by the same man who had taken the colony to Chicago to go on tour to

England, Europe, and America. Three died while exhibiting at Olympia, in London. In February, 1901, they were heard of in Algeria, and then went to America. On September 28th, 1903, six only of them were landed at Ramah, sick and destitute. They admitted having led degraded and immoral lives while they were away, and it has been found since they had contracted a most loathsome disease, and which has spread gradually throughout all the settlements, and killed slowly and painfully a large number of poor creatures—the innocent with the guilty. So serious had the matter become that it was contemplated sending H.M.S. Brilliant down in the fall of 1907 with medical assistance and supplies. With these instances before us, I think that no question will be raised as to our duty in this respect, and there will be no objection to the Bill.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Mr. Speaker, I very heartily support the Bill presented by the Hon. Minister of Justice, namely, the protection of these innocent children of nature. It will be within the memory of hon. members of this House that a few years ago a number of these Esquimaux were taken to the Chicago Exhibition, and they brought back with them not only the seeds of consumption but of the most loathsome of diseases, and were the unwitting instruments of sacrificing the lives of hundreds of their fellow-beings. They are nature's children, innocent of the wiles and pitfalls of our so-called civilization, and I think we should be perfectly justified in going a little further and impose a heavier fine than is provided in the bill. I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it might be desirable to include in this bill the Mountaineer Indians. They are a noble race, splendid specimens of humanity, and great sportsmen—a superior race to the Esquimaux, but almost as innocent, and probably their innocence may be taken advantage of now that the deportation of Esquimaux is forbidden. Under these circumstances I think it might be desirable that they should be included in this bill. I merely throw this out as a suggestion.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The suggestion of the hon. member seems to me to be a wise one, and I shall be pleased to consider it.

The Bill was accordingly read a second time, and ordered to be referred to Committe of the whole on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND gave notice of question.

MR. KENT gave notice of question.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, February 27th,

at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, Feb. 27.

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

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bonavista and adjacent places asking for the construction of a breakwater at Deadman Bay. Also a petition from the inhabitants of Seal Cove, asking that a light be placed on Indian Arm Head. Petitioners state that this light would be a great benefit. Also a petition from the inhabitants of Fair Islands for a public wharf at that place. The public wharf at present there is in a very delapidated condition. The members for the district are trying to arrange this matter, but there is a difference of opinion amongst the residents as to where the wharf should be located. Also a petition from Broad Cove, B. B., from the branch of the Fishermen's Protective Union at that place, asking that it be made a port of call for the s.s. Dundee. It is true that Broad Cove is not very distant from King's Cove, but if the steamer could call at Broad Cove it would be of great importance to the people. I have much pleasure in supporting these petitions and ask that they be referred to the departments to which they relate.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of the S. E. Arm of New Bay, Twillingate District, on the subject of roads and bridges. Petitioners represent that a sum of money is needed urgently for this purpose, and I have been there myself and know that this is so. I have therefore much pleasure in presenting and supporting this petition.

MR. GOODISON—I beg leave to present a petition from West St. Modeste on the subject of trawling. Petitioners set forth that outsiders come down in their vessels and trawl within the three-mile limit, thus interfering with their means of livelihood. I have much pleasure in presenting this petition and hope that it will receive the consideration of the House.

HON. MR. EMERSON—I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Rencontre, Fortune Bay, asking for the sum of $450 to construct a wharf at that place. The petitioners point out that the steamer calls there once a week, and on account of their being no wharf the passengers have to be landed in dories, which is not only a great inconvenience, but also very dangerous. Rencontre is one of the finest harbors in Fortune Bay, and if this wharf were erected the steamer could go right alongside, as the water at this point is five or six fathoms deep. Petitioners also state that trade would be greatly increased. In

asking that this be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries I hope that something will be done to carry out their wishes and that the public wharf will soon be built there.

Ordered, that these petitions be received and referred to the departments to which they relate.

THE HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS laid upon the table of the House—

Detailed statement of Expenditure of the Colony for the financial year ending June 30th, 1910; and

Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act, 1899, for the year ending Jan. 31st, 1911.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the question asked the other day by the member for Burin, Mr. Gear, in regard to the amount paid to Messrs. Daniel Bishop and James Vigus for signing quarterly poor cheques, I beg to say that I have communicated with the Commissioner of Charities and he has informed me that no amounts have been paid.

Questions.

MR. KENT—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail amount spent on New Court House at Harbor Main, including amount paid for building repairs, painting, materials, supplies, freight, cartage or any other purpose connected with the said building, giving names of parties, dates, and amounts paid in each case with vouchers.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—The statement is being prepared.

MR. KENT—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail all moneys paid, with names of parties, dates, and amounts of all moneys spent on the Main Line of Road from Harbor Main to Healey's Cross, and from Healey's Cross to Brien's Bridge, North Arm, in the District of Harbor Main, from January 1st, 1910, to date, with vouchers.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—This statement is also being prepared.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines if a license of occupation of lands in the neighborhood of Peter's Arm in the District of Twillingate, has been recently issued to Dr. A. C. Ames, of Botwood, and, if so, to lay a copy of same on the table of this House.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—No license has yet been issued, but application for license of occupation over 865 acres of land, in the neighborhood of Peter's Arm, has been approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. The timber upon the area shall be reserved and shall not pass to the licensee until he has shown himself to be entitled to a fee simple grant of the area.

2. The licensee shall have the right to cut timber on the area (1)

for the actual and bona fide clearing of land in order to prepare it for cultivation ; (2) for firewood, fencing and building purposes generally, it being understood that all timber cut by the licensee or his assigns shall be used on the area or in connection with its improvement and shall not be sold, and (3) for no other purpose.

3. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines may at any time during the currency of the license by notice in writing prohibit the licensee or his assigns from cutting timber on the area for any purpose whatever, except for the clearing of land.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of the expenditure of the sum of $50 allocated for the mail route between Beaverton and Boyd's Cove in the district of Twillingate, stating to whom such allocation was sent.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —The statement is in course of preparation.

MR. KENT—To ask the Hon. Minister of Justice to lay on the table of the House all returns (ordinary and special) from the Magistrate at Harbor Main for the years 1909 and 1910, containing the calendar of cases, civil and criminal, which came before him during that period, and all letters relating to or covering said reports.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—I beg to lay on the table of the House the returns asked for. There are no letters.

MR. KENT—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the number of logs purchased for the Public Wharf at Bell Island, St. John's East, since the 1st day of January, 1910, to date, giving the names of the parties from whom same were purchased, with the date and number of logs purchased from each and the amount paid per log to each party.

MR. KENT—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail the amounts paid for material, supplies, hire of vessels, names of men employed, with amounts paid each, in connection with erection of Marconi stations ; also specifying number of stations and where each is situated at Labrador, from Jan. 1, 1910, to date.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the following particulars: (1) total amount credited to district of Twillingate out of special votes for year 1910-11 ; (2) allocations made out of such votes giving (a) date, (b) amount, (c) to whom made, and (d) for what purpose.

MR. GEAR—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a detailed statement of all money spent on public wharf at Flat Islands, district of Burin.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES — The information asked for in these questions is all contained in the statement which I have tabled.

MR. CLIFT—That is very satisfactory.

Pursuant to order the Hon. Prime Minister moved the third reading ing of the Bill entitled, "An Act to Encourage the Establishment of Cold Storage Plants in this Colony."

HON. MINISTER FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I am aware that it is unusual to address this House on the motion for the third reading of a Bill, but I am advised that it is not irregular, and the importance of the matter to which I have to refer to is my excuse for departing from the recognized custom — in order to offer to the House some explanation regarding the matter brought up here last week by the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

You will remember, Sir, that the Rt. hon. gentleman criticised the Customs Department very severely for what he described as its failure to prevent Captain Corkum, of Gloucester, from securing a cargo of herring in Fortune Bay.

I stated to the House at that time that the Customs Department knew nothing, officially, of Captain Corkum, and that the license to purchase the cargo of herring in question was issued to Captain Tibbo, of the schooner Coronation, of Grand Bank, a native of this Colony, and his vessel being registered in this Colony.

I go on to say, Sir, that in this procedure the Customs' Department was only pursuing the policy adopted and carried out by the Rt. hon. gentleman and his friends when they were in control of the Government of this colony. After he made the breech with the Americans, early in 1907, and because of my disagreeing with him on this policy, I left his party and went into opposition. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the chartering of British vessels by Gloucester or Boston agents, has been going on ever since 1905, when licenses were refused to American vessels. They could not purchase or export herring themselves, therefore, they had to charter either Newfoundland or Canadian vessels to procure cargoes of these fish, and to take them to the United States.

I have here a memorandum of British vessels, chartered by Gloucester and Boston agents, during the year 1906, when licenses were refused to American vessels and they were confined in their right of fishing under the convention of 1818. The memorandum is as follows :—

Memorandum of British Vessels chartered by Gloucester and Boston Agents during the year 1906, when Licenses were refused to American Vessels, and they were confined to their rights of fishing under the convention of 1818.

October 22nd, 1906—Schooner Ettie, Lunenburg, Oxner master, was chartered by George Turner, of Boston. He purchased a cargo

of herring and cleared for Boston with them. License was issued to Captain Oxner, of Lunenberg, port of Wood's Island.

October 22nd, 1906—Schooner Havana, Lunenburg, Conrad master. This vessel was chartered by Jerry Cook, agent for the Gorton-Pew Fisheries Co., of Gloucester. License was issued to Captain Conrad, at Curling, enabling him to purchase and export for food purposes. This vessel got a full load, and cleared at port of Curling for Gloucester.

November 21st, 1906—Schooner Alma, Nelson, Lunenburg, Backman master. This vessel was chartered by A. D. Malloch, of Boston. License was issued at Birchy Cove permitting Captain Backman, who is a Canadian, to purchase and export a cargo of frozen herring for food purposes. Cleared from Wood's Island with 1,480 brls. pickled, 800 brls. frozen.

November, 1906—Schooner Spectator, Lunenburg, H. G. Corkum master. This vessel was also chartered by A. D. Malloch, of Boston. License was issued at Wood's Island to Corkum, a Canadian, to purchase and export herring for food purposes. Cleared from Wood's Island for Boston with 600 brls. frozen herring.

Schooner Yukon, Lunenburg, A. Ritcey master. This vessel was also chartered by A. D. Malloch, of Boston. The Captain obtained a license at Wood's Island to purchase and export herring for food purposes. Cleared from Wood's Island for Boston with 50 brls. pickled herring and 600 brls. frozen herring.

Schooner Mindora.—Lunenburg, Peterson master. This vessel was chartered by Frank Carter, of Boston, and license was issued to the master of the vessel to purchase and export for food purposes. She cleared from Wood's Island for Boston with 550 brls. pickled herring.

December, 1906—The schooner Mariner, Lunenburg, D. Parks master. This vessel was chartered by John Carroll, of Gloucester. License was issued to the captain to purchase and export a cargo of herring for food purposes. Cleared from Wood's Island with 1,400 brls. salt bulk herring.

December, 1906—Schr. Jeannie May, St. George's, Chin, master. This vessel was chartered by Bonia, agent for the Gorton-Pew Fisheries Co., of Gloucester. License was given the captain to purchase and export. She cleared at Wood's Island for Gloucester with 600 brls. frozen herring.

In 1906 there were ten British vessels chartered by American agents, whose cargoes were shipped for Gloucester, New York, and Boston.

The reason for chartering our Newfoundland and Canadian vessels was that the captains of these vessels all had licenses and could purchase and freeze the herring on shore. Herring exported in British

vessels for the Boston or New York markets have to pay duty on entry.

I anticipate that the Rt. hon. gentleman will make the argument that these cases related to the Treaty Shore or West Coast of this Island, and that, therefore, there is a difference between our policy and his, in this respect, but my first rejoinder in this contention would be to point out that the herring taken away by these vessels was previously landed on the coast, and frozen on scaffolds belonging to the people there, which is, as everybody knows, not included in the rights enjoyed by the Americans in the treaty of 1818.

I have, however, a still better argument, and it is comprehended in this record of two vessels chartered by Americans in Fortune Bay, in February, 1909, and which I will now read to the House :—

February 6th, 1909—Schooner Argentia, Lunenburg, Maynard master. This vessel was also chartered by Sol. Jacobs and another. License was issued at Hr. Breton, enabling the captain to purchase and export herring for food purposes. This vessel cleared for Boston with 753 brls. frozen herring, 12 brls. pickled herring (15 half brls.), 7 1-2 brls. pickled herring, 33 brls. bulk.

February 18th, 1909—Schooner Lilla B. Hurtle, Lunenburg, A. Geldert master. This vessel was chartered by Sol. Jacobs and another. License was issued at Hr. Breton enabling the captain to purchase and export herring for food purposes. This vessel cleared for Boston with 159,000 lbs. frozen herring.

It will be noticed by the House that these two cases are identical with the case of Corkum, about which the Rt. hon. gentleman was so much disturbed last week. The Bond Government did not go out of office till the end of February, 1909, and one of these vessels cleared for Glousester on the 6th of February, and the other on the 18th of February, the latter leaving practically a fortnight before the Rt. hon. gentleman and his colleagues resigned their portfolios. If it was wrong for us to issue Capt. Tibbo a permit this month to export herring from Fortune Bay, because it was suspected that Corkum was behind him, how does the Rt. hon. gentleman explain his own permission to allow the schooners Argentia and Lilla B. Hurtle to take cargoes two years ago when these vessels were chartered by Sol. Jacobs in the same way?

MR. KENT—I would like to say one word in reply to the remarks of the Hon. the Minister of Finance. I shall only refer to those cases which deal with the Treaty Coast to say that they are not, being Treaty Coast cases, relevant to the case of Capt. Corkum. I do not know the full circumstances of Fortune Bay cases referred to, but from what the minister has stated regarding them they are different entirely to the case of Captain

Corkum. Captain Corkum went through Fortune Bay purchasing bait for export, and for this he had no license. This is certainly a different case to that in which an American hires or charters a vessel and the master of the vessel that is hired or chartered does all the work, purchases, ships and exports under a license. That was not the case which was brought before the Committee by the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, nor is it the one that is considered by us. In fact the case of Capt. Corkum is entirely different, and, further, we must consider all the facts and circumstances connected with it. A bill was before the House which it was contended would to an extent nullify the Bait Act, and it was asked whether it was the intention of the Government not to enforce the Bait Act. It was that which gave the Corkum case point. It indicated a policy of the Government not to enforce the Bait Act. It was well known that Corkum had come to St. John's before going to Fortune Bay, and while in the city he publicly said that he would buy and export herring there. He spoke of his intention to violate the Bait Act, and when he went to Fortune Bay he did it. As I have said, this is an entirely different case to the others brought forward by the hon. gentleman where the purchasing and storing of the fish was done by the captain or master of a chartered vessel. The Bill was thereupon read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message requiring the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINSTER FINANCE & CUSTOMS—It is not my intention to endeavor to rush the votes through the House and I shall ask the Committee to take up only those votes in which there are no changes from last year, such as legislation and customs. If there are any votes which the Committee wish to discuss I shall have no objection to defer them.

MR. KENT—There are a few matters to which I would refer before these votes are passed and the first of these is the matter of reporting the debates of the Assembly. This has been a subject of complaint session after session, and I really think that some steps should be taken whereby the reported debates would be useful to the members during the sitting of the House. The present system is very unsatisfactory and as a result the debates are published two and three months after the House closes and nobody looks at them. This is not the fault of those who carry out the reporting of the debates, but it is the

fault of the system. In other legislatures if a debate is on to-day members have a draft of their remarks before them to-morrow and some such system should be introduced here. Already the reports of this session are a fortnight behind, and the debates are now ancient history. I submit that the matter ought to be taken in hand at once.

There is another matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the Government. In the Opposition rooms there should be some means whereby the members can communicate with the messengers. There is no bell or telephone and if a member wishes to have a message sent he has to go into the halls and obtain one. There is a bell and other conveniences in the Speaker's room and I think something ought to be done to improve the room of the Opposition on the lines I have mentioned.

I would like also to know in what papers the Reports of the House are published.

HON. PREMIER—In the same papers as last year.

MR. KENT—That is the Chronicle and Daily News.

HON. PREMIER—The full reports appear in these papers, but several other papeas publish a synopsis which is prepared by the Supervisor of Debates. I may say in reference to the remark of my hon. friend concerning the Hansard that if what he suggested could be carried out it would be an excellent thing, and it is beyond doubt that the debates published in book form and properly indexed would be a valuable record. While it is quite true that at the present time debates of former sessions may be seen in the newspapers which are kept on fyle in the library, they are of very little service, as it means endless work if one attempts to look up the old record. If we had a Hansard we could without difficulty look up the debates on matters of public interest that were carried on in former years, and read the opinions of those who went before us. There is no reason why a change in the system should not be considered, but it will be impossible to have the reports published and ready for next day unless we increase the vote considerably. It will also be necessary to have more reporters and I doubt whether we have any printing offices able to cope with the increase of work which this would mean. A change is very desirable, but it cannot be effected unless there is a large increase in the vote.

As to the Opposition room, the Government has only one desire, and that is to make them as comfortable as possible, that they might serve as an inducement to the hon. members opposite to remain there. There is no doubt that the Opposition room is an isolated place, shut off from the rest of the House, but even this had its advantages in the old days when members were not anxious that outsiders should

know what was going on there. I am sure that if the matter is brought to the notice of the Commission of Internal Economy they will do all in their power to have the request of the hon. gentlemen opposite acceded to.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress, passing certain votes, and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered that the report be received and the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Esquimaux or Indian residents in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —When this Bill was being read a second time the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested that it be amended to include the Mountaineer Indians. I think that the suggestion is a very proper one and I have altered the Bill to include these native Indians.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the same with some amendment.

Ordered that this report be received and that the bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order the Hon. Minister Agriculture and Mines moved the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Sale of Seeds."

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—The object of this Bill is to give the Government control of the seeds in the Colony. In Canada they have very stringent rules and regulations in regard to the inspection of seeds, but up to now the matter had never been given any serious consideration in this country, and the Government have never exercised any control over seeds. The bill is now brought in to give the Government that power, and it provides that a license must be secured from the Minister of Agriculture and Mines or an inspector by parties selling seeds. The Agricultural Board have seen for some time back that all kinds of seeds—and oftentimes what appeared to be mere sweepings—were disposed of and an earnest attempt will be made to prevent this in the future. There should be no need of any further explaining this Bill, Mr. Speaker. It is simple in itself and self explanatory. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agricul-

ture & Mines, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the subject of the Manufacture of Peat.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, in connection with these resolutions I think there is no necessity for me to offer more than a few remarks. I need not go into the interesting questions that have been brought out by the discussion on peat manufacture, but I may say during the past year we have been making an attempt to develop the Colony's peat resources. We have had four peat cutters out from Ireland who have been all round the Island giving demonstrations as to how the peat should be handled and used ; and from a report which I have and which I will lay on the table for hon. member's information in a couple of days, it will be seen what they are doing, and their opinions, and also the opinions of others who have studied the questions in connection with them. There is no doubt in my mind that we should do something in the way of replacing wood as a fuel, particularly in those places where it is no longer possible to obtain it easily. I could I think, Sir, if it were necessary, give striking examples of the distance our people in some places have to go for wood. All along the north shore of Bonavista Bay, from Cape Freels to Safe Harbor, a distance of 12 or 14 miles, there are very large and good peat areas. These have never been worked except to a small extent last summer in connection with the peat-cutting demonstrations. From time to time companies have been formed, or rather attempts have been made to form companies and begin operations, but they have not proved altogether successful. We have had repeated applications for further encouragement to such enterprises, and these have resulted in the bringing of these Resolutions now before us. Under the Act 5, Edward VII., Cap. 18, a bounty of 25 cents a ton was given on all peat manufactured for a period of five years. We have now extended that period to 10 years, and we hope this will offer sufficient encouragement to those who contemplate engaging in the manufacture of peat. The manufacture of peat opens up a large industry. Whilst we look on it largely as a fuel, and it is used extensively for that purpose, there are also valuable by-products. At the present time some of these peat products have been successfully used for medicinal purposes. Others are used for making mats and other articles which I might name. But, Sir, our chief need here is cheap fuel. We want as cheap a fuel as we can get, and I think if our peat areas are utilized they would give us a fuel cheaper even than the wood many of the fishermen now use. When putting in their wood

they do not include their labor, or the cost of fitting out of one of these vesels, including provisions, crew's wages, tackling and the risk run ; all of which increases the cost of their fuel. I am led to believe that you can put a peat manufactory on every 5 and 6 miles of bog land for about $7,000 or $8,000 ; that is, on a small scale; of course you may have other concerns that will take up double the amount of space and operate on a large scale. We have large peat lands at Lamaline, said to be the best in the Island. We have others at St. Mary's Bay, at Brigus, and indeed throughout the Island. And all these places are easily approachable by water, so that cheap transportation from one part of the Colony to another, would be a very simple matter indeed. And if we can get a peat manufacturing plant working at one of these places, the question of our fuel supply would be quickly settled. With these few observations, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the adoption of these resolutions.

MR. KENT—Regarding the resolutions which the hon. member has just moved, I think it important that we should have before us the report of those peat-cutting experts who were here last summer. The Government, of course have these reports and no doubt are familiar with the results of the labours of these people, as they have the reports before them. I find the work of these people cost the Colony some $2,000, and I think it only fair that this Legislature should have the benefit of any advice which they may have to give regarding our peat before we are called upon to consider these resolutions.

I do not think that as to the desirability of developing our peat areas there can be any two opinions. It is a matter of necessity that every effort should be made to develop this valuable fuel. There might, however, be difference of opinion as to how it should best be done, as to what would be the best way. We are to-day in a very serious position. You have the price of coal up to a height which it never before reached. You have the wood which was formerly available for our fishermen for shipbuilding and other purposes connected with the fishery, being rapidly cut out. Some substitute must be found for wood in as many directions as possible, in order to preserve a sufficent supply of wood for the use of our fishermen for shipbuilding and other purposes. If these efforts are successful in putting within the reach of our people a cheap fuel which will dispense with the high cost of coal on the one side and the destruction of our wood on the other, I think a great work will be accomplished. I understand that at the present time the woods of the Colony are being seriously cut into. I do not think the railway contractors ought to be permitted to cut so extensively for railway ties on the public domain,

and several hon. members have spoken on the necessity for the breakwater. I need not say anything more on the matter, therefore except to ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, where I hope it will receive very careful consideration.

Ordered that this petition be received and referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up, entitled, "An Act to Encourage the Manufacture of Explosives," without amendment.

The Chairman, from the Committe of the Whole on Supply, reported certain resolutions which were read a first time as follows: Legislation, $33,400.00; Education, $4,100.00.

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary whether there has been any negotiations, correspondence or agreement or the Postal Department and either the Western Union Telegraph Company or the Direct Cable Company regarding the landing of cables in this Colony by both or by either of these Companies, and if so, to state the nature of such negotiations, and to lay on the table of the House a copy of such correspondence and agreement.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to my Rt. hon. friend I have to state that there have been negotiations and correspondence between the Government and the Western Union Telegraph Company and Direct Cable Company, regarding the landing of cables in this Colony. The negotiations have proceeded up to within a day or two ago, and agreements are now finalized and will be tabled with a view of being ratified by the Legislature within a few days, when the whole of the correspondence will be laid upon the Table.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of the expenditure of the sum of $3,000 voted last session for surveys in connection with branch railways.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—The statement is in the course of preparation.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a copy of the charter or agreement for hiring of the steamer Stella Maris for her recent trip to the northward; also, copies of all correspondence leading up to such agreement; also, if any representations were made to the Government respecting the necessity of such trip and to lay a copy of same upon the table.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to say that representations were made by the representatives of most of the Northern Districts. Further the Government is committed to the Northern Coastal Service when the same is possible. To-day there are two steamers on the South and West Coast ,and the North is entirely shut off. The Government were able to arrange with the Prospero for an additional trip in January, also for a trip by the Fogoto, and now it is hoped to have additional trips by the Stella Maris, if navigation is open. The correspondence relating to the hiring of the Stella Maris is tabled herewith.

MR. CLAPP—To ask the Minister, of Public Works whether it is the intention of the Government to put a motor ferry to ply between Woody Point and Norris Point, Bonne Bay, in substitution for the row-boat now in use there, in compliance with the request of residents there contained in the petition presented to this House last session.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —No petition has reached my department in this matter and there has been no correspondence whatever concerning it.

Persuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the HON. PRIME MINISTER, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Act," was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the PRIME MINISTER, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 6, Edward VII., Cap. 6, entitled "An Act to Regulate the Use of Motor Vehicles on Highways," was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Esquimaux and the Indians, resident in Labrador," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Several votes were passed.

SIR ROBERT BOND—No useful purpose would be served by a detailed and extended criticism of the Estimates that have been tabled for the current fiscal year, for time is precious, and we have now been in session three weeks and little has been done in the way of useful legislation. The old time custom was to avail of an occasion such as this to range the whole field of politics. I prefer, sir, to

come right down to business, to say what I have to say at once and then allow the Estimates to go through without obstruction. We on the Opposition side of the House are by no means in a proper position to fully criticise the Estimates, for we have not had an opportunity to examine the public accounts. I asked some days ago for these accounts to be laid on the table, but they were only produced yesterday. In accordance with the Audit Act, the Report of the Auditor General on public expenditure for the past fiscal year should have been tabled two weeks ago, but it was only tabled yesterday. It will be perceived then how impossible it is for us at this time to determine whether we are dealing with over or under estimates, the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report being the only reliable guides to an accurate conclusion. The principal offender in this matter is, I regret to say, the Auditor General, and in a secondry degree the Minister of Finance. The Audit Act, Section 36, provides that the Report of the Auditor General on the Appropriation Accounts and other accounts shall be laid upon the table of this House by the Minister of Finance within one week after the Legislature assembles for the despatch of business; but the 50th Section also provides that if the Minister of Finance does not table the Report within the said time "the Auditor General shall forthwith present such report thru the Speaker of the House." The object of this section is to prevent the Government from withholding information from the House. We have been in session now three weeks, the report ought to have been in our hands two weeks ago, and the Auditor General has failed in his duty in not presenting his Report to the House through the Speaker after the lapse of a week from the day of the opening. Sir, I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to direct the attention of the House to the anomalous, yea, improper position that the Auditor General at present occupies in respect to this Legislature and to the public. In the year 1899 an Act was passed which provided that the Governor, mark, not the Governor in Council, not the Legislature, but the Governor of and by himself, may appoint a suitable person under the Great Seal as Auditor General, who shall hold office at a salary of two thousand dollars per annum during good behaviour, and shall be removable only by the Governor on address of the Legislative Council and House of Assembly. The object of this appointment, as set forth in Section 22 of the Audit Act was for the control and the more complete examination of the public accounts of the Colony, and for the reporting thereon to the House of Assembly. The fact that the appointment of this official was to rest exclusively in the hands of the Governor was to secure abso-

lute impartiality on the part of the official, and to inspire absolute public confidence in the official. He did not owe his appointment to any political party, therefore he was removed from any sense of obligation, and could be absolutely impartial in his examination of and report upon public expenditure, and the public could feel satisfied that he was not influenced in any way by political or personal considerations. His salary was made equal to that paid the highest departmental officer in the Government, and it was provided that he could be removed from office only by the Governor in order to secure his complete independence of all political parties and persons. To-day, sir, the position of the Auditor General is altogether different from that which it was twelve months ago, for within the past year he has become the recipient of the favour of the present Government by his acceptance of the position of Acting Cashier of the Newfoundland Savings Bank and of the emoluments that attach to the position. He is no longer the man sitting apart in splendid isolation, away from the influences of the Government and the dominant party in this House. He has become an employee of the Government, and the retention of his emolument as such depends entirely upon their pleasure and favour. Now I do not mean to say or to insinuate that the Auditor General's neglect in the matter of his report on the Public Accounts must necessarily be attributed to the facts that I have related, but I do mean to say, of a certainty, that his usefulness as Auditor General has been seriously impaired by his acceptance of this favour at the hands of the Government; first, because it is bound to awaken suspicion as to his impartiality in the minds of some; and, second, because it renders it impossible for him to discharge aright the duties of Auditor General. Either the position of Auditor General is a mere sinecure and the work is done by subordinates, or the position of Cashier of the Savings Bank is a sinecure. Which is it? If the former, then the present large staff in the Auditor General's Department should be dismissed at once, and if the latter then the position of Cashier should be abolished. One or other of the offices must stand in that position, for no sensible man will contend that if these are important and exacting duties attaching to these two positions, that one man can possibly perform them within the same office hours. The duties of one or the other must necessarily be neglected, so far as the Auditor General is concerned. Again, sir, another anamoly is created by the Auditor General having added to his duties those of Cashier of the Savings Bank and it is this—he becomes Auditor of his own accounts —the Savings Bank accounts, for which, as Cashier, he is responsible. Perhaps some one will say

that, as Auditor General, it is not his duty to audit the Savings Bank accounts. Is it not? I contend that it is, in the absence of the special Bank Auditor. For some years the late Mr. Stephen Knight, was special auditor of the Savings Bank, and the services of the Auditor General were therefore not required, but after Mr. Knight's decease did it not become the duty of the Auditor General to audit these accounts? Let us see. The 51 Section of the Audit Act after enumerating certain accounts that must be audited, concludes by declaring "and all other public accounts under the Audit Act," for the expression "public moneys." "public revenue," or public accounts is given in Section 2 of the Audit Act as including money from any source whatever passing into the revenue of the Colony. The Newfoundland Savings Bank Act declares that the profits of the Bank shall go to the liquidation of the public debt; they pass into the revenue of the Colony for that special purpose. Again, the general revenue of the Colony is liable for all moneys deposited in the Bank and for all interest payable thereon; the Minister of Finance is the Savings Bank. Probably the Minister never recognized himself as of such importance. Yet the Act of incorporation declares that "the Receiver General, or as we now say Minister of Finance, together with such persons as may for the time being have deposits in the Bank, shall be a body corporate by the name of "The Newfoundland Savings Bank." It would be difficult then to divorce this Bank from the ties that bind it to the Treasury, or its accounts from those "other public accounts" in Section 2 of the Audit Act. Now these anomalies to which I have drawn attention should end, and end at once. At the early part of the session, I asked the Government if it was their intention to appoint a Cashier to the Savings Bank at an early date in the place of the late Mr. Payne. I was told in reply that the matter had not been under the consideration of the Government since the appointment of the Auditor General as Acting Cashier. Well, if not, why not? Surely there has been ample time in which to make a selection since June or July last. Surely it will not be contended that the well-being of a great public institution such as this, and the proper audit of the Public Accounts may be sacrificed to party expediency. That is really what is happening, and it is becoming a public scandal. Now that attention is drawn to the anomalies existing, I hope an appointment, if it is necessary to fill the position, will be made without further delay, and that the appointee will be a person who shall command the respect and confidence of the public. Now we will pass on to a review of the Estimates before us. For the most part they are the same as those of last year,

bnt in the sum total of estimated expenditure there is an increase of two hundred and seventeen thousand dollars. Nearly half of this amount is due to the railway policy of the present Government, and represents interest on money borrowed for the construction of branch lines, but as the whole of the money borrowed will not be paid over immediately to the Reid Newfoundland Company, it is estimated that fifty thousand dollars will be temporarily returned to the Treasury. I have already placed on record my views in respect to this liability, and it would therefore merely be a work of supererogation to deal again with the matter. Of the items that make up the remaining half of the increase there are some that call for more than a passing notice. Twenty thousand dollars is set down as the cost of taking the census. The total cost of the census was, I think $18,000, but in view of the better facilites now afforded the enumerators by rail and steamer, it seems to me that the estimate is greatly in excess of what it should be. It certainly should not cost more than in 1891; it ought to cost considerably less, because of more rapid and cheaper means of transit. Twelve thousand dollars is estimated for Old Age Pensions. It is difficult to regard this vote seriously. As, however, a bill will have to be introduced to deal with the matter I shall not anticipate the debate on the question but simply record my opinion that the estimate amounts to an absurdity. Twenty-five thousand dollars is provided in the Estimates to increase the vote for agriculture to $40,000 per annum, and $5,000 for Fire Patrol and other services. As a bill is to be introduced to deal with agriculture I shall not anticipate the debate. Suffice it to say at this juncture that I regard the vote as at present administrated at little short of a wilful waste of public funds. Four thousand dollars of the five just referred to is for a Fire Patrol along the line of railway. The Patrol itself is a very excellent means of preventing the spread of fire originating on the railway track; that is to say from sparks thrown off by locomotives or in the clearing out of fire boxes. But does it not occur to this Committee that if the Railway Contractors were compelled to carry out their obligations under contract and clear the right of way of all fallen timber and other inflammable debris that there would be little risks of forest fires. Under the Act passed by this Legislature a few years ago for better protection of our forests, further obligations were laid upon the railway contractors. Why should these Contractors be released from those obligations and the country be saddled with this expenditure? It is generous to the Contractors, but it is not just to the taxpayers. Under the head of Civil Government there is to be an increased expendi-

ture of $2,000 for new salaries. I observe $450 for Mr. Thistle as Examiner of Mill Accounts. I recognize this Mr. Thistle as an active, and not over scrupulous, canvasser at the last election for the party in power, but I am unable to recognize him as a competent accountant. This man was in the employ for some years of a company of which I was President, and I therefore have some knowledge of his capabilities. If a thorough accountant is necessary to this position, then the selection is a bad one, and Mr. Thistle's services to the party in question should have been awarded in some other manner. But, Sir, is this new official—Examiner of Mill Accounts—required at all? I venture to think that he is not, for the reason that we have few, very few, mills operated on licensed property and thus liable for the payment of fees to the Crown. The work of examining the accounts of those few mills could easily be done by a competent official from the Crown Lands Department at a season of the year when the staff of that Department is not over-burdened with work. I regard this new appointment as a piece of political jobbery and as nothing else. With regard to the increase of salary, they are petty but pernicious to the well being of the Civil Service, inasmuch as they are calculated to arouse jealousy and engender discontent. I submit, Sir, until the Legislature is prepared to deal with the whole permanent machinery of State it is manifestly unjust and impolitic to single out a few civil servants for favor and increased emolument.

The pension list is to be increased again this year, evidently for the purpose of making room for pertinacious office seekers. When I resigned the Government the Pension List amounted to $12,000, today it is nineteen thousand two hundred and ninety-four dollars, an increase during the past two years of about six thousand five hundred dollars. In looking over the new list of pensions I can discern but one whose long public service and age and infirmity warrants consideration at the hands of this House. Take the case of Mr. Shortis of the General Post Office. He is not an old man. He is not an infirm man. Judging from reports that have been appearing in the newspapers for many months past, Mr. Shortis is an exceedingly active man; active with voice, active with pen, mind clear and limbs sound. Why is Mr. Shortis pensioned. I notice that the Postmaster General has been supplied with an extra clerk at $400. He had already a Secretary at $650. I have not the least doubt but that if instead of pensioning Mr Shortis the Government had increased his salary twenty-five or thirty per cent, he would have willingly added to his former duties and done away with the necessity for providing $400 for an extra

clerk to the Postmaster-General. But, of course, Mr. Shortis had to move ont in order to make room for some importunate camp follower. It cannot be said that Mr. Murray, late Magistrate at Harbor Main, is old and infirm, or that Mr. Tuff, Magistrate at Old Perlican; Mr. Christian, Collector at Trinity, or Mr. McEchren, Collector at Curling, stand in that category. Then why are they pensioned. Probably for the same reason that I have applied in the case of Mr. Shortis. The case of Mr. Murray, late Magistrate at Harbor Main, is a particularly glaring example of how far the present Government are prepared to go for political and party expediency. Mr. Murray, late Magistrate of Harbor Main, is a man of exemplary character, of calm, judicial temperament. His successor has been a notorious disturber of the peace. I have heard that an old smuggler should make a good Custom Officer, but I never heard that a disturber of the peace was likely to make a good Magistrate. I have had placed in my hands a copy of some police records, which I have to assume are correct, and I find, Sir, that the man who Magistrate Murray has been pensioned to make room for was on the 16th of April, 1901, convicted of assault and battery; and that on the 23rd November, 1904, he was charged with disorderly conduct and using threatening language; and on the 29th March, 1910, he was again charged with assault and battery and the case was postponed; and this is the man whom the Minister of Justice, Mr. Morison, has recommended to His Excellency the Governor as a suitable person to hold the King's Commission as a Stipendiary Magistrate. I cannot conceive of anything more calculated to bring the administration of justice into contempt in this country. What respect can the people Hr. Main have for this man in his judicial position? What moral influence can he possibly exercise in that community! But, Sir, not content with giving this man O'Toole the position of Stipendiary Magistrate, the Government must needs reward him with an increase of nearly double the amount of the former voted salary. Mr. Murray's voted salary as Magistrate is $550 per annum. I have now dealt with the principal increases in the Estimates. The other increases I think it will be more convenient to deal with as we come to the votes, and therefore I will not delay the Committee further at this stage of proceedings.

MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS — Mr. Chairman, I should like to make one or two remarks in reply to the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition. First, I must congratulate him on the very able speech he has just delivered. It was excellent from an opposition standpoint, and well calculated to throw dust in the eyes of the people of the Colony and to injure the Government.

In his opening remarks he stated that this House has now been open three weeks and very little has been done. I grant you the House has been open three weeks and that little has been done, but that little is more than ever was done in the same time under the governments of the past, and, further, I think the hon. gentleman will admit that part of this delay has been caused by the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, for he has on three occasions asked that the business of this House be deferred, and out of courtesy to him it was deferred to suit his convenience. I do not think I am wrong in saying that he stated the estimates now before the chair should not, or cannot, according to Parliamentary practice, come in until the Auditor General's report has been presented or tabled in this House. I think the hon. gentleman is a wee bit forgetful, for if he will go back and look up the Journals of the House for the last year he was Leader of the Government he will find the Estimates were brought in here and were passed on several days before the Public Accounts were brought down. In 1908 the House opened on January 9th, and on February 6th the Auditor General's report was tabled at the request of your humble servant who sat on the other side of the House then. Later still, the Public Accounts were tabled that year, and now he is horrified at our delay. I take upon myself the responsibility for the delay in tabling the Auditor General's report. It has been in my desk for the past ten days. It was asked for on Friday last by the Leader of the Opposition, and was tabled yesterday by me.

The hon. gentleman's speech is not sincere; it is entirely for publication. Why should he criticise us for doing what he did himself a few short years ago? His speech on the Estimates just delivered is a masterpiece; few could do it better; but it was only meant to throw dust in the eyes of the people through the reporter's box. It was evidently well thought out during the last forty-eight hours while this House was delayed to suit the hon. gentleman's convenience. His attack on the Auditor General was most unwarrented. I do not think the Auditor General has stepped aside at all from the beaten path, or from what is right. While the Auditor General holds the position of Superintendent of the Savings Bank he is saving the Colony a substantial amount. He also went on to insinuate that the Government were holding back information from this House. I do not know of any information that has been held back. I have gone out of my way to give all the information possible pertaining to my Department. I am sure the hon. members of the other side will do me the justice to say that I have given them all the information asked for. I have nothing to hide, the Government has no-

thing to hide, we are here to do our duty and to do it above board. Anything in my department that the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will ask for I am prepared to table.

He stated that the position of the Auditor General as acting manager of the Savings Bank is a public scandel. I do not know his definition of a public scandal, but he ought to be an authority on the subject, as no governments produced more scandals than the late Government, led by the Rt. Hon. gentleman. He expresses surprise at the vote asked for of twenty thousand dollars for the Census. It is another case of forgetfulness on his part. I may point out, Mr. Chairman. that ten years ago, when the hon.gentleman was leader of the Government and Colonial Secretary of the day the same work cost twenty-eight thousand dollars, the first vote taken was for $20,000, the second, $5,000, and a third of $3,000 to complete the work. These are the exact figures (as telephoned me by the Deputy Colonial Secretary, Mr. Mews), that was asked for by the hon. gentleman just ten years ago. He also referred to Old Age Pensions and said it was an absurdity to ask for twenty thousand dollars. I do not think it is an absurdity, neither does the country, but I would call it an absurdity to come down to this House from year to year and promise the people pensions, and appoint a committe to enquire into the matter, with instructions not to report. This was the policy adopted by the late Government. We come down here to-day to do our best and give the old people of the Colony what we can afford, we do not come here to fool them. We have come here to do our best for them and our best we will do. I am prepared to state that the old fishermen will be perfectly satisfied, and when our time is up and our promises carried out and we go back to the country, we will not be told that the twenty thousand dol lars voted in 1911 for old pensions was an absurdity. Our people are possessed of ordinary common sense and can tell readily when they are about to be fooled. No government has ever done as much as this Government in the short time in which it has been in power. Practically all the promises contained in Sir Edward Morris' manifesto have to-day been carried out. It shows that Sir Edward and his party are sincere, and are prepared to carry out the promises made to the people in 1908-09.

The vote for $4,000 for Fire Patrol was also criticised. What better investment could the Colony make than to vote $4,000 to protect the forests and place it in the hands of a competent committee? How many thousand dollars worth of valuable wooded land has been burned in the past twenty years? And no attempt was made by our criticisers of to-day to remedy it It is impossible to estimate the

value. The hon. gentleman tried to point out that we were relieving the Contractor of this liability. I do not think so. The Contractor to-day is doing his share, and so are the other companies, such as the Albert Reed Co., the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., and the Central Forest Co., and the several other companies interested, are formed into a Committee, each paying a proportional part of the amount subscribed to finance the undertaking, and the result has been shown in the past year that good work has been done. We had less fires, in fact no serious fires were reported, due solely to the Patrol Committee. Next he went on to ridicule the idea of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines appointing a man like Mr. Thistle to examine the accounts of the several saw mills around the Island. Mr. Thistle may not be a chartered accountant, but I think he is competent in every respect to carry out this work. He was proprietor of a large saw mill for years, and has done a large lumbering business on Water Street, and I think it will be admitted by all unprejudiced people that he is the right man in the right place. Over thirty-two million feet of lumber was sawed in this Colony last year, and each and every mill in the Island engaged in the work was visited by Mr. Thistle as his detailed report in the Agriculture and Mines Department can testify. This work could not be done by the staff in that Department, so Mr. Thistle was put on at a very reasonable salary to carry out the work.

The pension list was also criticised. How can we help men getting old? and if they get old in the service is it not the right thing for us to give them a pension? I speak for my department. By pensioning the official who had charge of the Customs at Curling, this Colony has been benefited. The past two years the Customs' collection in that part of the Island dropped considerably, and from the information received through the Department, the shortages were due in the main to that official being too old to attend to the details of his work. Would it not be an act of cruelty on the part of the Government after a man working for years in its service, to put him on the street? With reference to the late Magistrate at Harbour Main, he asked to be retired, although the hon. the leader of the Opposition has just stated that he is a man in the prime of life. He asked to be retired, and gave souund, substantial reasons, his doctor recommended it, the Government fully considered it, and the decision was to appoint Mr. O'Toole in his place, a young man, competent in every respect for the posltion, although he has been attacked and villified this afternoon by the Rt. hon. the Leader of the Opposition. We have no evidence here this evening to show that the statements made by that hon. gentleman

are correct, neither does the hon. gentleman in his remarks point out to this House where any definite evidence could be obtained to back up the statements he had made. I consider his action this evening in this House both cowardly and contemptible. Most likely if Mr. O'Toole was here this evening to give the other side of the case it would put a different complexion on his statement to go abroad to to the public.

SIR ROBERT BOND.—Mr. Chairman, of course there is nothing of material importance to the hon. members remarks to reply to, because he has not attempted to refute the position I have taken in this House. I leave it to the sense of this Committee as to whether there has been any reasonable attempt to refute the various positions I have taken.

Now, what was my position? It was this, that the Auditor General had been relax in his position as Auditor General. The hon. member has told us that he was prepared to support the Auditor General because he had had his report in his desk ten days before it was tabled. What has that got to do with the responsibility of the Auditor General? My point is that the Auditor General had not been faithful to the trust imposed upon him as Auditor General. If the Minister of Finance and Customs had the report in his desk, then it became his duty to lay it upon the table, and it was a very grave omission on the part of the Auditor General when he found the Minister of Finance and Customs had his report in his desk and that he did not immediately table it not to have tabled it himself through the Speaker. That was a sufficiently serious matter to move this House for the cancellation of his commission, if necessary. My second position was that he should not have accepted a position of emolument at the hand of this Government. I pointed out that this position made it imperative that he should be removed from favor or partiality or allegiance to any party. That is the reason he is appointed by the Governor under the Seal of the Crown, so that he should be above all party influence or suspicion of influence. For him to take a position of emolument at the hands of this or any government was a violation of the trust imposed in him by this Legislature when it consented to his appointment. I am told that my remarks are calculated to throw dust in the eyes of the public. No, sir, they are not calculated to throw dust in the eyes of the public, but to remove the film of indifference that has been over their eyes for some little time. I did not accuse the hon. member of withholding information. What I said was that the public accounts had been withheld until yesterday. That is quite true. Then I am told that the business of this House has been delayed at my request. I challenge the Prime Minister to say

that the business of this House was delayed for one second through my absence. Isn't it the fact that I could not get here on Monday because the train didn't come in. That didn't delay the work of the House, did it? I repeat the work of this House has never been delayed one second by me. This statement is absolutely incorrect. Then, again, we are told by acting as Cashier of the Savings Bank the Auditor General is saving the Colony $1,400. Am I to understand that Mr. Berteau is receiving $600 as cashier. The salary is $2,000. Am I to understand that the Auditor General has compromised the position and is receiving only $600. That is the implication, because the hon. member says the Colony is saving $1,400. I say it matters not if he receives $600 or 600 cents. It does not affect the crime of having forfeited the confidence of this Legislature. It does not detract from the magnitude of the position as I have pointed out.

Then I am told in reference to my observations on the fire patrol, that the contractor is not released from his obligation. What else is it? Will it be contended that the forest fires that have taken place have not for the most part originated from sparks from the line of railway. If that is true, and we all know it is true, does it not become the duty of the contractor to minimize the danger by carrying out his duties and clearing away the fallen timber and inflammable debris. And is it not true that by the expenditure of this $4,000 we are releasing the Contractor from fulfilling his obligation? We are told that there were no forest fires last year. What does that point to, but that if the contractor had done his duty in the past we would not have had millions of dollars worth of timber in this Colony destroyed. I said when speaking upon this point that I recognized the great advantage of a fire patrol, but it is not the duty of the Government to provide it. I do recognize it as the duty of the contractor, and as duty on the part of timber owners in their own interests to provide it. I believe that it would be of material advantage for the Harmsworths and the Albert Reed Co. to join with the Railway Company in providing this patrol, but I deny that it is the duty of this Legislature to release the Contractor from his obligation. I am also told that I have ridiculed Mr. O'Toole, because he is the son of a fisherman. I do not care if he is the son of a fisherman or of any other man. I don't care whose son he is; in my opinion he is totally unworty of the Crown's Commission as Stipendiary Magistrate. The fact that he is a fisherman's son is not going to deter me from stating my opinion. But as I have already said I give my opinion for what it is worth. The Government may not appreciate it. I repeat that a man who has been thrice convicted of a breach of the peace, a man who

has been three times convicted of assault and battery, cannot command the respect of his fellow citizens. Nor can the appointment recommend itself to the public. I have not attacked O'Toole. I have simply explained to the Government my opinion of the matter as I saw it. That opinion may be right or it may be wrong. It is not because you do not see it as I do that you are right and I am wrong. Mo opinion is as good as yours. I appeal to the morality of the community. I appeal to the morals of the people as to whether in their opinion a man thrice convicted of assault and battery and breach of the peace is a man fit to hold the position of Stipendiary Magistrate. I think not.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —Mr. Chairman, I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a word or two in reference to the remarks made by the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition. Of course we are always pleased to hear the Rt. hon. gentleman criticise the policy of the Government. His language is always of the most pleasant kind and his manner most gentlemanly. But, sir, his special reference to Mr. O'Toole, the present Magistrate at Harbor Main, in reference to his character, was not, I think, in the best taste or in accord with the hon. member's usually gentlemanly manner. It is the first time that I have heard any such reference made, and it is the first knowledge that I have ever had of any misdemeanor on the part of Mr. O'Toole since my acquaintance with him. As to his character, I may say that he stands high in the estimation of the people of Harbor Main. I do not know a man more popular with the people than that gentleman. He is and has always been a man fair and square, upright and honest in all his dealings and in all his transactions, commercial and otherwise. In the cause of charity he is always the first to take up the cudgels on behalf of a neighbor, or any one in misfortune, not alone in that district, but in any district in which he may in any way be of help. I feel sure he will be an ornament to the position which he occupies as a magistrate. Any man, sir, may hit a blow in self defence and I admire a man who hits from the shoulder, and, if he happen to be brought before the magistrate on such an offense, I am confident that there is some explanation which would satisfy the Committee in that respect if he could be brought here to-day and be heard in defence of himself. With reference to the late Magistrate Murray, he on many occassions spoke to me of his resignation, and I believe he actually did send in his resignation. I was asked to recommend O'Toole as the proper person to fill the position, and I recommended him. He is, sir, well qualified in every respect to carry out the duties of the effice, and I am pleased to say that since his appointment

thereto, has given every satisfaction. I felt bound, sir, to speak on this matter as I could not allow this attack to go by without making a few remarks. And I trust that the Committee and the gentlemen of this House will be satisfied that O'Toole is not deserving of the attack made upon him.

As far as the district is concerned, there may be a few who object to him—perhaps on account of his late political view—but on the whole the district is well pleased with the appointment. Of course, we all have a few enemies and we are all endeavouring to keep up our end of the plank, but I know of no man in this Island more fitting for this position, and whose popularity is so well merited, and I am pleased, sir, to have had this opportunity of saying these few words in his defence.

HON. THE PREMIER.—Mr. Chairman, I merely desire to make two or three remarks in relation to the points raised by the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, in reference to the Estimates now before the chair. In the first place, as to the charge made against Magistrate O'Toole. I am not in a position to make any statement as to the circumstances surrounding the various cases referred to. I think I am right in saying that the Rt. Hon. member stated that he was convicted on three occasions, namely April 1901, 1904 and 1910, of assault. Am I right?

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND.—April 16th, 1901, Nov. 23rd, 1904, and on March 29th, 1910, he was again charged.

HON. THE PREMIER—Was he only charged on the last occasion?

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND.—No. Charged, convicted and fined. The case was postponed after his being charged; but he was subsequently convicted and fined.

HON. THE PREMIER.—Well, as I say I am not in a position to debate these cases, but if it is true as stated by the Rt. Hon. member that the man is an "habitual disturber of the peace—"

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND.—I did not say "habitual," I said "notorious."

HON. THE PREMIER.—There is very little difference. I am perfectly satisfied to change it. But the word as I took it down was "habitual." That was my note made while the Rt. Hon. member was speaking.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND.—My point was, I had often heard of a notorious smuggler making a good Customs' officer, but never of a notorious disturber of the peace making a good Magistrate.

HON. THE PREMIER—It all depends on what one regards as an habitual disturber of the peace. It all depends on who makes the statements and on what may be termed an habitual disturber of the peace. I am not here to defend the appointment of any man to a judical position who is a notorious disturber of the peace, but I can quite under-

stand even the best of citizens coming under the arm of the law in relation to an assault or even to disturbing of the peace. And we must always take into consideration the facts which gave rise to the case. Now, take the first two of these cases, the ones in 1901 and 1904. These were both in the years of general elections and for all I know both of these cases may have arisen out of the elections, and if everyone in this country who has been concerned in election troubles were brought before the magistrate and were thereby debarred from holding civil appointments, there would be very few left. As I have said, I cannot discuss these cases without the evidence of the papers. A man may be before the Magistrate tomorrow for assault and be fined and when he comes out of the Court he may be hailed by his fellow citizens as a man who, under the circumstances, could have done nothing else. There are times when a man would be a cur if he did not commit an assault. But the law follows an assault or breach of the peace with fining, and it is very right that we should have a law for stopping, preventing, and if necessary punishing such disturbers. But it does not follow that punishment for such an offence should be a disability on a man all his life. This I say without knowing anything of the facts of the case cited here to-day. It is the first time that I heard of the matter and I merely throw out these remarks to be taken on their merits. But it is always the case that the absent man is wrong, while if Mr. O'Toole were brought here to-day he might be able to give some explanation, as to fully justify the circumstances under which he was brought under the arm of the law.

As regards the case of Mr. Murray, I may say that this is not a case of pensioning to make a place for O'Toole. Mr. Murray has been ailing for years. He is suffering from maladies that I have not the right of his permission to state here to-day. When I was head of the Department of Justice he applied to me for a pension, he was then seriously ill. His is not a malady nor illness that would show on him, but there is many a man suffering from bodily and mental illnesses far worse than those that give physical indications. He applied for a pension in 1905, when I was head of the Department, and applied on several occasions since. So far as he is concerned he was not pensioned to make room for O'Toole, but he was retired because according to his own statement and a medical certificate he was no longer fit to carry out his duties.

Now, sir, the only important point made by the Rt. hon. member, touched on by him was the relation of the Auditor General of this Colony to the Legislature, in that he is now holding an acting appointment and it was pointed out that it was not in his interest nor in the interest of the Colony, nor in the in-

terest of the position in which he stood to the public, that he should be in any way subject to or accept any favours from the present or any Government. So that position as a general principle there can be no objection. But there are times when the principle may be found capable of being slightly departed from and this is one of those cases. In June last the late Cashier of the Saving Bank, Mr. Payne was suddenly called away. Mr. Berteau did not seek his present appointment, but the Government sought him. It was not an office or position that could brook delay and was filled by an acting appointment. There are many offices in the public service in which no immediate appointment need be made because they are deputies and clerks ready to do the work, but in the case of the Savings Bank where large money interest are con cerned, it was important that an immediate acting appointment should be made. The Government was not then ready to make a permanent appointment, and in the interests of the public this acting appointment was made. The services of Mr. Berteau were invoked and he was asked to take the acting position, which he has held ever since, as no permanent appointment has yet been made. The Rt. hon. member pointed out that the position of Mr. Berteau must be a sinicure, if he was able to combine the offices of Auditor General and Cashier of the Savings Bank, or that there must be very little to do in the Savings Bank. My reply to that is that no man in Newfoundland knows better than the Rt. hon. gentleman what are the duties of the latter position, for not alone was he a governor, but he was also a director of the Savings Bank, and he is intimately acquainted with the work of the office in all its details. We know, sir, that it is not an office where there is much work in the way of actual labor, but it is a position in which there is a necessity for continued care and watchfulness, and for which we want a good, reliable, sober, intelligent man, a man of integrity, in whom the public has every confidence. As I say, it is not a position to be measured by the volume of work it entails but by other considerations, so that there is no reason why if Mr. Berteau can, by working extra time perform both duties, he should not. But the main contention of the right hon. member is that it affects the position of Auditor General to give him any employment or to recognize him in any way, or to give him any extras in any shape or form, even to one cent. It takes away from the value of his office says my honorable friend. "He is no longer a man sitting in splendid isolation looking down upon all the public departments whose books he has to audit, but becomes a servant of the Government of the day. He becomes subject to the dominant party, sacrificed to party expediency, and it has become a

public scandal.'' Perhaps he may think so. I do not. I think it in no way affects the Auditor General or the office or the position by his acceptance of the temporary appointment which he now holds. I take it that I am stating the hon. member's position correctly, that the Auditor General should take no appointment and no emolument whatever outside his office.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Yes, that is correct.

HON. THE PREMIER—Then, sir, in that case why was it that the Auditor General received emolument from the right hon. gentleman. I want to state the position quite clearly and I do not want to make any advantage out of the quibble. The right hon. gentleman pointed out that the Auditor General should accept no office whatever even to the value of one cent or receive any emolument or favor from the Government of the day. Now, I draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the right hon. member was party and I was party to the appointment of Mr. Berteau to a commission with Mr. Gear and the now Mr. Justice Johnson, to go to the Custom House and inquire into certain matters in relation to that department, and for that he was paid $300, and Mr. Gear was paid $300 and Mr. Johnson $350, and it was never held that it lessened the integrity of the Auditor General because he accepted that position. It may be accepted that that is only only one case. But it is a precedent and I have no doubt that there are many other similar cases, but I just speak of this one from memory.

Now as regards the Report. Considerable stress was laid on the point that it had not been tabled. The minister in charge replied that he had had the report. And the right hon. member replied that that is no answer. He contended that if the Auditor General did not see the report tabled within a certain time he should have sent it to the House through the Speaker. I can only say that if the records are looked into it will be found that this is the procedure that has been followed ever since the Audit Act was introduced in 1898, and that this report was never tabled here until after the tabling by the Receiver General of the Estimates. There never has been a case in which the Auditor General considered it necessary to resort to the means of sending the Report to the House through the Speaker. We have the Audit Act, and it has been quoted correctly that if the report be not tabled within a certain time that the Auditor General can have it tabled by the Speaker. It is perfectly right and correct, but the Auditor was never intended to exercise this power, and there is not a case in the Canadian or other records where a similar act is in force where the Auditor General has exercised his power under the Act. This is, I think, a complete reply to the right hon. member.

The right hon. member next referred to the pension list. He pointed out that, when he left office, the pension list was $12,800 and that it was now $20,000 or over. Well, if the Committee will look at the names of those on the pension list they will find that it is not in any way due to the present administration, nor are they in any way to blame. If that is so, what is the object or sense in making such a statement as the right hon. gentleman has made. Who are those who have swelled the pension list? In the first place there are five men in the Custom House who had not been to work for over five years previous to the hon. member going out of power. Those five men had never seen the Custom House during this period. They were invalids, but were drawing full pay, and were paid out of contingencies. When this Government came in they were immediately put on the pension list, thus saving one-third of their salaries. Now, is there anything wrong in that? What is true of those is true of every person on the list. There is Mr. Densmore, who had been keeper at the Lunatic Asylum for something like 38 years. It was a scandal and a crime to have kept him there so long. He ought to have been pensioned years ago. It was neither in his own interest nor the public interest that he should be kept there an hour longer. Then there is Mr. Gosse, nearly 80 years of age. He was for many years Road Inspector in the East End and is now receiving $300 a year. I do not think that anyone will find fault with his pension. Under the late administration his pension was being paid out of contingencies, it is now put on the regular list. Then there is another old man, Josiah Garland. He was a messenger in the Department of Agriculture and Mines, placed there, I think, by Mr. Woods. This man was tottering around the streets, and so he was placed on the pension list. Another was the keeper of the light house at Cape St. Francis. It was no longer safe in the interests of life and property to keep him there. He had to be pensioned. Then there is Mrs. Stabb, an old widow, who was postal telegraph operator at Bonavista. She was the widow of a one-time prominent figure in the commercial life of this country. She was no longer able to perform the duties of her office, and so she was placed on the pension list. Then there is Dr. Henry Shea, getting up to 80 years of age, and he ought to have been pensioned years before. He occupied a very responsible position, and it was neither fair to him nor to the public to keep him there any longer. Another is an old man named Day, a lighthouse keeper. He became blind, and thus unfitted to perform his work. He had to be pensioned. Now we come to another that was granted this year, viz., to Mr. Shortis. The right hon. the Leader of the Opposition pointed out that

Mr. Shortis has not qualified for a pension on the ground of ill health, because by his tongue and his pen he has given evidences of his ability to perform his duties. Well, I have merely to say that, at the time Mr. Shortis was pensioned, he was at death's door. He had been a whole year in bed under the administration of the right hon. member, and was drawing full pay. But he was a very sick man, and it was only on the written testimony of his doctors that he was unable to perform his duties that he was pensioned. If a miracle has taken place, and he is enjoying health and strength, I think he would be glad enough to come back and get a larger salary instead of the small amount he is now receiving. If the pension list has been increased from $12,000 to $20,000 a year, it has been due entirely to the legacies left us by the late government—old men broke down, whom it was not in the public interest to longer continue in their positions.

Now, as regards the census. The right hon. gentleman said while the vote for 1901 for this purpose was only $12,000, the vote this year is $20,000. Well, I am not prepared at this moment to contradict that statement, but my recollection is that the vote for 1901 was $20,000.

SIR ROBERT BOND—I referred to the vote of 1891.

HON. PREMIER—I thought the hon. member was quoting the vote for 1901. That would have been the proper vote to have quoted, for if we wanted a precedent to go by surely the last vote was the proper one. The hon. member stated that the difficulties of taking the census this year would be minimized and would not be so great as in 1891. There may be something in that. In 1891 we had no bay steamers, no railway service connecting with nearly every settlement. We have those to-day but still we will find that after meeting travelling and other expenses due to more settlements and increased population, there will be very little left. We are voting the same amount as in 1901, and there is very little difference in the conditions which existed then and those that now exist.

The hon. member then went on to criticize the vote for Old Age Pensions and claimed that the $12.000 was not nearly sufficient. But half a loaf is better than no bread. The Government only claim that this is a beginning. We are not only giving $12,000 this year but $20,000; and this is the way we propose to do it. We propose to ask the Legislature for $200,000 of the surplus which invested at 4 per cent. will bring in $8,000, and this in addition to the $12,000 from current account, will mean $20,000 a year. We hope to be able to vote $20,000 more next year and $20,000 the year following, and the Government are going to do this without increasing taxation one cent. Of course we expected to be told that we should have provided for 2,400 pensions. But if

we had provided for that number we should have been asked why we did not give 5,000, and it would be the same if we provided 10,000. We do not expect any support from the Opposition on this measure. But we are not going to be tried by the Opposition. They are not going to be our jury. We are going to be tried by a higher court and that is the court of public opinion, and when we appeal to the country in 1913, we shall be satisfied to leave it to the people to decide as to whether this scheme represents an honest attempt to provide pensions for the old worn-out people of this Colony. If the Government were looking at this merely from the standpoint of self-advancement, and of rewarding their supporters, the list would not be only doubled, and trebled, but quadrupled; but the responsibility is on the Government to find the money and we must cut our garment according to our cloth. We cannot endanger the credit of the Colony, or alarm those engaged in its business. We are perfectly satisfied that when the details are laid before this House and when this House is asked for $20,000 for 400 pensions this year, and for 400 more next year, and 400 the year after, that the Colony will see that we have made an honest attempt to carry out our promise to the people.

The right hon. gentleman then went on to point out that there was something like an increase of $2,000 in the salaries of the civil servants. Well, if the hon. gentleman will look at those small increases, he will find that no attempt whatever has been made to reward supporters; in most cases those who had been rewarded are those who were not in favor of the Government. I should like to see a more equitable arrangement of the Civil Service list than at present, some are starving while others are overpaid. The Government hopes to be able to take this matter up and if necessary remedy any glaring incongruities that may exist. It is not so much the men receiving salaries over $700 a year, but those receiving less that require to be looked after—the class that is poorly paid and has always been poorly paid. Two thousand dollars is not a great deal spent to improve the status of some of the civil servants, and we court enquiry as to the salaries and services that go to make up that increase.

Then the right hon. gentleman went on to refer to a Mr. Thistle whom he described as "an active and not over-scrupulous canvasser for the party now in office." I think those were the words used by the Leader of the Opposition. I did not know Mr. Thistle, did not know anything about him until the hon. member made this statement. I did not know he canvassed for the Government. I did not know his politics. I do not know him from Adam. All I know about him is that he was engaged in the very same business that he is now

connected with. He is a lumber man and to perform the services for which he has been employed does not necessarily mean that he should be a chartered accountant, but simply to know enough of book-keeping to examine the books of a small or a large mill. His duties are to see what lumber has been cut, and if the stumpage has been paid. That is about all. I should be sorry indeed if any man should be appointed merely for canvassing for or supporting this party, but it is almost impossible in this country to make any appointment to any office, whether large or small, without laying oneself open to such charge. A man has either supported a member of this Legislature or a candidate for it, and we cannot find any important office, from the Chief Justice down, that is free from politics and pull. There are men to-day in the Civil Service who are not worth half of what they are being paid, but they are getting big salaries simply because they had some political pull. But should it be a disability for a man to engage in politics? Does it mean that he is never again to be recognized, that he is to have a black mark against his name forever, and that he is never to have any hope of entering the public service? That may be a good principle to enunciate, but when it comes to the carrying it out, it will be found very difficult. Then a reference was made by the hon. gentleman to the $4,000 which this Committee is asked to vote for fire patrols for safeguarding our forests from fires. We want to live for the present, and act for it and conserve the little that is left us.

I agree with what has been stated that thousands, if not millions, have been lost to the Colony. Nobody can say what the amount is that has gone up in smoke. It has been stated that the fires along the line of railway have been the result of negligence of the Reid-Newfoundland Company. All I can say in regard to that is that the Committee has to assume that those who have been in authority to see that the terms of the contract were properly observed and carried into effect by the Company, did their duty, and that, notwithstanding the carrying out of the bil', the fires took place. Be that as t may, all that is asked for now is a contribution towards a fire patrol to which every owner of land along the line has agreed to subscribe. Last year the sum of $10,000 was spent in putting out fires which originated from different causes. People who go trouting, hunting, and timber cutting may, by a mere accident, start a forest fire and sp∂cial precautions must be taken by us to see that no more of our timber areas are swept away in this manner. Last year, at the instance of the Government, a meeting of all parties interested, such as the Harmsworths, the Albert Reed Company, the Reid Newfoundland Company, and twenty

or thirty others, was held, and all agreed to contribute towards this fund. Their idea is not to release the railway contractor from his obligations in any way, but, on the contrary, I expect they will make him "toe the line." These men have put their money, amounting to millions of dollars in some cases, into the timber business, and they do not want to find some day that their property has been swept away by fire, and their business ruined. Will anybody say that it is unreasonable for the Government to co-operate with them in any attempt to safeguard our timber? On the contrary; and we hope to continue this protection service and place it on a sound basis by permanent legislation. Every fire that occurs means a much greater loss than $4,000.

We can legislate and put the railway contractor under all kinds of obligations and restrictions, but fires will take place notwithstanding our efforts, and the best we can do is to take every possible step to prevent fires, and thus put an end to our forest destruction.

Referring back to the Census Vote, I have had the figures looked up, and I find that in 1900 the sum of $5,000 was voted for that purpose, and that in 1901 an additional sum of $15,000, and the following year a further amount was voted for that purpose. The figures given by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition misled me, for I concluded that he compared the present vote with that granted for the last Census taken, and not with the vote given some years previous to that. It would be as fair to compare it with a vote taken a number of years ago, when circumstances were entirely different from what they are to-day. If it is to be compared with any former vote, it should be compared with that of 1901, and, if with that, then we find that we are voting less than we voted for the Census of that year.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered that this report be received, and that the Committee have leave to sit again to-morrow.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I desire to lay on the table of the House a copy of a cable from the Secretary of State to His Excellency the Governor, which His Excellency has forwarded to me, with a desire that I bring it before this House. For the information of the hon. members, I will read it:

GOVERNOR, Newfoundland—

"With reference to my telegram of the 21st November, I am requested by a Committee of Members of both Houses of Parliament to send you the following message:

A Committee of Members of both Houses of Parliament here, representative of all parties, wish

to convey, through you, a formal invitation to two members of the Newfoundland Legislature to be their guests in London at the Waldorf Hotel from Saturday, June 17th to Saturday, July 1st, inclusive, this period including the week in which the Coronation is fixed to take place. Application has been made to the Earl Marshal to assign them places in Westminster Abbey. As it is anticipated that those accepting the invitation may desire to prolong their visit in order to see something of this country, the Committee hope to be able later to extend the invitation for one week in order to enable visits to be paid to the more important English towns, but it is not possible to speak with certainty on this point at present. Owing to exigencies of space, it is not possible to include in the formal invitation to the Coronation and subsequent festivities, the wives and daughters of the members invited. At the same time the Committee will be glad to provide hotel accommodation for one lady, being wife or daughter, in respect to each member, if information be sent to reach here by March 4th, giving full particulars as to the exact number of ladies coming, and whether wife or daughter in each case. In order to avoid any disappointment, the Committee think it well to state this clearly that they can only recognize members themselves as their formal guests, but they will do their utmost to make the visit not only of the members, but also of the ladies who accompany them, as pleasant and agreeable as possible.

Signed for the Committee,
Chairman, Harcourt.

I feel sure that the hon. members of this branch of our Legislature will very fully appreciate the high compliment which has been extended to them by the members of the Mother of Parliaments. The invitation comes from both branches of Parliament and is to both branches of our Legislature, and a copy of the same cable is also being laid upon the table of the Legislative Council. I feel sure that this branch will be glad to accept the courteous and almost brotherly invitation which is contained in the despatch to His Excellency. The occasion will be a most auspicious one, and must result in drawing still closer together the Colonies of the Empire, for the invitation which we have received has also been extended to the other Overseas Dominions of His Majesty. We are small in comparison with most of the colonies in point of population, however large we may be in other respects, and as invitations have been sent on the basis of the population, we shall not be represented by as many members as some of the other colonies, as, for instance, the great Dominion of Canada, which has been invited to send

sixteen representatives. However, I feel sure that what we appreciate mostly is the sentiment expressed in the despatch, and after all our Empire is ruled by sentiment. I am not prepared to say what is the proper procedure to adopt in making a selection, but I know the House will agree that in you, Mr. Speaker, they will find one who will honorably and creditably represent us. If you accept our nomination, as I hope you will, I trust that when the time comes for you to go to England and represent this House at the ceremonies to be conducted there, you will convey to your hosts our high appreciation of their kind and brotherly invitation. I therefore move that the House appoint the Hon. the Speaker as its representative at the ceremonies set forth in the despatch which I have read.

SIR ROBERT BOND — Mr. Speaker, I desire to place on record a sense of my appreciation and of the appreciation of my colleagues on this side of the House of the very graceful act, of more than courtesy, of hospitality, extended by the Mother of Parliaments to this, our Parliament, in inviting us to participate in one of the greatest events of the century—the crowning of the greatest Empire the world has ever seen. I am sure that the resolution moved by the Honorable Leader of the Government that you, Mr. Speaker, should go to London as our representative, will be accepted with the very greatest of pleasure by all the hon. gentlemen associated with me, and I say, in all sincerity, that it will give me much pleasure to know that you will represent this House on that historic occasion. You will bring dignity to the high office that you will hold as the selected representative of the Commons of the Oldest Colony, and I think that your ability and high character warrant us in the conclusion that you will uphold the honor and dignity of this House, as well as the Colony. It was my privilege and delight to represent the Colony at the Coronation of the late King, and the recollection of it will linger long in my memory. The beautiful ritual, the ceremonial, all so solemn and so grand, will impress itself greatly on the tablets of the memory, and will linger with you until the end. Sir, you will carry with you the best wishes and the best hopes of those on this side of the House.

The motion was put and carried unanimously.

HON. SPEAKER—Hon. Gentlemen of the House of Assembly, I find it hard to convey to you how grateful I feel for the honor you have done me in selecting me to represent you on the occasion of the Coronation, and how thankful I am to the Hon. the Prime Minister and the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition for the more than kind way in which they moved and seconded the motion. I assure the House that if I go, as I hope I shall, I shall carry with me a high

sense of the responsibility which I bear; and I desire to express my deep sense of gratitude for the honor that you have conferred upon me.

MR. KENT gave Notices of Questions.

MR. CLIFT gave Notices of Questions.

It was moved and seconded that when this House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 1st, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 1.

The House met at 3.30 in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I ask leave to present a petition from Reuben Laite and other residents of Lance Cove, Smith Sound, asking for a grant to construct a bridge over a brook on the road from the Main Line to the seashore or waterside. Petitioners state that the road referred to was constructed about thirty years ago and on different occasions small bridges have been built. These, however, have lasted only a few months, and petitioners urge that a substantial bridge be placed there without further delay. I also ask leave to present a petition from William Smith and others of Apsey Brook, Smith Sound, asking for a special grant to repair the roads leading to and from the settlement. I ask that the petitions be received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. SEYMOUR—I have to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bay Roberts, Spaniard's Bay, and adjoining settlements. This petition shows the road leading from Spaniards Bay to New Hr., T.B., to be in a very bad condition. It is used in the winter particularly (and it is also used in the summer) by the people who have to go a long distance to get firewood. To my own knowledge the road is impassable from Spaniard's Bay to the barrens on the New Harbor Road. The petitioners state that the sum of $900 will be needed to put the road in repair. This road is not only used by the people of Trinity Bay, but by the people of nearly every settlement in the district which I have the honor to represent, and I hope that the Government will be able to accede to the request of the petitioners. I passed over the road last summer, and the condition was such that no man could draw a load over it. It is an important road. It is a connecting road between Trinity Bay and Hr. Grace. The grant is only $300 for 21 miles of road. I hope that the Hon. Colonial Secretary, who represents the District of Trinity, will be able to help us in this matter.

MR. PARSONS—In rising to support this petition, I would corroborate the statements made by my colleague, and to say, in addition, that the road is used by the people as far east as Island Cove.

It is used by the people of four or five settlements. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—I should like to state that I have not received any petition with regard to the Trinity end of that road referred to by the hon. members for Harbor Grace, but I shall be glad to make some enquiries, and no doubt if the road is in the condition the petitioners state, my colleagues and I will be glad to do what we can to repair our section of that road.

MR. KENT—I beg to present a petition from George Moulton and other residents of Pouch Cove and Flatrock, in the district of Saint John's East. The petition asks that an iron ladder be placed in a small cove between these two settlements of Pouch Cove and Flatrock. There has been a wooden ladder there, but it is now in a state of delapidation and requires to be renewed. I may say, for the information of the House, that this small cove is a place of refuge for the people of both Pouch Cove and Flatrock, and in case of storm it affords them a shelter. The cliff which surrounds the cove is very steep and a ladder is required to negotiate it. I would ask that this matter be referred to the Marine and Fisheries Department, and I am sure my friend, the Minister, will take the petition into his consideration and endeavor to comply with the request therein contained.

MR. CLAPP—I beg leave to present a numerously signed petition by fishermen and captains of New Ferrole, Bartlett's Harbor, Brig Bay, Bird's Cove and Current Islands, as well as other places on the coast, asking that a lighthouse be erected on New Ferrole Point. This petition has been forwarded to me by the Rev. Father O'Rourke, of Bonne Bay, and the petition sets forth that a lighthouse at this point is very badly needed. I think that this petition is a very important one and should receive the consideration it deserves. The Government should take this matter seriously in hand, as St. Barbe district has but one lighthouse on this coast and a harbor light. St. Barbe has received very little from the hands of the Government, in fact, the lights on the north-east coast are simply harbor lights, and it is their duty in this case to put a lighthouse at this point, for it may mean the saving of many lives. I would ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. CLAPP—I have several petitions to present from the district of St. Barbe which have kindly been handed me through the courtesy of the Premier. One is from Jacob Bussey and others of Lance au Meadows, to Little Braha, District of St. Barbe, re telegraph extension ; also one from Henry Way, Michael Lawless and others on the same subject, and also one from Israel F. Dean and others of St.

Anthony, also on the same subject.

It gives me great pleasure to support these petitions. During the last session I presented a petition from the people of Bonne Bay and Port Saunders. I am glad to say the fruits of that petition are to be seen now, and that the telegraph has been extended to Port Saunders. It was during Sir Robert Bond's regime that this telegraphic extension in the district of St. Barbe was decided on. As representative for the district I pointed out to Sir Robert the desirability of telegraphic connection with the capital as well as with the outside world. The telegraphic extension was begun. Telegraph offices were opened at LaScie, Seal Cove and Western Cove. I am glad also to see that an office has also been opened at Coachman's Cove. Ever since I have been a member of this House I have never ceased to draw attention to the strong necessity that existed of giving to the people of St. Barbe further steam communication. I asked a question in this House the other day in connection with putting a steamer on White Bay, running through the Straits, returning to meet the Prospero at her destination, and I was informed in reply that the Government were taking the matter into consideration. I would suggest to the Colonial Secretary that it would be well to put out tenders for a small steamer to ply on that part of White Bay. Now, Mr. Speaker, these petitions have my very strong support, and I am very much pleased to see that it was foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne that this telegraphic extension was going to be continued, and I trust before the term of the present Government has expired we shall see a telegraph system from LaScie running down through the Straits to Flowers Cove and touching at Port Saunders.

HON. THE PREMIER—These petitions referred to by the hon. member were forwarded to me for presentation, but, following out the usual course, I handed them over to the representative for the district who has so ably presented them. I was asked to support these petitions and this I most willingly do. It would serve no purpose to point out the neglect of the past, but it is sufficient to say that when the present Government came into power they found a state of isolation as regards the district of St. Barbe that could no longer be tolerated. It was not a question of party or of politics—the Government really admitted that these people should participate in the advantages of the telegraph system of the Colony. It has to be borne in mind that the people down there are taxed for railway and telegraph and steamship facilities, and, with the exception of two or three small places around Notre Dame Bay, there were no telegraph stations at all. And being taxpayers, contributing to these services, they should have the benefit of them, if it is at all possible. Every-

thing cannot be done in a day, but I think an effort should be made from time to time whenever it is possible. This was one of the first planks in the platform of the present Government. We were determined and pledged to extend the telegraph system. The House will remember that this policy was foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne last session. Last year we built 130 miles of telegraph, the record amount ever built in one year by any Government. This was entirely in St. Barbe district. And the Government hope this year to make a further extension. That will, of course, depend on the finances at the disposal of the Department. The same is true as regards steam. There is hardly any steam service in White Bay; yet the people are taxpayers and have to pay their share for the upkeep of steamers elsewhere. It is impossible to accomplish all these things in a day or two; but after a while we shall be able to do for that district what we have done for Fortune Bay, Fogo, St. George's and Bay of Islands and other districts.

MR. ROBERTS—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition on behalf of the District of St. Barbe. But the House looks at this matter solely from the point of view of the people on that shore. There is another view than that. People from all parts of the North and East Shore of the Colony go down there for their summer's fishing. They all enjoy the facilities of telegraphs and steam service at home, and then they go down there during the summer and are cut off from all connection with the outside world. Again, many fishermen have to go for treatment to the hospitals down in that district. It would be a great comfort to their families if they could be in some sort of communication with them. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker, I might state that I have here a plan drawn up by Mr. Stott, Superintendent of Telegraphs, and which it was the intention of the Government at that time to carry into effect. If any hon. member would like to see it, it is at his disposal.

HON. MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Seal Cove, in my district, asking for the sum of $250 for the purpose of effecting repairs to roads and bridges. Petitioners point out that a bridge across a stream running by the settlement is very necessary, as the mailman is sometimes unable to leave the mail at Seal Cove, owing to inability to cross the stream. I hope the Department will see its way to providing this.

MR. EARLE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from H. J. Rowe and others of Seldom Come By, asking for a sum of money to fix a well. The well they have there is in a very bad condition, but they could make it good for $20. This seems a small sum, but

I suppose they know best. They say dogs and other animals get in the well and spoil the water. I hope it will be attended to. I have also a petition from the inhabitants of Seal Cove, Fogo District, on the subject of a road to their gardens. This they can make for a sum of about $30. It will be a great help to agriculture in that place. I beg that these petitions be received and referred to the department to which they belong.

RT. HON. SIR. R. BOND—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from J. B. Osmond and others of Moreton's Harbor, Twillingate, asking for a sum of money for the construction of a breakwater at Deadman's Bay, near Cape Freels. Fogo, to make that harbor a port of refuge for the numerous craft coasting and fishing in that neighborhood. A very good anchorage could be obtained there for a large number of schooners, and the shelter would be all that could be desired. It would prove the greatest of blessings to our coastal navigators; indeed it is a public necessity. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition. There have been several petitions presented already on this matter, and I trust the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be able to give it his attention, and find a sufficient sum. I beg this be referred to his Department.

MR. EARLE—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting that petition. I remember some years ago a commission was appointed by this House to inquire into the possibility of erecting a breakwater at Cat Harbor, near Deadman's Bay. It was considered a poor place for the purpose. I trust the Government will see its way clear to providing this means of safety, not only for the petitioners, but for the whole community fishing and coasting on the East Coast. I think it would be a wise move to comply with the prayer of this petition.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from J. Holden and others of St. Brendan's and Deer Island, asking that no further saw mills be allowed to be erected on any part of the coast lands between it and Ash's Cove. I beg to move that the petition be received and referred to the Department of Agriculture and Mines.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Greenspond on the subject of a breakwater at Deadman's Bay. So much has already been said about this that I have nothing new to add to it.

Also a petition with regard to a public wharf at Deer Island. This place has been made a port of call for the Dundee, and since then the need of a wharf has been greatly felt. I was there myself a short time ago, and in my opinion no place in Bonavista Bay is more deserving of a wharf. It is an iso-

lated spot, the nearest place being Fair Island. They have great difficulty now in landing their freight. The amount required is small, only $400.

Also a petition from the Trustees of the Methodist church at Bonavista, asking for $300 to construct a road to the cemetery. At present the road is incomplete, and the people are put to great inconvenience in using it. I beg that these petitions be referred to the Department to which they belong.

Ordered: That these petitions be received and referred to the departments to which they relate.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up, entitled "An Act to Encourage the Manufacture of Peat," without amendment.

QUESTIONS.

MR. KENT—To ask the Hon. the Minister of Justice whether the Magistrate at Harbor Main has instructions to visit, or has visited officially, places in his district other than Harbor Main; if so, to name such place or places, and state whether he is paid extra therefor, and what amount.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—In reply to the hon. member, I beg to say that Mr. Murray, the late Magistrate at Harbor Main, had instructions to work at Holyrood and Conception Harbor as well. He was paid the yearly sum of $200 extra for this work. The same arrangement is being continued with Mr. O'Toole. This is in addition to his $550 salary.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the table of the House the following statement—(1) A list of all animals distributed for agricultural purposes from 1st May, 1909, to date, stating the breed and age of each animal, from whom purchased, the price paid, and to whom sent; (2) A list of all animals sent from the Experimental Farm since May, 1909, to date, giving cost of each animal, when sold, by whom purchased, price paid, and when delivered to purchaser.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, I may say the statement is in course of preparation.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of the expenditure of the sum of $3,000, voted last session for surveys in connection with branch railways.

The Minister tabled the information asked for.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, before passing on it might be well to refer back to the discussion that we had here last evening, particularly on the question of estimated cost of the census. I agree with the remarks that were made by my right hon. friend, Sir R. Bond, on that occasion. He said that in making the estimate for the taking the census during the coming year the estimate ought not to exceed that of 1891; conditions existed which rendered the making of the census more expensive and a more onerous undertaking in past years than it is to-day.

In this connection, not only since 1891, but even since the taking of the last census of 1901, conditions have improved greatly all round this Colony so as greatly to facilitate the taking of the census. For the same reason the estimate which is in the Estimates now before us ought not to exceed that of 1891. It should be less than that expended thereon in 1901. During the discussion last evening reference was made to the anomalous position of the Auditor General. I think that this is a most unusual and extraordinary thing for the Auditor General to occupy his present position, and one repugnant to the very purpose and object of the establishment of the office. He is the official appointed by the Governor as the auditor of the public accounts and comptroller of the public expenditure, responsible to this House and not to the Government; expressly and for good reason the appointment is by the terms of the Audit Act, taken out of the hands of the Executive Government of the day. His province is to control the public expenditure, to examine the public accounts and to prepare the report on all financial matters, whether regular or irregular, to be laid before this House, as the representatives of the people of this Colony. He is the watch and safeguard placed by the constitution over the Government dealing with public money. I think it most improper and wrong that a man holding this position of guardianship on behalf of the people's representatives, should hold permanent position in the Civil Service even when the appointment is only temporary. Another matter arises out of the remarks of the Hon. Prime Minister which gives this to my mind an even more serious aspect. The Prime Minister quoted as a precedent the fact that Mr. Berteau, some years ago, had held under commission an inquiry into the affairs of the Custom House. This was a revenue inquiry of a judicial character and in accordance with the duties of his office, and there is no parallel whatever between that and the appointment of a man to a regular office in the public service. And the fact that the Prime Minister cited Mr. Berteau's appointment to hold an audit in the Customs' Department as precedent for his appointment under salary to an office in the public

service. shows how far this proceeding may be used as a precedent in the future, and I submit that the fact that the Prime Minister tries to justify that appointment by such a precedent, shows how far he is prepared to go to look for a precedent. There is no precedent or parallel to it at all. I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that if trustees of a company had appointed an outsider as auditor of the business of the company, the bond-holders or debenture-holders would like to see that auditor in the pay of the company. His independence would be destroyed, and his continuance as auditor would not be tolerated for a day. The case is exactly parallel to Mr. Berteau's position. Mr. Berteau is the Auditor, Trustee and Guardian of the public funds, in the pay of this House, the representative of the people, and whilst filling that office he takes an office of pay under the Government whose accounts it is his duty to audit. The cases are exactly parallel. There ought to be no more connection between the Executive and the Auditor General than there is between the Executive and the Judges. I don't mean in any way to reflect upon the integrity of Mr. Berteau. I believe he is an excellent official, but he puts himself in an improper position, and it is a bad precedent and may be availed of as a means of great abuse in the future. Other matters were under discussion yesterday afternoon. The question of the pension list was considered by the Committee. Now I don't think any member of this House will ever have any objection to a pension being provided for a man who has given years of his life to the public service, and through age or infirmity becomes incapable of performing his work. That is the object of the pension list, but when it is used otherwise it is an abuse. Now, take the case of Mr. Murray, of Harbor Main. I had an opportunity of having official dealings with him when I was Minister of Justice, and a more capable magistrate than Mr. Murray does not exist in the Colony. Mr. Murray is to-day just as capable of performing his duties as when I was Minister of Justice, and then he was thoroughly competent to do so. It looks as if this pension was provided for Mr. Murray in order to make a place for his successor, Mr. O'Toole. I am sure nobody minds a Government, when an opportunity honestly and properly occurs in the civil service and there is a man competent to take the position, preferring those who supported them to others. But Mr. O'Toole's appointment is objectionable, not only on the grounds that Mr. Murray should have been continued in office, but also from the fact that Mr. O'Toole has had recorded against him charges before the very tribunal upon which he now sits in the capacity of a judge, and that one of these charges was only a few months before he received his appointment. The re-

cords of that were before the Minister of Justice at the time he recommended the appointment to the Executive Council. Not only is Mr. O'Toole appointed in the place of Mr. Murray, but his salary is increased by a straight vote of $250, and besides he is allowed $200 for visiting two sections of his district, making a total salary of $750. I think that when an appointment is made like this one, a straight salary ought to be voted. If you are paying a man $750, put it in the estimates, and let us know what we are voting, for if the fact that these extras are being paid Mr. O'Toole had not been extracted by questions put by me to the Minister of Justice, the Committee would not have had the information. Again we are informed that Mr. O'Toole occupies other positions in the civil service. I am not in a position to say if that is true or not, but it is so stated, and no doubt he was also drawing a salary from these positions. The Committee ought to be informed as to every position he occupies when they come to consider a vote of this kind. Of course it was the province of the hon. gentleman opposite to defend the appointment of Mr. O'Toole and the increase of his salary. I can understand the position of the Minister of Public Works. No doubt he remembers Mr. O'Toole's work in past election contests, and of course the Prime Minister will stand by his own executive and justify what they have done.

There were other points under discussion yesterday afternoon, e.g. the vote for old age pensions. We will have an opportunity when the resolutions embodying this old age pension scheme come before the House, of considering the scheme in detail. However, I think, with the bare outlines of the scheme that were given us yesterday, that it is going to prove an utterly absurd and unworkable and unfair proposition. The amount to be voted for this purpose is on the face of it absolutely absurd. The principle of old age pensions is one which is deserving of the support of this whole House, but this kind of thing now called an Old Age Pension Scheme, I consider, to use the words of the Minister of Finance, as only "throwing dust in the eyes of the people." Reference was further made to the petty increase in the salaries of some public officials. I think that in view of the large revenues which this Government is in receipt of, that these petty increases do them no credit. It is an admitted fact that our public servants, from the highest to the lowest, are underpaid, and much of the revenue which has been received during the past year, and upon which, no doubt, the Minister of Finance is basing his estimates, could be devoted towards increasing the wages of the civil servants of the country. Most of the officials of the civil service receive the same wages as their grandfathers received 60 years ago, and

in some instances doing three times the work, and the cost of living has meanwhile gone up three or four fold. I think no better use could be made of the volume of revenue which the present Government is receiving than to help the civil servants of the country, if you want a better service and better men, and a cause of complaint which has always been a sore one removed from the public service. Take the Custom House officials. Nowhere in the world are they paid as small salaries as here. Take our policemen ; they are receiving the smallest wages of any force in the world. Besides, Mr. Chairman, the number of officials is being increased. As I stated before, I think the body of civil servants is large enough to be able to do the work of all the departments and instead of adding to the number of civil servants the salaries of those who are doing the work at present should be increased. There are other matters in the estimates to which I wish to refer, but to which I shall take the opportunity of referring when we come to vote on each subject, some of the expenditure which to my own knowledge has taken place in my own district that I don't think it would be in the power or art of man to justify. I have one or two instances in my mind at present. In connection with the public wharf at Flatrock, which was carried away last fall twelve months. It was built four or five years ago at a cost of from five to seven hundred dollars. It was replaced last spring at a cost of over $2,700. In other words for every dollar it cost before it cost four dollars last spring and there is no improvement whatever in the wharf. This is only one instance of an expenditure which I don't think it is possible to justify. There are many matters in the settlement of Flatrock upon which this large amount might be expended after giving them a good public wharf. They need launchways, winches for landing boats, improvements in the roads. If this $2,700 was to be spent there and the members were consulted, it would have been spent to better advantage.

MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, just a word in reply to the hon. member for St. John's East. Yesterday we fully debated the vote of $20,000 for the census. We are asking for this service exactly the same as was asked for in 1901. The census that year under the Government of Sir Robert Bond cost the Colony $28,000, and now that gentleman is trying to tell the country that in asking for $20,000 we are asking for too much, well knowing that the work cannot be done for less than $25.000. We are no way unreasonable in asking for $20,000 to begin the work in 1911 ; the matter was thrashed out here yesterday and there is no necessity to debate it now. We shall not spend the money if it is not needed. The same argument applies in connec-

tion with the hon. gentleman's criticism in regard to the Auditor General. The Government is quite justified in appointing that gentleman to the position of Acting President of the Newfoundland Savings Bank. The last Government appointed him to a commission to enquire into the business of the Custom House and paid him $300, but according to the argument produced here to-day it is a public scandal for the present Government to appoint him to the Savings' Bank. Now we come to the vote for pensions. Mr. Murray is singled out. He is a man, according to their argument, in the prime of life, although he is nearing seventy years of age. The position is this. A year ago he asked the Government to pension him and he produced a doctor's certificate that he was not in good health and unable to attend to the duties of his office. The hon. member for St. John's East tried to criticize the Old Age Pension vote of $20,000. Well, as I have already told the House, the late Government promised the fishermen of the Colony old age pensions on the eve of the elections. They appointed a commission to look into the matter and that commission never reported. Some are uncharitable to state that they were instructed not to report, but the present Government, led by Sir Edward Morris, intends to do its best for all classes and we cut our cloth according to our measure. We are going te give four hundred old age pensions of fifty dollars each the coming year and hope to be in a position to give four hundred more in 1912-13. We are told this afternoon that we should increase the salaries of the civil servants. I think most of the officials are getting enough, and if they do not like their salaries let them get out. The hon. member also insinuated that we were trying to smother up certain salaries, while half the amount that goes to make up the increase this year is a legacy left by the late Government, while they were afraid to come in and vote the salaries for certain appointments they paid them out of contingencies, and we are here to-day putting them in the regular list and taking a vote in the House for the same. In reference to the statement made by the hon. member for St. John's East, about the Flatrock public wharf, I know nothing of it. The Minister in charge of that Department is here and I presume can speak for himself.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Mr. Chairman, I think it was Carlyle who said that "silence is the supreme duty of man if he has nothing of importance to say." The Hon. Minister of Finance has not said anything of importance in the observations that he has made here this afternoon. They are a mere repetition of his statements of yesterday. Throwing dust in the eyes of the people! What claptrap. How are we throwing dust in their

eyes? By exposing their extravagance. By showing up the scandal in relation to Magistrate O'Toole. By the fact that the Auditor General's accounts have not been tabled. By criticising the accounts before us. Does the hon. minister mean to be quite serious? I have taken up that account, sir, the report that preceded it, and I have perused it, and I now quite understand why the minister kept it in his desk for the last ten days. I quite understand it. It is a revelation. It shows an over-expenditure of some $170,000. I say, sir, it is a revelation of expenditure totally unwarranted, unlawful and illegal on the part of the ministers opposite. A few years ago, when the minister first made his appearance here as Minister of Finance, he stated that the previous Government had exceeded their authority in making expenditure on executive responsibility. Turn up the Budget Speech of 1909 and see the words in that of condemnation of the expenditure on Executive responsibility, unwarranted by the Legislature, and yet during this very year that has passed, and the year that preceded it, he has out-Cæsared Cæsar. This is the Auditor General's report. I said yesterday in the course of my observations that the increases in the salaries of the civil servants were pretty but pernicious. When I read that report I came to the conclusion that they were not petty but they were stupendous. I find, sir, under the head of Postal Department, an increase of salaries and positions, amounting on the whole to $8,170. And that in the Postal Department alone. Yes, sir, the hon. minister said on Thursday last that the whole increase was only $2,000 in the whole service. I say, sir, that the total expenditure upon Executive responsibility, unwarrantable, unlawful, and illegal, in that it was unwarranted, amounted last year to $104,786. Is that throwing dust in the eyes of the people. I call it stripping away the film that blinds them, and letting them see with that clear light that should shine on every public matter.

The hon. member endeavored to make a point by attacking my reference to the census in comparison with that of 1891. Surely he does not wish for any more explanation of that point. But I say again, sir, that I went back to that period to point out that the enumerators had to labor under difficulties which they did not have to contend with in 1901 or now. Was not that a sound argument?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Then why did you vote $28,000 in 1901?

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Why, sir, what a position! Do not my remarks apply perfectly to ten years ago. My argument applies if they passed $28,000 ten years ago. It ought to cost lees to-day because of the increased facilities over ten years ago. I went back to 1891 to get the ave-

mittee nor a member of this Legislature who knows better than I that we have far too many officials in the public service. We have enough, sir, to govern 2,000,000 people not alone 200,000. Is not that true? Perfectly true. In my opinion we would be far better governed than we are if we had fewer officials who were better paid to do their work.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Then why did you not do it?

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—If we were to do this we would be better off in every respect. Meanwhile, sir, we have to pander to the demands of unfortunate office-seekers. Every party knows that this is true. Everyone who was ever in power believes it. It is recognized, and has been recognized for years past, that it is true. For years, sir, we had the General Hospital under the management of a man who in his profession held the highest credentials. That gentleman, as far as I know, discharged his duty with credit to himself and satisfaction to the community. I now speak of Dr. Henry Shea. I know whereof I speak, because I was a member of a commission of an enquiry into the hospital, a vile attempt to sully the character of that gentleman, out of which he came as clean as a new pin.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—More than could be said for his patients.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—If that is so, I say, sir, that Doctor Shea was not to blame. Does the Hon. Minister mean to say that Doctor Shea was to blame? If he does, sir, then what reason could there be for his pensioning him at the rate of $1,800. It ill becomes the hon. Minister to throw a slur upon Dr. Shea in the face of the fact that he was the one to pension him at $1,800. Again, sir, I say that that gentleman filled that position with credit to himself and satisfaction to the community at a salary far below that which is now being given to the man who now fills that position. Is there any justification for the increase in two directions of the salary now given to Dr. Keegan. Dr. Keegan, as far as I know, is a thoroughly up-to-date physician. But if that is so, so was his predecessor in office and if his predecessor in office undertook those duties at $1,600 a year, by what line of reasoning do you give his successor $500 or $600 more. Dr. Shea is a gentleman crowned with a circle of 75 or 80 years upon his head. What did he do? He gave his services free to the Penitentiary and attended to the patients there. What is done in the present case? Not satisfied with increasing his stipend as physician to the Hospital he is paid $100 for walking a few yards to the Penitentiary. Is that throwing dust in the eyes of the people? I say admitting for the sake of argument that Dr. Keegan is in every respect equal in attainments to his predecessor, admitting that he is

superior in his attainments, is there any justification for the increase in two directions as you have done? Again, sir, Dr. Shea occupied for years a delapidated quarter of the Hospital; now the new physician comes into a palatial residence, and even if there were no increase he had a great advantage over his predecessor. I repeat, sir, once again, that there is no justification whatsoever for that increase, but, sir, not only do we find the same with reference to the resident physician, but also with the attending physicians. Does it mean that Dr. Campbell is any better than his predecessor, and Dr. Fraser is better than his predecessor?

Now, let us take the Department of Agriculture and Mines. I look over the list of officials in that department, and what do I find? I find, sir, that a large increase is accounted for here. I find, sir, an increase in connection with the Museum; there is a Mr. Gleeson appointed as an assistant at a salary of $750 a year. I have been in the old Museum scores and scores of times, and I defy any man to point out any duties that have to be performed, except by Mr. Howley, that is worth 750 cents a year, let alone $750. This mind you to only one salary. There is another assistant, a Mr. Snelgrove, also at $750 a year. What are his duties? To assist Mr. Gleeson up and down the stairs. There, sir, is $1,500 a year wrung out of the fishermen of this Colony, over whom the hon. minister was so pathetic. He spoke of the fishermen with tears almost running from his eyes, but he does not hesitate now, with one stroke of the pen, to despoil them of $1,500 a year, to provide a billet for these men. Why, the people were told during the election that there was nothing in the Museum but mummies, and now they appoint two men to take charge of these mummies.

Again, sir, I go a little further down the list, and I find a Mr. Bayly appointed as an assistant in the Crown Lands Office, at a salary of $1,020. Is that throwing dust in the eyes of the public? We are told in one breath that the civil servants are tumbling over one another, and now the Government comes in here and asks us to vote for another, at a salary of $1,020 a year. Consistency, thou art a jewel.

I do not knew, sir, exactly, what the population of the country is today, but I am afraid that we will find that there has been no material increase since the last census. It will be about 230,000, I take it. Well, if that be so, then the increase in the Estimates this year will mean one dollar per head for every man, woman and child in this country over last year. It is perfectly true that out of the $210,000 an amount of $50,000 for interest should be taken. I am prepared to allow this, but it does not affect the result very much. I could go on for the next hour, but I have no desire to talk

unnecessarily in this House. I would sooner sit down and listen to other people criticising. I did not intend at this stage to say anything this afternoon, but I was provoked by some of the observations of the minister in charge of this Bill.

SIR ROBERT BOND—I rise to enter a protest against the voting of the sum of $875 to the Magistrate at Grand Falls as the salary of that official. Grand Falls is in the district which I have the honor to represent, and is a place of growing importance, as hon. members are aware, but this vote of $875 to Mr. Fitzgerald, the Magistrate there, is totally unnecessary, and it is unjustifiable for the reason that before my Government went out of office Mr. Henry Burt, of Botwood, acted as Stipendiary Magistrate over a district which included Grand Falls, Botwood and several other places. For years Mr. Burt acted as Justice of the Peace and he was an official who had a long experience and was able to conduct in a most satisfactory manner the duties of his office. As I have said, Grand Falls was in his jurisdiction and there was no necessity whatever from a public standpoint for a second magistrate to be appointed in that place. To day you have two magistrates at Grand Falls, unless Mr. Burt's powers have been curtailed, and both these men have power to act as magistrates at that place. That is not proper. Mr. Fitzgerald was a defeated candidate at the last election but he is not the worse for that. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the Government wanted to do somethidg for him, but I submit that they might have done better in the interests of the Colony, than appoint him magistrate at a place where another man was already acting and thereby waste the amount that is now voted to him. It may be contended that Mr. Burt does not live there, but I know he would be delighted to go there, for at present he has really very little to do because you have taken away from him the important work of his office and given it to Mr. Fitzgerald at Grand Falls. I am not going to multiply words, Mr. Chairman, but I wish to enter my protest against this vote.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—I wish to say a few words in reply to what the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition has said in reference to Mr. Fitzgerald's appointment as Magistrate at Grand Falls. What my right hon. friend said in reference to Mr. Burt's duties at Botwood might have been true a few years ago, but it is not so to-day. Some years ago Botwood was a large place and a lumber company was carrying on a large business there. However, it fell back considerably, and in the meanwhile the Harmsworths began operations at Grand Falls. At that particular time Mr. Burt could manage to preside as magistrate at both places, but the work of the Harmsworths reached such large proportions, and the A. E. Reed Co. having also commenced operations on a large scale, it was found necessary to have a permanent magistrate at Grand Falls. Consequently Mr.

Fitzgerald was appointed to the position, and has performed his duties in a very satisfactory manner.

One of the difficulties that we always meet with in the administration of justice is the illegal sale of intoxicating liquors, and this is especially the case where a large number of men are working at an enterprise. We had that trouble in these places, and for that and other reasons we thought it necessary to have a magistrate appointed at Grand Falls.

Mr. Burt, during the past year or so, has been so ill in health that the Government considered the advisability of allowing him to retire, for he has been too ill to attend to the duties of his office.

SIR ROBERT BOND—Does not my hon. and learned friend know that what he has said amounts to an admission of the objection that I raised. He said that when Mr. Burt was appointed as Stipendiary Magistrate at Botwood the population there was much greater than it is to-day. As I have said, Mr. Burt still holds the position, with jurisdiction over Grand Falls, and, consequently, there are two magistrates there. Surely this is a good reason why Mr. Fitzgerald should be transferred to a place where his services are necessary.

I am sorry to learn that Mr. Burt is in ill health, but I do not think he was ill when Mr. Fitzgerald was appointed to the position. So far as I know he was in good health up to very lately, and there is no reason why Mr. Fitzgerald should have been appointed two years ago.

With regard to the floating population at Botwood, I assume that a justice of the peace would be able to do all the work there, for at the present time there is little or nothing to be done. I wish it to be understood that in himself I have no objection to Mr. Fitzgerald, and I have no doubt that the minister is correct when he states that he does his work in a satisfactory manner; but why not appoint him to some place where his services would be of use to the Colony?

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—I think the right hon. gentleman misunderstands the position. He is correct when he states that Mr. Burt did not fall into ill health till last year, but as the right hon. gentleman no doubt knows, it is impossible to get honorary Justices of the Peace to do effective work. The whole reason for the appointment of Mr. Fitzgerald was that the circumstances called for it. There are large crowds of men at Grand Falls as well as Bishops Falls and Botwood and there have been several crimes committed there that we do not usually have to contend with. As an instance, there was the big safe robbery at Grand Falls, and although every effort was made to capture the guilty party he has so far escaped. It is very important, therefore, to have a permanent man there for their services are constantly needed

and as the places grow in importance their presence will be more necessary than ever.

SIR R. BOND—I admit all that my hon. and learned friend has said, but he has not shown even yet why two magistrates should have power over the same jurisdiction. If these places are growing in importance why is it that Mr. Fitzgerald has been put at Grand Falls to relieve Mr. Burt of his duties there? Mr. Burt is a man of great experience in this work, while Mr. Fitzgerald is an entirely new man and probably knows less about law that any member of this House. This is not his fault, but it is certainly poor policy to put a recruit in the work in place of a man who has had the experience of a quarter of a century and who has performed his duties with much satisfaction.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—It is a matter of opinion, but I would say that I would not recommend Mr. Burt for the position because of his ill health. There is plenty of work to be done by the Magistrate at Grand Falls, in fact more than Mr. Butt could attend to unless he was in good health.

SIR ROBERT BOND—It is not a matter as to whom the minister would appoint, for Mr. Burt is already appointed. He is there already, and he has power to sit on the bench there. The position is not vacant, but if it were I should not think that a recruit should be sent to such a place where the responsibility is so great, and where there is so much work to be done.

MR. KENT—This matter in reference to Grand Falls and Botwood raises a very important question in connection with judicial districts. I referred to this question last session, and was told by the hon. the minister that steps would be taken before the House met again to deal with this question. The question of having judicial districts properly defined is of great need in this Colony, and should be undertaken as quickly as possible, so that there could be no question as to where or when a magistrate was exceeding his jurisdiction. It is quite clear that a magistrate has jurisdiction as justice of the peace over the whole Colony, but it is quite another thing to say that he has jurisdiction as a stipendiary magistrate. There are differences of opinion as to that, and that is why there is need of judicial districts. It is a serious question I submit. A question may arise any day as to whether a magistrate, sitting at any place except the actual settlements mentioned in his commission, has any jurisdiction whatever. I distinguish a stipendiary magistrate from a justice of the peace. A stipendiary magistrate is a purely stipendiary tribunal established with all the limitations of a statute appointment, and it may be a very serious question some day as to what territorially is the extent of the jurisdiction of a magistrate. I again bring this matter

before the notice of the Minister of Justice. I may say that during the short time that I occupied the position, the matter was engaging my attention. I drew the minister's attention to it last session, and I simply mention it again now.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—I do not think I promised anything along that line, as that aspect of the situation never occurred to me. If I remember there was some trouble about a magistrate stationed in a particular place having no special instructions or regulations under which he could visit other important settlements within their jurisdiction. The fact mentioned is of some importance and I would have taken the matter up except that I was out of the Colony from May to October, and since I came home I have been too busy to take it up. I can assure the hon. gentleman that no one has suffered and that no trouble has cropped up in that direction.

SIR R. BOND—I would like to ask my hon. and learned friend if he can tell me upon what authority justices of the peace are appointed in the Colony.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—They are simply appointed under the innate authority of the Crown, as it stood two or three centuries ago in England, as it was brought out here when Newfoundland was discovered and became a British Colony.

SIR R. BOND—I am not doing this for the purpose of embarassment, but I had considerable doubt as to the authority upon which we have been appointing justices of the peace in this Colony. I have looked up and tried to discover the authority, but could not find it. There is nothing in the Governor's letters patent, or in his commission, and I have not been able to find any statutory authority. It is an interesting point, and I would be glad of some information from my hon. friend.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—I agree that it is a very interesting question, but it never came before me. I have taken matters as I found them. The justices of the peace are appointed by the Governor in Council. It is enough for a man to get through 15 or 16 hours a day, without looking up those abstruse points.

SIR R. BOND—That may be perfectly true. I have thrown out the suggestion for the committee, and I think it is worthy of very serious consideration. I submit that it may become a question of vast importance.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—When it comes up we will deal with it. I told you that as soon as I had a moment's leisure I would look into it. It had stood for a couple of hundred years, and I think it will stand for another month or so.

MR. KENT—I would like to ask what is the reason for selecting one man for an increase in the Constabulary?

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—The other men get $800 and $100 for rent. This man lives outside the barracks and only gets $800, and is a senior officer. This is given to put him on the same level as Winsor and Dunn.

MR. CLIFT—A matter came under my notice the other day with regard to the firemen. The East and West End men have to pay house rent. They simply get their salary, but the firemen in the Central station get their salary and are provided with house. I think this matter ought be looked into and levelled up.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—I am glad my attention has been called to this. I will look the matter up and see if there is anything in it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

Mr. Chairman, from the Committee, reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and made some progress, passing certain resolutions, and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered, that this Report be received, and that the Committee have leave to sit again to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond gave notice of question.

Mr. Clapp gave notice of question.

Mr. Earle gave notice of question.

Mr. Roberts gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when this House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, March 2nd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, March 2.

House met at three of the clock in the afternoon.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Rev. E. Broughton, Rev. R. A. Penny and others of Greenspond, asking for some arrangement by which freight would be prevented from being landed from the coastal steamers on Sunday. Some of the coastal steamers are compelled to make port there on Sunday, and as they have usually only a short delay they land their freight at once; and this has been found to occasion a great deal of trouble and disorder. The House will remember that seven men were brought before the Court in St. John's not long ago for interfering with the landing of freight. They apparently had no realization of the serious nature of their conduct, and they at once pleaded guilty. The petitioners ask that the shipping and landing of freight in future on the Lord's Day be prohibited; and if any steamer arrive on Sunday at Greenspond she be compelled to remain until after twelve midnight, unless the captain deem it necessary to go to another safe harbor and return again. But

the same difficulty arises in connection with other ports. The Government has done its best to adjust the matter so as to prevent any cause of complaint. In the present case I ask that the petition be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary that an investigation may be made and such steps taken as may remove the grievance of the people of Greenspond.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the Rev. C. M. Stickings and 125 inhabitants of the South Side of Harbor Grace, asking for a sum of money for a road, which it is necessary to widen. The distance is about 19 miles, and for this they ask a grant of $140. The road in places is not safe; it is only about four feet above the water, and the sea washes the foundations away. The people desire to add a few feet to the south side of the road to widen it.

MR. SEYMOUR—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting that petition. I know the place, and this improvement is necessary to prevent it being even dangerous to life. It is especially dangerous in winter time, because of being so narrow. I hope the Government will be able to make this grant.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bonavista in relation to the construction of the branch railway in the vicinity of the town of Trinity. The petition sets out that the main line or trunk line passes within one and a half miles of Trinity town, and the nearest part of the trunk line is connected by a good road with Trinity. Petitioners state, in answer to the view of the supporters of the spur line, that it will be beneficial to all those who obtain their supplies from Trinity; they do not consider there will be any such advantage; and there will be a perpetual increase in the delay and expense of other places. Trinity at the present time is well served by the coastal steamers, and will be well enough served by the railway line passing within one and a half miles of it. I may say that there is no letter with this petition, and I do not quite understand it, unless there is some movement in Trinity against the construction of the spur line, and they have asked some of the people of Bonavista to join with them. I may say that it is a matter of public notoriety that the line has been surveyed into Trinity, that a considerable portion of the land has been paid for, and, in the ordinary course of affairs, the contractor will construct the line next year. I ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—I ask leave to present two petitions on the same subject—one from the Parish of Trinity East and the other from Catalina and vicinity. As my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has stated, this matter has

had the full consideration of the Government. Last year, at the urgent request of the people of Trinity, the Government directed that a survey of the proposed spur line be made, and later, when the contractor submitted a profile of the section of the line near Trinity, which profile included a spur line recommended by the Government Engineer, the survey was accepted. The Government gave very great consideration to the matter and the Government Engineer was directed to notify the contractors to proceed with the construction of the line into Trinity. I ask that these petitions be referred to the Executive Council.

MR. GRANT—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Trinity West in connection with the building of the spur line, protesting against the former petitions which are being presented against this line. Since I am informed that the Government have made arrangements for the building of this line, I don't need to say much on the subject. I might say that I am strongly in favor of the petition which I have presented because of the importance of Trinity and the fact that the harbor is open all the year round. I only ask now that the petition be read.

(Mr. Clerk read the petition.)

SIR R. BOND—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure indeed in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by Mr. Grant, the hon. member for Trinity. I know something of the locality from whence this petition emanates. Having represented the district of Trinity for several years I can speak for the necessity of bringing this spur line into Trinity now that the railway is passing into such close proximity to that important place. I have been informed—and I give the information for what it is worth—by residents of Trinity and the neighborhood, that these adverse petitions have been instigated by the employees of the contractor who have been diligently at work trying to create an opinion against the construction of this spur line. It seems to me that it is the duty of the Government to make inquiries into the matter now that I have mentioned it in this House. The contractor, under the contract entered into last year by this Legislature, was bound to complete this spur line to Trinity and if this be true he should be kept to his contract. I am advised that the objection of the contractor to this spur line is that it is going to be a costly piece of work. That is a matter with which the Legislature has nothing to do, because the contractor should have been fully informed as to the possibility of performing the work for the price stipulated. I think it would be a fatal mistake, now that this railway has been carried down so far, that the important town of Trinity should be ignored. The line terminating where it does would be of

little or no use to the inhabitants of Trinity proper because of its remoteness from the centre of trade, and I trust that in view of the fact that the Government have obtained the right of way, etc., that they will insist on the contractor performing his contract.

HON. PREMIER—In supporting the petition I should like to say that I entirely agree with the position raised by the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition so far as it goes ; but there does seem to be some confusion in relation to this spur line. How it has arisen or who is to blame I am entirely at a loss to know. All the Government know is that the contractor has surveyed it right into Trinity Harbor, and we have bought the right of way up to the site of the proposed station. An agitation was started. in Trinity because of a report that the line was not coming there ; while it is a fact that there are people in Trinity who last year were opposed to the line coming in there. They thought it would destroy the settlement, and cut it up ; that bringing the railway here and making a "Y" would destroy the beauty of the place ; others objected to the noise. Up to the present all we know is that in the ordinary course the contractor went down and surveyed into Trinity, and as far as the Government know it will be proceeded with. Probably one of the causes of the misunderstanding was that the contractor went on to Bonavista without going down to Trinity. When the attention of the Government was drawn to that fact, instructions were issued to proceed with the survey into Trinity. The argument was advanced that the line was near enough already to Trinity ; but any man who will go there and look at the situation as I did last year, will see that the real benefit to Trinity will be the bringing of that line right down to the harbor and connecting it with a deep water terminus. Then Trinity will become a distributing centre for the whole of Trinity Bay for freight and passengers. If this petition which has been presented has originated with the contractor, it would show that he did not properly appreciate his relations with the Government, and if that comes to the knowledge of the Government, he will be put right without any delay.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—I should like to say one or two words in support of the petition presented by Mr. Grant. As I have already said in presenting the former petitions, the Government gave its word some time ago that the line would be brought into Trinity. At that time I was not aware of a single dissenting voice in the district. I am convinced that the people who signed the petitions from Bonavista and the other places did so under a misapprehension, and that when the line is built they will be among the first to recognize its advantages. The pledge of the Government having been given, it is now too late to consider any pe-

titions except the one just presented by my hon. colleague, Mr. Grant.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from Jasper Reid and others of Miles Cove, Sunday Cove Island, in the electoral district of Twillingate, asking for $100 to replace a bridge which has been carried away.

Also a petition from H. W. Manuel and others of Loon Bay, asking for a sum of $200 to construct a bridge over South West Brook.

Also a petition from Thos. French and others of Tizzard's Harbor on the subject of telephone connection. Petitioners set out that Tizzard's Harbor is a place where considerable business is done, and they ask that it be connected by telephone with Moreton's Harbor, where there is a telegraph station.

Also a petition from Wm. Knight and others of Moreton's Harbor on the subject of a fog alarm on Cape Bonavista and Cabot Island. Petitions have already been presented on this subject, and it is unnecessary to remark on them. I have much pleasure in giving the prayers of these petitions my hearty support, and I ask that they be referred to the department to which they relate.

MR. ROBERTS—I have much pleasure in supporting these petitions, particularly that one asking for a fog alarm.

CAPT. WINSOR—I have much pleasure in supporting the petition for a fog alarm, and I am glad to see that the people of Green Bay at last recognize that Bonavista Bay was not fairly treated by the late Government.

Ordered: That these petitions be received and referred to the departments to which they relate.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions, which were read a first time, as follows:

Civil Government .	$168,072.28
Administration of Justice	180.912.52
Pension	2,186.00

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved that the House concur with the Committees therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

RT. HCN. SIR R. BOND—To ask the Hon. the Colonial Secretary if he can state when the Trinity Spur Line will be constructed.

Also, if the Railway Contractor has objected to building it, and to table all correspondence between the Government and the Contractor on the matter.

Also, if any amount has been paid for a right of way in connection with the Spur Line.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—In In reply to the right hon. gentleman, I may say I am unable to state the exact date when the Trinity Spur Line will be constructed. The Government have notified the Contractor to commence the work as soon as possible. No objection has been raised by the Contractor. The correspondence with reference

to the Spur Line is tabled herewith. The right-of-way to the proposed site of the station has been paid for.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to state the names of the parties who comprise:

1. The Terra Nova Lumber Company,
2. The Labrador Syndicate, Ltd.
3. The Bay du Nord Corporation,
4. The Hamilton Pulp and Lumber Company,
5. The Gander River Pulp and Lumber Company.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, the information is being prepared.

MR. CLAPP—To ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing all amounts paid Captain William Winsor for services on Labrador and elsewhere since the present Government assumed office.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS tabled the information.

MR. CLAPP—To ask the Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail all amounts paid under Civil and Criminal Prosecutions from Feb. 1st, 1910, to date, giving names and dates of every such payment.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, in the account of expenses of civil and criminal prosecutions there are a very large number of small items, and if the hon. member wishes to have the whole detailed account, I am afraid it cannot be prepared under a week. For instance, there are numerous items, such as travelling expenses of witnesses, payment of jurors, and similar small items. If the hon. member is desirous of getting particular information, I think the best way would be for him to go down to the Department of the Colonial Secretary and examine the accounts and mark off the information that he wants. In that case we will probably be able to table the information to-morrow afternoon. If he wants to know the amounts paid under civil and criminal prosecutions, with details of names and dates, I am afraid it will take a week to complete.

MR. CLAPP—I am prepared to wait a week for it.

MR. CLAPP—To ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail the amounts paid in connection with the Royal Commission on West Indian Trade, including amounts paid in connection with the attendance of the Minister before the Commission.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I have no record of any payments being made through the finance department.

MR. CLAPP—To ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the table of the House a statement, showing in detail all

amounts paid to all or either of the following: Messrs. A. H. Seymour, J. F. Downey, and R. J. Devereux, for any purpose whatever since the present Government assumed power, giving in each case the date of payment of each amount and the purposes for which each such payment was made.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—That statement is also being prepared.

MR. EARLE—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail, with names of parties, dates and purposes of each payment, all money expended during the twelve months ending Feb. 28, 1911, in connection with the Steam Mail Service for the District of Fogo, and what, if any, tenders were received for the said service, what tender was accepted, the amount of subsidy paid, and when and upon what conditions the same is paid.

Also, to lay on the table of the House the agreement under which said service is conducted, and all correspondence relating to the said agreement or to the said service prior or subsequent to the acceptance of the tender.

Also, to state why the said service was extended to ports in Bonavista Bay, south of Wesleyville, and ports in Trinity Bay and Bay de Verde.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, I beg to lay upon the table copies of the tenders which were received last year in connection with the Fogo mail service. The tender of the Newfoundland Produce Co. was accepted. The contracts are now ready for signature, and will be submitted in the course of a few days for ratification. The Government arranged with the contractors without affecting the service, and without additional expense, to extend the service referred to in Bonavista Bay, Trinity Bay, and Bay de Verde. I have asked the Postmaster General to furnish me with a statement of the payments referred to by the hon. member, and hope to table same at the next sitting.

MR. ROBERTS—To ask the Hon. Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to vote a sum of money at this session so that material can be purchased for Bait Depots asked for by the Fishermen's Protective Union, which offers to erect those depots by free labor.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The whole question of the erection of Bait Depots, and the localities of the same, is under the consideration of the Government. The Government hope that under the agreement with Trefethen and Lord, five large cold storage plants will be erected, and will serve in the districts where established as bait depots, for the sale and supply of bait on a large scale to our fishermen. In addition to these, the Government hope to arrange for

the establishment of others. We have been voting for years, and have this session voted the same sum, namely $5,000, for cold storage for bait; but, by reason of its not being availed of, it becomes a dropped balance.

MR. ROBERTS — To ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail the amount expended on account of Railway Arbitration fees, legal fees, disbursements, printing, and other expenses, with names of parties and amounts paid in each case, from July 1st, 1910, to date.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is being prepared. It will be three or four days before I can table it, as the books are being used in answering other questions.

MR. ROBERTS — To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a copy of all contracts made for Coastal Steam Service since the present Government assumed power, with all correspondence relating thereto.

Also, a statement showing the amount of subsidy, or for any other purpose, in each case, to whom and for what purpose.

Also, to state whether each of the said services were carried out by the steamers calling at each port in the schedule, and, if not, what ports were omitted, and when and how often and why they were so omitted.

HON. COL. SECRETARY — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, I beg to say that the contracts to which the hon. member refers to will be tabled in the course of a few days for ratification by the Legislature. The contracts will show the amount of the subsidy paid in each case. The Postmaster General has been asked to report as to whether any ports were omitted last year, giving the particulars asked for by the hon. member, and I hope to table his report at the next meeting of the House.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. GEAR—Mr. Chairman, before going into the next vote, I would like to ask the Minister if it is the intention of the Government to complete the light houses commenced in my district. There were four started by the late administration—one at Flat Islands, where the Home went ashore; one at Mortier Point, one at Burin Island, and one at Lamaline. Money was voted by this House, and they were commenced, but nothing has since been done. I should like to know the intention of the present administration on the point.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—They will be completed this year.

MR. EARLE—I would like to say a few words in regard to the vote for the light at Change Islands. It is a surprise to me that money has been voted the past few years for this light and there is no light there. I petitioned for it three or four times, and the matter was sent down, but nothing has been done since then. The Inspector came down and approved of the location. He talked the matter over with the captain of the Clyde, and there is no doubt at all but that this light is wanted. I hope the Government will look into this matter and see that this light is finished forthwith.

MR. CLIFT—I would like to know if any exploration of our coal areas is now going on.

HON. THE PREMIER—The Government is not doing anything at present.

HON. SIR R. BOND—What is the result from the work of the English contractors who were expected to develop the areas at Bay St. George.

HON. THE PREMIER—Nothing has been done. A contract was entered into and approved of by the Legislature, but nothing came of it. A Mr. Cooper, of London, was the contractor, and he was highly recommended by a large financial institution as being a reputable business man. He disposed of the contract, but the parties did not carry it out, and so it fell through. The property has now come back to us.

HON. SIR R. BOND—I would like very much if the Premier would kindly inform me if there is any truth as to anthracite being found on the Labrador.

HON. THE PREMIER—We know nothing officially.

MR. CLIFT—This item for $300 for mineral and other assays, what does that mean?

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—That is for the regular work of the Department; the same amount has been voted for years past.

MR. CLIFT—I would like to know whether the Department of Agriculture and Mines pays for all surveys made, or at least for all assays, regardless whether the people are able to pay themselves.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—We do not pay for every assay. If the parties are not able to pay then we have the assaying done for them.

MR. CLIFT—I would like to know why there is an increase in the vote for travelling expenses in connection with the Marine and Fisheries Department, and if that vote is intended to cover all the travelling expenses.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is the intention.

MR. CLIFT—The Minister of Marine and Fisheries visited Canada in connection with the Solling process. His expenses were charged to the vote for the encouragement of the herring fishery. Now, it

seems to me that if we vote a sum of money for the encouragement of the herring industry, or for any other particular object, it is highly improper to expend this money for travelling expenses, or for any other purpose than for which the money was voted. By reference to the accounts, I find that, out of the vote under the Herring Fisheries Encouragement Act, the sum of $952.35 was paid to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Inspector O'Reilly for travelling expenses to Canada in connection with the Solling process. I think that a very improper proceeding. If the Minister incurred any extra expense it should be charged to his own department, and shown in that vote, and not in another. We have no way of following these votes if they are not charged to the accounts to which they properly belong, and I object strongly to this method. The same applies to the accounts in the Department of Agriculture and Mines. The Bonus Accounts do not properly come under the Land Clearing Act any more than travelling expenses come under the Herring Fishery Act.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—In the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries I beg to say that out of the sum of $950, $750 was paid to Inspector O'Reilly, whose chief object was for the encouragement of the herring industry. Only $200 was paid to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. CLIFT--It is not the amount I object to, but the principle.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Insp. O'Reilly incurred most of that vote. It was a special thing altogether.

MR. CLIFT—Then there is a sum of $753.49 paid to Mr. J. H. Dee for services and expenses. Was that in connection with the herring?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—In connection with herring and lobster protection service in Placentia and Fortune Bays.

MR. KENT—In addition to the information given by the hon. minister I would like to ask for further information. We have been informed that the amounts of $952 and $753, amounting to over $1,700 have been spent during the past year for travelling expenses for the encouragement of the herring industry. These, I take it, were evidently for special commissions, and for special purposes. If that be so I think that this Committee should have before it the reports which these people have furnished to the Government. I presume their work was embodied in a report. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries visited Canada and the United States for the purpose of developing the herring fishery, or rather, I should say, in connection with the Solling process, whereby the development of our herring would show this Committee what has been accomplished.

HON. THE PREMIER—Just a few words in fuller explanation of this charge for travelling expenses. It seems to me immaterial as to which account they are charged. As has been pointed out, $750 of this amount was spent by Inspector O'Reilly, who, in his capacity as Herring Inspector, was merely continuing that work when he went out of the country. He, with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, visited Montreal, Gloucester and wherever herring was in demand, and they came back here and gave us a full report of their work and this report was tabled last session and will be found in the Journal of the last session. The report was signed by both gentlemen, and the amount expended will be amply repaid by the benefits which will ensue. When I was in England in 1909, Sir William MacGregor, who happened to be there too, advised me very strongly to go to Aberdeen, and see the various methods used in treating the fish. At that time, unfortunately, I had no time to spare, but Inspector O'Reilly, who was in England at the time, after his work was completed, went there. He found them using the Solling process, which process was known practically all over the world. I got into communication with Captain Solling, who was the representative of the Danish Government in London. He came here free of cost to the Colony. He went to Bay of Islands and instructed the people how to use his method. He also addressed the Board of Trade, and they were struck with its possibilities. The method was adopted by many of our people, and we read in the daily papers of shipments of fresh fish preserved by the Solling process arriving every day. During the last two years all the leading grocers have been selling this kind of fresh fish. I sent Earl Grey, the Governor General of Canada, through Ins. O'Reilly, some samples of herring and cod wrapped in the Solling paper. He was so delighted with it that he sent for some more and distributed it throughout the leading clubs in Canada. The samples of cod were put in Solling paper, and he said that it was the first time in seven years that he had really ate codfish and enjoyed it. That fish was in the paper for a fortnight before it was eaten. The adoption of new processes such as this should help to open new avenues for disposing of our fish. The present increase in this department is trifling. Last year the vote was $960 and now it is increased by $700. One new inspector has been appointed, namely, Mr. McFarlane, boiler inspector. His salary has been well earned for he has returned more than the amount paid to him in fees to the Government. It was impossible for Inspector McLoughlan to do all the work of his office, for there are now between two and three thousand boilers in the country to inspect, and he could not

inspect half of them. Mr. McFarlane has to be voted travelling expenses, but we get the fees that result from his work and by giving him his travelling expenses we obtain the revenue that he collects.

MR. CLIFT—I am sure the Committee is obliged for the explanation that has been given as to the amounts paid to the inspectors of boilers and to Mr. O'Reilly, and we appreciate it. However, the explanation that has been given does not get over the fact that the amounts paid Mr. O'Reilly have been charged to the wrong account. Further, we do not know from the way in which the amounts are set forth whether the Minister, Mr. Piccott, received the greater part of the amount or whether Mr. O'Reilly was paid more than that gentleman, but however that may be, I submit that the whole amount paid is charged to the wrong account. The amount should appear in the vote for travelling expenses of ministers, and, if there has been any over-expenditure, it should go into the supplemental account.

With regard to the amount paid Mr. J. H. Dee for services, I think that there should be a report tabled to show that the expenditure has been justified. I do not know if such a report has been tabled, but I have never heard of it.

HON. PREMIER—I think the hon. gentleman will find the report of Mr. Dee if he will look at the Report of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries of 1909. That is my recollection of the matter. I have seen this year's Report which is now in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and it will be tabled here in the course of a few days.

I would also like to say a word or two in reply to the criticisms that have been made in relation to the charges in question. When I tell the Committee that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries proceeded to Bay of Islands, and made purchases of herring, and had them put up in Solling paper, and took them to Montreal, and then went on to Gloucester and various cities in Canada and the States, and made experiments in relation to the sale and exportation of herring, the members will agree, I think, that the expenditure was properly charged to the account for the encouragement of the herring fishery. It certainly seems to me to be very germane to the herring industry and proper to make the charge to that account. If they had dealt only with the codfishery it might not have been properly charged, but even then we would have had numerous precedents for doing so. From a book-keeper's standpoint, and technically speaking, there may be some ground for objection, but the amount was charged to a vote that was in credit, and I do not think that any substantial objection can be made against charging it to the vote for the encouragement of the herring fishery.

MR. CLIFT—My objection was more against the manner in which

the amount was shown. The sum was spent in travelling expenses, and should have appeared as such, and we should know whether or not the Minister exceeded the amount voted for travelling. If he has exceeded the amount, then the excess should not be charged to another and different vote, for it is clearly wrong to do so and misleading to the House. I agree that it is as broad as it is long, for it all comes out of the revenue, but my contention is that it does not show the exact amount of the Minister's travelling expenses, and that is the point that we want to get at.

MR. CLAPP—I would like to make reference to a petition from Rev. J. T. Richards and others, asking that a ferry be placed at St. Margaret's Bay. This petition was presented by me last year, and in doing so I read a letter from Mr. Richards, in which he stated the necessity for it, and I hoped that the House would give the letter the attention it deserved, as coming from a gentleman who had spent from ten to fifteen years on the coast, and knew how much need there was for a ferry to be placed there. Everybody knows the hardships which the people of the district have to contend with, for they are denied many of the advantages and privileges which have been given to other districts. I took it upon myself, before leaving for England last year, to call on Mr. Harris of the Board of Works office and explain matters to him, and he referred me to the Colonial Secretary's office. I did as Mr. Harris suggested, and prefaced my remarks to the minister by saying that it was not a question of politics, and I told him of the need of the ferry and the hardships which the rev. gentleman and the people entertained through not having it. He partly promised me that he would do something, but, on the whole, his answer was an evasive one. When I returned from England I called and asked what had been done, and I was informed that the matter was still under the consideration of the Government. So far nothing has been done in the matter, and this is almost a crime, for the reason that other things of less importance than this are carried through, whereas this is not, and it is not to the credit of the Government that they have to look round for the small sum of $50 to carry out the wishes of the people of that place. I ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary if any decision has been arrived at, and if it is the intention of the Government to put it there or not.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is only due to the hon. gentleman to have the question put by him answered. The position is this, that the petition referred to by him, with a number of others from different parts of the Island, is now under the consideration of the Government. We have not absolutely refused any of them, but, as far as we can, we shall carry out the

wishes of the people. If that petition were the only one to be considered, it would be quite easy to say "yes" to it; but it is only one out of a large number from every district. I can sympathise with the hon. member for St. Barbe, and I know that the people of his district have very poor facilities. I assure him that if it can possibly be done it will be.

MR. CLAPP — The matter has been under the consideration of the Government for twelve months now, and I have received nothing but evasive answers up to the present time. I am going to fight for the rights of St. Barbe as long as I have breath in my body, for my district is not given proper justice. I would like the Hon. Premier to walk with me through the district, and he would see that the people were under many disadvantages. It is a pity that this request for a ferry is denied them, but this is what usually happens in every department. Fortune Bay and Fogo are to be given mail steamers, but where is St. Barbe? Nothing is done for the district, but I hope the day will soon come when it will have its needs properly attended to by the Government in power.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask the hon. the Colonial Secretary what subsidy is paid for the mail service between Bell Island and Portugal Cove.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—$2,800.

MR. KENT—The vote last year was only $1,800.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—No, $3,500.

HON. MIN. FINANCE—It is a different service now.

MR. KENT—What is the present subsidy?

HON. MIN. FINANCE — $2,800.

MR. KENT—I understand tenders were asked for a service between Bell Island, Portugal Cove, and Kelligrews, twice a day. That was the service called for. And the estimate of $2,800 was made for that service. Now that service has never been carried out. The original service which $1,800 would have paid for is the same service in force to-day. The new contract, if there is a contract, or correspondence forming a contract, would call for a service calling at three ports twice a day, and connecting with the mails each day. Personally I do not know whether such a service is practical or not. But men on Bell Island acquainted with the circumstances say that it can never be carried out. The fact remains that the service called for, and for which the $2,800 was paid, is not the service actually carried out. The Euphrates has been substituted for the Progress, and she is a little larger boat, but that is all. There is no freight service between Bell Island and Portugal Cove, and there is no service at all to Kelligrews.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—I might say for the hon. gentleman's information that the contractors could not run their boat to Kelligrews because they were unable to land at the old wharf. Last year, however, the Government built a new wharf, which has a sufficient depth of water at its head to make it safe for the Euphrates to land her passengers and freight there. It is the Government's intention to instruct the contractors to take up the service there as soon as the ice moves off.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, this raises another question in connection with this service. I understand that there has been spent some $3,000 or $4,000 on the wharf at Kelligrews. At the time of making the contract for it, both parties must have known this wharf would not be ready for a year, and arranged for the service accordingly. If you look at the condition of the public wharf at Bell Island, the accommodation the public there have for their trade and business, you can see that that money would have been much better spent on building a wharf on the beach at Bell Island. The present wharf is exceedingly antiquated. A large sum has been spent on it which is absolutely thrown away. If the money spent on the Kelligrews wharf, and the $1,200 wasted on the Bell Island wharf, were expended on a good wharf at Bell Island, you would have an effective service. At Bell Island I have seen two steamers loaded with freight and three craft waiting for their turn. One of the steamers was not able to get in because there was not sufficient depth of water. The wharf was littered with goods that had been landed, and 500 men were waiting on the wharf on a Saturday night to get their goods for Sunday. If the people of Bell Island had the control of their own money they would allocate it usefully. Another cause for complaint is that a man was sent over from St. John's, paid out of the grant for the wharf, to inspect the repairs. That was money thrown away. There was no necessity whatever for Mr. Vinicombe to inspect it. There are competent carpenters, wharf-builders and mechanics of all kinds at Bell Island, and I know myself numbers of them who would gladly have taken the job, men of the utmost integrity. I think that if money is to be spent on building wharves for the improvement of the service, it ought to be spent at the Bell Island end. The Kelligrews wharf will serve no useful purpose whatsoever. In order to make it useful you will have to expend three or four times as much more.

HON. THE PREMIER — Mr. Speaker, the intention of the Government was to give the Bell Island people a good service. The matter was brought up in this House, and it was reported that the steamer on that service was not what she should be, and it was thought that by calling for tenders we should

get a better steamer, and send her to Kelligrews as well, and so a good service would be brought about. I am satisfied that when the wharf is finished all will be well. At present, if you want to go to Bell Island, you have to hire a carriage and drive to Portugal Cove ; it may be raining or snowing or blowing a gale of wind. It takes you another hour and a half, and if you are alone it costs you a lot of money. You cannot always get out with the mail man. But if you have the steamer calling at Kelligrews you can get out there by the train for about sixty cents, in less time, and you get aboard and cross to the Island in the steamer in a cabin, with proper protection. There was little protection on the old steamer ; passengers had practically to go on deck. When tenders were called for, we had one at $2,800 and the next was $5,000 ; and the contract was given the lowest tender. It was made clear to the contractor that he had to go to Kelligrews ; but it was found that the wharf up there was not sufficient ; the water was not deep enough for the steamer. The whole thing was done with a bona fide desire to accommodate the people of Bell Island. As regards the work done in the district last year, it is true Mr. Vinicombe was appointed to inspect, but not entirely for Bell Island. He was building works at half a dozen other places as well. He was recommended for this work on account of his special fitness. He has built many wharves in the past, and he did good work last season. If there is still further work required at Bell Island, there is no reason why it should not be done. It is true that the mail service is not exactly the service that was tendered for ; but an alternative service is carried on, which is just as expensive in every particular ; just as much coal is burnt ; just as much wages paid. If that service had been tendered for, we would not have got it for a dollar less than what we are paying. It must be remembered that the train connection at Kelligrews means more passengers and more freight to that little boat. If you can advertise a service to Bell Island without having to drive to Portugal Cove in all kinds of weather, and pay $4, more people would go there. That was what made the arrangement attractive to the Government—the railway connection at Kelligrews. Thousands of men from all over Conception Bay go to Bell Island to work. What an advantage it would be to these men to connect with the train twice a day. They take the boat at Kelligrews, and for a few cents they are at their work. Now, if they want to get on to Bell Island, they have to come into St. John's, hire a carriage to the Cove, and take the steamer from there. You can see them every day, as many, sometimes, as seven men in one waggon, going into the Cove. I am sure a service of this kind would commend itself to my hon.

friend, Mr. Kent. It was with a desire to give his constituents, among others, an up to date service that the change was made. We looked for a cheap and effective service, and we have it. I cannot myself understand how the parties contrive to put on that boat for $2,800 a year. As a matter of fact, Mr. Neal, a fair contractor, gave us his tender for $5,000.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I think the Prime Minister has entirely missed my point. The point to which I desired to draw the attention of the House is that the contractors are performing a different service to that they contracted for. The service they contracted for was a more circuitous service than they are performing. I do not think that the matters which the Prime Minister referred to are at all pertinent or relevant to the matter which I have brought up. My point was, whether the service would be better if better accommodation were provided at Bell Island, Kelligrews, Broad Cove, and Portugal Cove. This is not the service which the contractor is performing at the present time. I think that all parties, if they had made enquiries at all, might have known the conditions before the contract was made. It is unfair to other tenderers to alter the service and continue with the same contract. As to the men leaving Bell Island on Saturday evening to go to their homes, it is well known that both the steamers Euphrates and Progress are available to go up the Bay and take the men to their homes. They have not to go to St. John's at all. They go right to their own doors in the steamers. And on Sunday evening the steamer calls round and takes them back to the Island. Mr. Vinicombe was sent over from St. John's. I don't know what his qualifications are for the building of wharves. I can only speak of results as I found them, and which were anything but satisfactory to the people of Bell Island or creditable to the Government. I have asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the returns of the expenditure upon this wharf, which he has given me, and it shows an expenditure of $1,200. Now, the returns themselves are not satisfactory. In the first place it is within the knowledge of all members of this Committee that certain formalities have to be gone through in connection with expenditures such as that on Bell Island wharf. In these returns which I have here these formalities have not even been attempted to be complied with. The allocation has been made in the name of James Vinicombe, who, in his returns for an expenditure of $200, annexed vouchers for about $60, including labor. The other certificates at the foot, one of which is to the effect that the work has been satisfactorily performed under a superintendent, have not been signed, but stamped with a rubber stamp with the name "James R. Bennett." There is

another certificate which is supposed to be signed by a resident of repute. This has not been signed, and the same stamp has been put on that one. There is a third certificate which states that the people have received the amounts after respective names; that is also stamped with the same name. It has not been audited by the Auditor General, nor are any other of the requirements of the Audit Act complied with. There is a statement which purports to be a voucher, but is not. It simply states that 100 sticks were bought from Ambrose Jeans for $9.00, and is signed by James Vinicombe. There is a sum of $51.40 included in the $266.44 which does not appear in the returns at all. Personally, I don't know, and can't gather what it is for. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that these returns are not satisfactory. I don't wish in any way to say that there is anything improper about them, but as far as I can gather from them there is nothing to show that the object of the allocation has been performed, and certainly the result in the wharf at Bell Island is no evidence that the work for which this money was allocated has actually been done. If this money was paid, them it was a wilful and unjustifiable expenditure of public monies. If the money had been properly expended a very fair addition might have been made to the wharf, which would have made it a little better than it is at present. About two or three years ago an addition was made to it extending it about twenty feet. I have seen, as I said before we adjourned, two steamers and three schooners, loaded with supplies, waiting their turn to land them at the wharf, and at the same time the wharf was filled up with other materials. There is no room on that wharf for the business of the Island, and I think the expenditure which has been made on the Kelligrews wharf might have been used with much better effect on Bell Island, where a thoroughly good wharf might have been built. The difference in cost to the people of Bell Island coming to and from St. John's between going round by Kelligrews and taking the train to St. John's and going to St. John's via Portugal Cove is not as great as would appear. A party of three or four can leave St. John's and drive to Portugal Cove for a dollar each. You can't do it less via Kelligrews, and, although it is quite possible that if a first-class service were arranged between Kelligrews and Bell Island, a number of people would avail themselves of it; still I think quite a number would prefer the Portugal Cove route. The steamer service, under the conditions that exist, I have no fault to find with. What I object to is making a contract for one service to go back to the old service and allow the contract for the larger service to remain in force, especially when the conditions which existed and prevented the carrying out of the service by

way of Kelligrews were known to every person concerned. It looks as if this service was being carried out for the purpose of giving a contract to the supporters of the Government; I don't say it is, but that is the impression it gives. The position as it existed was that a company of private citizens, both here and on Bell Island, had for some years been running the mail service. Last year the contract was changed, and a new steamer and new service were advertised for. It was run for a week or so and then abandoned. It is not fair to compare the tenders received on that notice with those that would have been received if the service advertised for had been carried out. The Premier has said that there were two tenders for this service—one from the present contractors, for whom I think Mr. Frank McNamara is the the agent; the other from a company of which Mr. George Neal is the agent. One was for $2,800 and the other for $5,000; but the service which Mr. Neal carried out before cost $1,800. Mr. Neal may have had an idea of what would be required when making his tender, and of the difficulties which would have to be overcome in the conduct of the service to Bell Island. The conditions were such that the present contractors, after making one or two trips, had to abandon the service. But what I want to find fault with is the fact that the service rendered is not the service tendered for.

MR. CLIFT—I wish to make a few observations with reference to the Money Order business of the Colony, and I am sure that everybody is pleased to see that there is an increase in the amount of business done by the department. My reason for speaking is that I think some further facility might be given in the matter of issuing money orders, for there can be no reason, as far as I can see, why a money order should not be issued as readily as an express order. Now it is impossible to buy a money order after four o'clock, and after that hour you are compelled to buy an express order. Why can't money orders be sold at all times? I notice one improvement lately, and that is that the banks will accept them as they would accept a cheque, and I think that everything further should be done to facilitate the purchase of money orders, especially when we are in competition with an express company. It will be a great convenience to the public and will be profitable to the department, for a large amount of business in the way of transmission is now done by the express company, and I think the Government should put the department on the same footing.

SIR ROBERT BOND—I would also like to ask the Colonial Secretary if the express company have made the returns for the past year called for under the Act. They are expected under the Act to make returns showing the amount of business done in connection with the

transmission of money. I would just like to know if they have been furnished.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—I think there is a great deal in the contention of the hon. member for Twillingate. Mr. Clift, and I feel sure that the Government will be only too pleased to take the matter up and see if they can get over the difficulty. It is quite true that the post office is in competition with the express company, and it is very desirable that the service should be as popular and give as valuable service as the express company. It was for this reason I took up with the Postmaster General last year the question of the banks accepting money orders with deposits in the same way as express orders. Formerly they had to be taken to the post office and initialed, and then taken to the bank. The Bank of Montreal is now a sort of clearing house for money orders, and they can now be deposited like certified cheques or express orders. I think that members of this Committee will be very glad to know that the business of the Money Order office increased very largely the past year, as will be seen from the Report of the Postmaster General. With regard to the returns from the express company, I presume these are part of the returns called for under the contract.

MR. CLIFT—No, they are called for under a Special Act.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—I will look into it.

MR. CLIFT—Speaking of competitions between the two services, one would naturally suppose that members of the House of Assembly, for instance, would patronize the post office if they wanted to transmit any money. I have known members to pass the post office and go to the express office and get an express order.

SIR ROBERT BOND—I wish to say a word or two, and it is this: I know the great difficulty of getting some people out of antiquated methods. During my tenure of office I was continually trying to move the Postal Department in the direction to which Mr. Clift has called attention, and also in another direction. We should not only compete with the Reid Nfld. Company in the money order business, but we should also be great competitors in the express parcel business. I have over and over again urged on the Postmaster General the necessity of bringing the parcel post department up to date, and to bring down the price of parcel post for the public by greater competition between .the Government Parcel Post Department and the Express Office of the Reid Nfld. Company. I remember on one occasion getting the reply: "Why, we can scarcely now accommodate our mails." My reply was, instanter, this: "It is only for you to apply to the Government to secure all the accommodation you need. If you have too much to fill one car, and you need two or a half dozen, the con-

tractor is bound to supply you with these cars." We ought to be able to do that business far cheaper than the Reid Nfld. Co., and we should derive a large revenue in that direction.

HON. THE PREMIER—I am in entire accord with what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition. I agree with him that a much larger revenue could be obtained in this direction without any additional expense. There is no reason why every mail going out on a train or steamer might not contain a considerable number of parcels, all of which would mean revenue for the Colony, and would not cost the Colony one cent more as regards its carriage or delivery. That matter will no doubt be taken up by the Colonial Secretary's department, to which it specially belongs. In relation to the point raised by Mr. Clift, I am also in entire agreement with him that every facility should be given as regards the utilization of the postal money order service. Now the rule obtains to-day, and has been going on for a number of years, that the office closes at four o'clock. There is no reason why it should not be kept open until six o'clock, and in the busy season it might be kept open even later, in order to accommodate the public. Every postal order means revenue for the Colony, and I see no reason why a postal order business might not be done by telegraph through the various offices all over the Colony. In that way we could successfully compete with any competitors. If the telegraph offices worked in conjunction with the postal department, there is no reason if, for instance, a man at Bay of Islands who wants $100 or $20 sent, why he should not be able to go to a telegraph office and have it forwarded without any additional cost. That would bring in considerable revenue to both departments.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, regarding the post office at Sydney. Last year I drew the attention of the Committee to this office. Since then I have had an opportunity of seeing it again, and there has been no improvement. I think the post office at Sydney and the accommodation provided is utterly inadequate for the work being done. It is simply a little caboose or box on the wharf at Sydney, in which almost the whole foreign mail, except the little that comes direct, is handled, and the clerk, Mr. Shano, when engaged in sorting mail, has not room to turn around. I think there are 250 or 300 sections to be provided for, and the mail must be distributed in this small place. Any members passing through Sydney and seeing the office must have felt ashamed of the accommodation provided. I again bring this matter to the notice of the Colonial Secretary that he may make such arrangements as are necessary to meet the requirements of this office. The man himself is overworked. He should have an assistant. I am not certain whether

there is one assistant there or not, but if there is there should be another, because the amount of work is so great that they simply cannot overtake it. The same remarks apply to the mail clerk on the Bruce, Mr. Gushue. The accommodation provided for him is in need of great improvement.

MR. MOULTON—It was only a few days ago I was at Sydney and while speaking to Mr. Shano, the mail clerk there, he gave me to understand that he was overworked, and I believed him, especially in winter time when the Bruce is detained. I brought the matter to the attention of the Government, and I think it is the intention to give Mr. Shano some help and to enlarge the post office there.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—It is quite true what the member for St. John's East has said, and also what Mr. Moulton has said. The matters are now being dealt with.

MR. KENT—I am glad to hear it.

SIR ROBERT BOND—I should like to say a word in connection with the recent issue of postage stamps. Hitherto the American Bank Note Company manufactured all our stamps, and, though somewhat expensive, the work was excellent. I make no complaint concerning the last issue, but I think it must be recognized as very much inferior to former issues. It is very desirable to have a first-class stamp, as good engraving increases the value to collectors, and very much money is made the world over from stamps purchased by collectors. Now the value of the stamps depends in a very marked degree upon the engraving, and I think the Government must admit that these stamps are of a very inferior quality.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—Last year the Government decided to issue a set of colonization stamps to commemorate the three hundredth anniversary of our entrance into the British Empire, and it was decided to give the order to a British firm, instead of patronizing an American firm. There is no question that the American Bank Note Company do good work, though one objectionable feature is that they place their imprint on the top of each stamp. I saw that commented on very adversely in the British newspapers. The stamps last year were printed by Messrs. Whitehead, Morris & Co., who have been printing the Government debenture bonds for many years, and they claim to be able to do good work as any other firm. Their work in connection with the debenture bonds is certainly excellent. They were given a very short time to prepare these stamps, and I understand almost a year is required to properly design, engrave, and print them. They claim that if they had the usual time these stamps would have been as good as those printed by any other company. However, I agree with the hon. gentleman

that the issue was not successful. The reason we gave them the work was on account of this being a British Colony we thought the work should be done by a British firm.

MR. EARLE—I would like to say a word in reference to the coastal service in Fogo district. In reply to a question in regard to the Fogota as to why the service was extended south of Wesleyville into Bonavista and Trinity Bays, I was told that the Government effected this by an arrangement with the contractor and without any additional expense. There may not have been any money paid for the extended service, but I notice on looking at the Estimates that whereas last year the subsidy was $17,500 it is now $18,500.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—The explanation is that $17,500 was paid from the first of May until the end of December, but the Government decided that a couple of trips should be made in January and the extra thousand was paid for that.

MR. EARLE—I am very glad that no expense was incurred, but the reply to my question went on to say, "And without affecting the service." I say, Mr. Chairman, that it does affect the service a good deal. Now I have no complaint to make with regard to the boat. She is a great deal better than anything we have had in our district. It is true that complaints were made that she is not warm enough, but I understand that that will be rectified before next year. I understand that there are one or two other improvements to be made also. But what I object to is this: Having to go to these ports in such a rush it is not possible to get the work done properly. There is no man can do the work better than Captain Barbour. He is a very excellent commander and he has a very excellent crew, but he has to do the work in such a rush, and going thrcugh this district on dark nights the risks are something frightful. Experienced men in the district say that if this is kept up, disaster will follow, and I make this appeal to the Government to take warning and not try to please everybody by forcing this boat to do an almost impossible amount of work properly and safely. As I said before, I like the captain and I like the crew, but I do not like to have the business of the service conducted in that manner, with such risk to the public, and I therefore make this appeal.

SIR ED. MORRIS—There is a great deal in what the hon. member has just said, and I do not think there is any very strong desire on the part of the contractor to call at these places outside the district. They have been forced on him to a certain extent. The trouble in the past, not alone with the present Government, but with all governments, is trying to resist the applications to call at ports. The Bowring boats, both north and south, are largely overworked. We have

got over fifty ports of call on the Labrador service, and attempts have been made during the past year to get her to perform a coastal service also. Formerly the boat went down direct; now she calls at four or five ports, and calling at these ports has made it more difficult to perform the service for which she was subsidized. Now, calling at these ports gives the contractors very little in the way of freight and passenger traffic, and on the way back practically nothing. I think if the hon. member for Fogo will enquire he will find that the contractor gains very little in freight and passenger traffic. This boat was intended for Fogo district, and it was never intended that she would call at additional ports. A representation coming from a person with the experience and local knowledge of the hon. member who represents the district will receive every consideration at our hands.

MR. CLAPP—I am glad to see that the Hon. Premier admits that the Labrador boat has too many ports of call. If that is the case it shows that the Government should accede to the request of the petitioners, who, in the petition presented by me to this house, asked that a boat be put on White Bay. The Government should take up this matter, and see if they can put a small boat on White Bay.

MR. ROBERTS—I believe it would be much cheaper and a much more efficient service would be secured by putting two steamers on Notre Dame Bay, and return to Lewisporte, and another on the Southside, from Lewisporte to Wesleyville. I believe that it would cost much less than is now being paid to the owners of the Clyde and the Fogota. There is another matter to which I would like to refer, and that is the very small amount of room that is placed at the disposal of the mail clerks in these steamers. On the Clyde the mailman's room is an underground cellar. On the Bruce it is such that it is surprising that a man could live there. The same thing applies to the boats on all the bays. It is time for the Government to see that the mail officers have better facilities for handling their mail.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Speaker, I have no objection whatever to having an enquiry made into this question. But the hon. member will know himself that in the past twelve years the same room has been occupied by the mail official on the Bruce, and the same is true of the bay boats. If it has served its purpose for the last twelve years I do not think there can be anything materially wrong with it. If what the hon. member states is correct, a change would long ago have been effected. Now, on the other point, as to whether it would make a better service to have the boats go round Notre Dame Bay and out to Fogo, and direct from Fogo to St. John's—I do not know as much about this matter as the hon. member; but it

seems to me that if you had to go to any place in the bay via Lewisporte the cost would be greater than going direct. That is merely my opinion. If you had to take a puncheon by train to Lewisporte and then tranship it to the steamer to send it out to Fogo, would it not cost more than if sent direct by the Bowring boat from St. John's? Whenever you tranship you generally increase the cost.

MR. ROBERTS—Mr. Speaker, I may say for the information of the Prime Minister that a puncheon sent from St. John's to Lewisporte and transhipped to Tilt Cove costs no more than by the Bowring steamer direct from St. John's.

MR. CLIFT — Mr. Chairman, before passing by these votes I should like to go back to the vote for travelling mail clerks, travelling post offices, and to ask the Colonial Secretary if he can tell me how many mail clerks there are on the Labrador steamer.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, last year there were two. Up to then there was only one clerk employed, but the work had increased so much that, upon the recommendation of the Postmaster General, a second was engaged to assist him.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. gentleman very much for the information. I was aware that there were two clerks on the Labrador boat last year, but I am informed on very reliable authority that the work has not increased, and that the service was less last year than in previous years. Notwithstanding that, two clerks were employed instead of one. I notice there is no provisions for the additional clerk in the vote for travelling post offices. Of course it may appear under another head. I also wish to call the attention of the Colonial Secretary to another matter. It is another omission in these estimates under the head of steam subsidies. It may be remembered that I enquired here, a few days ago, as to the northern service—the winter service. I understand that the steamer Stella Maris was chartered to go northward, and in reply to my enquiry I was informed by the Colonial Secretary that representation had been made to the Government of the necessity of this service by persons living to the northward, and that it was part of the policy of the Government to carry on this northern winter service. Then I submit that if it is part of the policy of the Government to carry on this winter northern service, provision for that service should be made in these estimates. I note that the steamer Stella Maris is chartered by the Government at the rate of $1,200 a trip, and if they made three trips per month—and that is a fair average, as I see the last trip took about eight days—that would mean $3,600 per month.

HON. THE PREMIER—Why three trips? There are only two made in the summer.

MR. CLIFT—Because the trips are to be eight days each, and

when she returns from one trip I suppose she will be made ready at once for the next trip, and in that case she could make three trips per month. But suppose that there were only two trips per month, that would make the amount $2,400 a month, and I presume that if the service is to be of any use at all it will be kept up for three months—January, February and March, or February, March and April—the months when the regular service is not on. This, at $2,400 a month would be $7,200. Now I submit that provision should be made in the estimate if such service is to be continued, and I should like to ask why no vote is now being taken, and what the intention of the Government is on the matter.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, with regard to what my learned friend has said as to the necessity for an assistant on the Labrador service, I don't know from whom he has got his information as to the amount of work. But I wish to state that a recommendation came from the Postmaster General, a strong recommendation, pointing ont the necessity for this assistant. And it was entirely on the strength of this recommendation that the second assistant was engaged. I shall however take a note of the contention of my learned friend and endeavor to get a report from the Postmaster General, and hope to be able to table it to-morrow. Now, as regards the Stella Maris. I think my learned friend might have been quite fair when he stated the amount of the subsidy. It is not $1,200 for a trip of eight days, as was said. If he will refer to the papers which I gave him, he will see that the subsidy is $125 a day, and if the trip takes over eight days the subsidy is to be at the rate of $120 a day, or not at any time to exceed $1,200; that is $1200 for a ten-day service, not eight days. I merely wish to put him right in that matter. This is entirely a new service, being carried out for the first time, and upon its success or otherwise the Government will be guided as to whether or not to carry it on. This year we will take a vote in Supplementary Supply to cover the amount.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, just one word. The Government found a great difficulty in getting a contractor for the northern service. Bowring Bros., with their superior steamers, would not undertake it. I saw Mr. Bowring himself before he went away. and I have since seen Mr. Munn, and the most that they would do was to make an additional trip. The additional trip brought the regular service up to February. The contractors of the Fogota were not prepared to go beyond that either. We then had to look around for a steamer, and the owners of the steamer Stella Maris undertook the service to go as far north as they could until the regular coastal service was taken up again. There

is nothing novel in this service. Important representations were made in the sessions of 1907 and 1908 that this service would revolutionize the north if we could only get a steamer to take up the work, and carry out the service during February, March and April. One can see what it would do for the northern districts by comparison with what has been done for the West Coast. They have the Bowring steamers and the Reid steamers. If it is possible, we wish to carry out this promise made to the electorate and keep that northern service open. It is quite true that there is no vote taken in the regular estimates, because we are not certain what the amount will be, but, before the Legislature closes, we hope to have some information, and if possible will vote a sum of money to cover the amount in Supplementary Supply.

MR. ROBERTS—Mr. Chairman, I am ready to believe that there have been no representations from Notre Dame Bay or Twillingate asking for a winter mail service by steamer. I know that when the Fogota was advertised to be leaving St. John's for the northern ports, messages were sent on here urging the postal authorities that if they contemplated sending any mails by the Fogota not to do so, because if the Fogota was delayed or could not get far enough north these mails would have to be returned to St. John's, and that would cause a delay of two or three weeks. Even if the boats for Twillingate, Fogo and other places were to carry the mails in two or three days, it would still be better to send the mails overland to Lewisporte and then across the ice. If the Stella Maris is of any benefit to the northern ports, she can be of no service to the District of Twillingate, and I would ask the Government not to send the mails by that route, or by any other steamer that may be employed by the Government on that winter mail service. If the mails leave here overland on Tuesday, we get our letters on Wednesday. This is impossible by steamer. And in the interest of my district I say we do not want the service. I do not know of what use she can be to the Southern ports, but to my district she is of no use whatever.

MR. WINSOR—Just a word, Mr. Chairman, about the mail service. This has been a question debated here for the past two or three years, and now that this Government is prepared to take up the matter, there are a number of gentlemen on the other side of the House throwing every obstacle in the way. Mr. Roberts states that the service would be utterly useless to the District of Twillingate. I know a man, sir, whose opinion I consider just as good as Mr. Moberts', who states that the service would be of the greatest benefit to them. This service has been promised to the people of the Northern Districts for the last three or four years, and it is the duty of

the Government to see that it is carried out. I state here, without fear of contradiction, that for the last five or six winters any steamer of any speed could have carried out this service just as well as in the summer season, and in nine cases out of ten, would have got as far as Green Bay. These people, sir, are shut out, from January, February and March, without any steamer connection. And why? Are they not entitled equally with the others to have a winter mail service? Do they not pay as much of the revenue? Certainly they do. As far as I can see, there has been nothing done in this House for the past seven years for the benefit of the district of Bonavista. And I think now that if we have a party in power prepared to give this service to the Northern Districts, they should give them the same show as has been given to the other districts for the past twenty years. It has been stated that the sum paid for this steamer is too large. I say it is not too much; it is not enough. I say the man who is going to run a steamer and take a full crew, and take the mails on the east coast here for the winter months at $2,100 is going to find at the end of the time that he is running at a loss. Again, sir, those mail men down the coast have to travel some 50 or 60 miles in the snow and ice to get the mails to the various places. This is completely avoided by having this winter mail service, and since the Stella Maris has been chartered, there is no longer any occasion to travel this distance. That boat can go from here to Fogo in very good time. Mr. Roberts said that if they had to bring back the mails as on the past trip, it would mean a great delay. On the last trip, sir, she carried no mail for Twillingate. Again, sir, there is lots of freight to come and go in the winter months just as much as in summer. On the last trip the Stella Maris had almost a full load of freight, although she was only advertised to sail one day in advance. As you will remember that was one of the stormiest days we have had this winter. The people who live in these outports have to come to town in November and December and take down fifteen, twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars worth of provisions to do the winter months, to last them up to March or April. On that money, sir, they have to pay interest. Now if they have a steamer running in the winter, there is no necessity for this, and there would be no need to lay in large stocks of provisions for three and four months. I say, sir, that despite what the Opposition says the Government's duty is to give this service to the fishermen of the northern districts.

MR. ROBERTS--Mr. Chairman, I understood that the Stella Maris was subsidized to carry mails, and I now learn that freight is the all-important thing. But I repeat that as far as the Twillingate mail is

concerned, this service is of no use. We can get our letters better overland. They leave here on Tuesday and we get them on Wednesday. While if they came by boat, the earliest we can get them is by Thursday morning, often later. I was speaking of the mails.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Chairman, just one word. It is a well known fact that there are many strong Liberals in some of the different post offices who would sooner send the mails overland, and who would send messages to the other offices to do the same, because they do not want to have this scheme turn out a success. The country was run for special districts during the last seven or eight years, but this Government means to treat them all with equal fairness.

MR. GRANT—Mr. Chairman, about this mail question. The mails from Trinity arrive here overland on Tuesday, but by the Stella Maris they could have arrived here on Monday morning. Some instructions should be sent to the post offices to send the mails by the steamer instead of overland, when the opportunity occurs to do so, as they would arrive much earlier. I think the service a very good one.

MR. CLIFT—Before this vote passes I would like the Minister to explain why he is asking for a vote for $4,000 for surveys of branch railways this year, as last year only $3,000 was voted, and all of it was not expended.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—It is our intention to start a branch to Heart's Content.

MR. CLIFT—I would like to know how he proposes to spend that money. What is the nature of the surveys? I asked last year when the vote of $3,000 was tabled what it was for, and was told that it was for the purpose of surveying the route of the proposed railways, and I pointed out to the Minister in charge that for survey parties to go out over those branch railways on the vote of $3,000 would be absurd, because this money would not keep any survey party of any size any more than three weeks. Now I find that $1,200 of the money voted last year was not expended in survey work at all, but that it was paid for services in connection with the railway surveys. There is a sum of $550 paid to Mr. R. T. Kennedy and to W. Hunt & Co. $293, and to the same people a further amount of $315. I do not know what these items are for, or what connection they have with the surveys.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS — The Government Engineer is supposed to superintend the surveys, but he cannot do it alone. For instance, he has got to survey the line from Shoal Harbor to Bonavista, also to Heart's Content and along the Southern Shore. He is a busy man, with a lot of other duties to attend to, and therefore he has to have a staff to

help him. That is the reason why we ask for this vote.

HON. THE PREMIER—Just a few words on this matter. It is proposed to start new branch lines this year, and this will necessitate the employment of more men than last year to check the surveys. Under the contract the contractor has to make the surveys at his own expense, but the Government Engineer has to check those surveys, and see that the proposed route is properly located, and that the best choice is being made. The surveying is not so difficult here, as when the trunk line was being constructed. For instance, along the Southern Shore, from St. John's to Trepassey, the line is clearly defined. It has to touch every prominent settlement, and the Government Engineer has to see that this is done. Last year we voted $3,000 for this purpose, of which $1,200 was spent. Well, that represents the salaries of Messrs. Kennedy and Whelan, who were on the surveying staff of the Government. Engineer Kennedy is a first-class man. He was with the Reid Nfld Co. when they built the road from here to Port aux Basques. He was at the Crow's Nest Pass, and served with the C. P. R., and I think that no better man could be found for overseeing the construction, and for judging the materials. Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer, is a very busy man at the present time, so it is necessary for him to get some assistance. We will require two other men for the Heart's Content branch. and also for the Bonavista Bay Branch, and in that way therefore the expense will go up. If the whole amount is not expended, well, there will be a drop balance, but there will be no extravagance. Now, as to the two or three amounts quoted by Mr. Clift. Those amounts were expended for the Government Engineer, most likely for the surveying instruments which he required.

MR. CLIFT — I notice in the lighthouse votes that an additional sum appears with the regular grant in some cases. Why is this?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—That is in connection with repairs.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and made some progress, passing certain votes, and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Committee have leave to sit again to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Sale of Seeds."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and passed the Bill without amendment.

Ordered, that this report be received, and that the bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Second reading of Crown Lands Bill.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES — I beg to move the second reading of the Crown Lands Bill. I may say, sir, that our reason for bringing in this Bill, which is in amendment of the Act of 1903, is that it has been found necessary to amend that Act. Some of the sections of the 1903 Act proved to be unworkable, and this Act deals particularly with these sections, and makes the alterations in the law that the Government considers to be necessary. For the present I shall simply deal with the Act section by section, and point out in what way the law is proposed to be amended.

The object of the first section is to prevent persons who hold licenses of occupation under sec. 5, 6 or 7 of the 1903 Act within the three mile limit or elsewhere, from taking away from the said land any timber except in the course of clearing the lands for cultivation or for actual use, unless he receives a fee simple grant comprised in the license.

Section 2 amends section 25 of the Act of 1903, which contains the conditions under which licenses to cut timber are granted by the Crown. Sub-section (1) (a) provides that the licensee must erect a saw mill or paper or pulp factory with the capacity to cut 1,000 feet of timber per day for every ten square miles granted by the license, and that the time in which the mill or factory is to be built and the minimum amount of money to be expended in the construction of it shall be stated in the license, the Governor in Council, however, having the power to allow the licensee to manufacture a greater or less quantity of timber in any year than the quantity I have mentioned. Sub-section (1) (b) merely provides that the licensee shall preserve the growth of young timber trees on his land. Sub-section (1) (c) provides for certain alterations in the annual returns to be made to the Government of the timber that is cut and subject to the payment of royalty, and also of the timber cut for the manufacture of paper and pulp. Sub-section (1) (d) sets forth that in addition to the bonus of $2.00 per square mile to be paid by the licensee he shall also pay an annual ground rent of that amount in advance, the first year's rent to be paid within thirty days of approval, and to be paid on the whole amount applied for and approved, and the rent for subsequent years to be paid on the area surveyed, and in addition to this he must also pay a royalty in all cases except on lands in Labrador, of fifty cents on every thousand feet for all trees cut down, the rate in Labrador to be twenty-five cents, but the section also provides that no royalty shall be paid on trees manufactured into paper or paper pulp.

Section 3 repeals section 31 of the Crown Lands Act, and provides

that instead of marking the boundaries by a cut of three feet, the lines shall be blazed in such a way as to connect the angles of area, and the angles of area shall be marked by posts five feet high. This is the plan adopted by other countries, and I think it will be found much more workable than the present cutting system. The survey must be made within a year, but if it can be proved to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that any of the conditions of this section could not be complied with for some good reason, the time for making the survey may be extended another two years on payment of an extra bonus of $2.00 per square mile.

Section 4 repeals sections 33, 34 and 35 of the Act of 1903, which deal with the licenses to cut timber on Crown Lands for the manufacture of paper and pulp, but it sets forth that any licenses already approved under those sections shall be issued notwithstanding the appeal.

Section 5 provides that all timber cut, on which a royalty is payable, shall be scaled, and in the following section the Minister of Agriculture and Mines is empowered to authorize such persons as he deems fit to be scalers.

Section 7 amends section 44 of the present Act, which now reads that the applicant for any "Discovery Location" may include in his application one or more adjoining locations of not more than ten acres each. Formerly it was three hundred and twenty acres. Section 8 provides that the word "licenses" shall be read instead of the word "leases" in section 49 of the 1903 Act, which deals with the application for leases of mining locations without staking under certain conditions.

Section 9 further amends section 50 of the 1903 Act, as already amended in 1906, by adding another sub-section, to the effect that a lessee of adjoining mining locations shall be entitled to fee simple grants of any number of such locations if he expends in searching and boring for oil such an amount as would, if divided amongst such locations, entitle him to a fee simple grant of such number of locations individually.

Section 10 does away with the necessity for the publication in the Royal Gazette of forfeitures under section 53 of the 1903 Act, and the Governor in Council is empowered under this section to grant to any applicant a license or lease of any mining location which may have become forfeited without notice to the holder of the forfeiture of the lease.

Section 11 is a new section, and empowers the holder of a lease or grant of a mining location which is under water, who wishes to acquire on adjacent private lands any right for the working of his mine, such as the erection of buildings or machinery or the opening of tunnels or shafts or the building of a

wharf or tramway, and cannot agree with the owner of the land for the acquiring of such right, to make application to the Governor in Council for the right, and the Governor in Council shall have power to grant or refuse the application. If the application is granted any matters of difference shall be settled by arbitration. The parties shall each appoint an arbitrator, and the two arbitrators shall, if necessary, appoint an umpire, and they will determine whether the rights asked for are necessary for the working of the mine, and the conditions on which the rights are acquired, and they shall also fix the amount of compensation to be paid the owner of the land. The decision of the arbitrators or of the umpire shall be final, subject to the Supreme Court.

The three following sections also deal with these cases and there is no need for me to explain them.

Section 15 provides for the surveying of agricultural lands and repeals section 73 of the present Act. It makes certain rules and regulations to be observed in connection with the application for these lands.

The last section provides that the Governor in Council shall, if they think fit, make regulations for the working of bog lands leased by the Crown.

These are in brief the principal points of the new Act and I do not need to say anything further just now for the different sections will be discussed in detail when the Bill reaches the Committee stage. I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill be now read a second time.

SIR ROBERT BOND—I rise not to object to the second reading of the Bill but to say that by voting for the second reading I do not commit myself to acquiescence in the measure. In introducing the second reading it is wrong to refer to the different sections of the Bill ; the principle only should be dealt with. While I do not concur in the measure I admit the principle that the present Crown Lands Bill should be amended and therefore do not object to the second reading.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to extend the operation of 5 Edward VII, Cap. 18, entitled 'An Act to encourage the Manufacture of Peat,'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that it be referred to committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up, entitled, respectively, "An Act further to encourage the Smelting of Copper Ores in this Colony,"

and "An Act to prevent the Spreading of Potato Canker," without amendment.

Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond gave notice of question.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

Mr. Earle gave notice of question.

Mr. Roberts gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, March 3rd.

The House met at 3 p. m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES--Mr. Speaker I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Greenspond and vicinity in connection with a local custom existing there of using caplin as manure. The fishermen desire that this be prevented for a certain length of time at least. They ask that no caplin may be taken by seine for any other purpose than that of catching fish until ten days after they have been caught for that purpose. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition and I feel sure that my colleagues feel likewise about the matter.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Harbor Grace. It is signed by about 230 or 240 people, and they ask that the Government would use its influence with the Reid Nfld. Co. to have a flag station built on the site of the old station. People round that section suffer a great inconvenience in having to travel down to Harbor Grace proper, or up to Riverhead, when they want to connect with the train, and they ask that this flag station be placed in that locality.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the petition, I would like to point out that this station would cost very little. The site which the petitioners ask for is the place where the old station was, and the line is graded right up to the place.

MR. SEYMOUR—Mr. Speaker, I also support the petition. There may be some objections to having three stations within a few miles of one another, but I do not think it would be much trouble to put one there. We must, however, not expect impossibilities. But I give the petition my hearty support.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Gasters, in the district of Harbor Main, in reference to the completion of a wharf. The petitioners pray that the sum of $200 be allocated in addition to the usual local grant. The petition is largely signed, and is supported by the Rev. J. Rowe, who took a great

interest in public matters in that locality.

I have also a petition from the inhabitants of Holyrood and Salmonier Road in reference to an allocation of money for repairs to Salmonier Road. Petitioners contend that the grant is insufficient. The traffic has increased to a large extent between St. John's and Placentia and St. Mary's, and those who have to travel over the road go through Holyrood and on through Salmonier. This traffic is really extensive, especially in the fall of the year. The present vote is insufficient, and the only thing we can do is, if possible, to grant a small sum out of the special grant to repair this road.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—I heartily support the prayer of the petitioners, and I do so for the purpose of officially calling the attention of the House to the disgraceful condition of the Salmonier Road, between Colinet and Carey's. Formerly this was a highway between St. John's and Placentia, but, while the railway has taken a large quantity of traffic, yet it is still utilized, if it can be utilized at all, by the people of Colinet. I have had many complaints from the people of that locality as to the condition of the road. No repairs have been made, and the grass grows over it. This should not be. It is the main road still, and the vote which is in existence should be applied to it, and not to other localities. I ask the Minister to give this his attention.

MR. MURPHY—I heartily support the prayer of this petition. There is a lot of traffic on this part of the road, and so it quickly becomes cut up. We have had several times to allocate sums of money to keep the carts from going up to their axles. In this part of the district there is a big trade done to-day; there are sawmills operating there, and therefore they want a little more money than any other part of the district. Twenty years ago only one man out of twenty had a horse and cart; to-day nearly every man has one, and as a result there is an enormous amount of traffic, and money is needed to keep the roads good. The present grant might have done twenty years ago, but it is not sufficient to-day. I will be very glad indeed if the Government will take this matter into its consideration.

HON. MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—In reference to the remarks of the Hon. Sir Robert Bond, I wish to say that the monies voted for this section of the district have not been allocated for any other purpose, so far as I am aware, but I will have this matter looked into at the first opportunity.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—I thank the Minister for his explanation, and hope that all possible means may be used to make this road passable, and not have it any longer in the condition it is, practically a meadow, the bridges in ruin, and the road impassable for a vehicle of any kind. I think some-

thing ought to be done so that the people of Colinet may be able to utilize this road.

HON. THE PREMIER—It is perfectly true, as has been stated, that the road is practically a meadow. I can remember, from '75 to '80, on many occasions driving over that road to Placentia, and I do not know of any more pleasant drive. The road, as has been stated is in a neglected condition. The bridges have fallen into ruin, and Rocky River bridge has fallen during the last few years. The vote in this end, between Harbor Main and the half-way house, is $500, that is about $50 a mile. Now, what happens to that vote? It evidently has been converted into other channels, so it is only a question of looking into the matter, spending the vote that is allocated for it, and bringing back the road into its former condition.

MR. DEVEREUX—I heartily support this petition; and, as to the road from Colinet to Salmonier, the present representatives of the district inquired into that particular road, and found that it had been abandoned for the last seven years. The special grants for this section were spent in other portions of the district. We recognize that this portion of the electorate should have a good road, and this we will do, if possible. We also recognize that the special grant will not be enough to put the road in the condition it was ten years ago, but this year we hope to do something. I am glad to find that Sir Robert Bond has recognized that that portion of the District of Placentia and St. Mary's has been abandoned for the last seven years, but with his help and his moral support, and the help of the Government, backed up by the representatives, we anticipate doing something the coming year.

MR. MOULTON—I have pleasure in presenting a petition from Capt. Collier and others of Burgeo, in relation to the placing of a fog alarm on Boar Island. It would be a great boon to the people if a fog alarm were placed there, for a great deal of traffic is carried on along this coast the whole year round, and our people find it very dangerous making port in winter time, particularly during foggy or stormy weather. During the winter months a large amount of fish is caught on the West Coast, valued at about $100,000.00. This necessitates schooners plying up and down the coast, and a fog alarm would be of great benefit to these. It was only the other day that a schooner was lost in this vicinity, but all of the crew escaped. A few days ago, while coming from Placentia to Rose Blanche, I saw hundreds of skiffs in this vicinity. A storm might have come up in a few minutes, and they would be compelled to make port, which would be extremely dangerous without a fog whistle, but comparatively easy if it were there. I am sure that the Government will take this matter into their consideration, and, if

possible, place a fog alarm at this point.

MR. CLIFT—I beg to present a petition from Thomas Bousan and others of St. Patrick's, on the subject of the prohibition of bultows from St. Patrick's to Little Bay. Petitions set out that they were the first settlers of that place, and that they have been fishing from that island the past 18 years. They ask that the use of bultows be prohibited along certain parts of the coast. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petitioners, and would ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the consideration of the minister of that department. I feel sure that, if at all possible, he will accede to the prayer of the petitioners, and if necessary make the requisite regulations.

Also, a petition from the residents of Fleury's Bight, on the subject of roads; also one from Thomas E. Wells and others of Little Bay, asking for the sum of $150 for a road.

Also, a petition from Solomon Rowsell and others of South West Arm, Green Bay, on the subject of making that place a port of call for the Clyde. I have much pleasure in giving these petitions my hearty support.

MR. ROBERTS—I have much pleasure in supporting these petitions presented by my colleague, Mr. Clift, particularly the latter.

MR. SQUIRES—I beg leave to present a petition from more than seventy of the residents of Trinity East, with respect to certain railway extension in that neighborhood. I fully appreciate the fact that on the presentation of a petition I am not only limited to five minutes, and the Rules of the House to prevent me from discussing the subject matter of the petition, but it is of such importance as to justify me in asking the leniency of the House while I refer to the desires of the petitioners in connection with this railway matter. The main line from Trinity to Bonavista runs through the country at a distance of about a mile from Salmon Cove. and about three miles from English Harbor. The petitioners feel that the extension of the railway to Salmon Cove would not only be of considerable benefit to Trinity East generally, but would also be a matter of great importance to the north side of Trinity Bay. It is set forth in the petition that the harbor of Salmon Cove is the best harbor on that side of the district of Trinity, and is one of the finest harbors in Newfoundland. The harbor is one which is not icebound to the same extent as other harbors in the immediate neighborhood, because of a strong stream flowing into the harbor, which creates a current that makes it much more difficult for the harbor to be frozen over than would otherwise be the case; the petition states that the bottom of the harbor is very rarely frozen over, even in severe winters. There are no serious natural objections, and the grading of the line could

be easily undertaken. It is a matter of regret that this matter was not taken up by the petitioners at the last session of the Legislature, when the railway legislation was passed, and now, that the legislation in reference to the Bonavista branch is completed, the surveys completed, and the line in this neighborhood actually constructed, without any movement having been made by the petitioners in reference to this alteration in route, extension of line or construction of spur line, it is an infinitely more difficult proposition to deal with. I trust that the House will pardon me for trespassing upon their patience in reference to this matter, but I feel that it is one of so much importance to this prominent section of the District of Trinity that I could not pass the matter over without something more than a casual reference. So that the subject matter of this petition may receive the grave consideration which its importance merits. I ask that it be referred to the Colonial Secretary for submission to His Excellency the Governor in Council for perusal at an early date.

I also ask leave to present a petition from thirty-three inhabitants of Heart's Content. It states that on the 28th of January certain legal proceedings were instituted at Carbonear in reference to a piece of land which, the petitioners state, has for forty years been a winter path. The petition sets forth that about thirty-three years ago one Dickinson had this land surveyed and a grant issued therefor; that when the grant was issued the path was not reserved. No difficulty arose whatever in connection with the matter, however, because Dickinson recognized the fact that there was a winter path over the property, and raised no objection whatever to its use being continued. This state of affairs existed until about five years ago, when Dickinson sold the property to James Wilcox. The path continued to be used without interruption until about two years ago, when Wilcox fenced the property, and prevented the use of the path by the public. The petition goes on to state that Mr. Wilcox was asked to open up the path, but refused, and that the people themselves then opened it up. This resulted in legal proceedings being taken before Magistrate Pennel at Heart's Content, and judgment appears to have been given in favor of Wilcox. The petitioners not only state that this has been used as a public path for forty years, but go further, and say that many of them have themselves used the path, without interruption, for a period of thirty-one years. This appears to be a matter of very considerable importance to these petitioners, and I would consequently ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department of Justice for investigation.

I would also ask leave to present a petition from Arthur Tuck, E. C. Jeans, Simeon Hopkins, Malcolm

Short, and 28 other residents of Hant's Harbor, asking for the allocation of a sum of money for the building of a concrete wall on the west side of Hant's Harbor. The petitioners state that the brook, which has been used during the past years, became polluted, because of the erection of buildings along its banks. I ask that this petition be received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

I also ask leave to present a petition from William Porter Hobbs and a number of other residents of Elliston, asking for the allocation of a sum of money for the construction of an agricultural road. The petitioners state that there are a considerable number of families settled along the line where they would like this road constructed, and that there is good agricultural land in that neighborhood. I would ask that this petition be received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

I also ask leave to present a petition from Simeon Whelan, John Thomas Drodge, Elisha Stringer, and about twenty other residents of Caplin Cove, in the District of Trinity, referring to road matters; also a petition from James Green, Alfred Brace, Edward Harnum, and 36 other residents of Green's Harbor, for the allocation of a sum of money for the construction of a road a quarter of a mile long to a sawmill. I would ask that these several petitions be received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

These several petitions were received and referred to the various departments to which they relate.

QUESTIONS.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the table of the House a statement showing:

1. All applications for timber and pulp licenses since 1st January, 1910, to date, with names of applicants, area in acres, and situation;

2. Dates of approval;

3. Date of payment and amount of bonuses and rent;

4. Date of filing survey;

5. If time of survey has been extended and upon what terms;

6. Why lands held by lessees and upon which the conditions under the law have not been complied with, have not been forfeited in accordance with the law.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I beg to say that the statements asked for are being prepared.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of the money paid for the right-of-way for the spur line into Trinity.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—I beg to table the statement asked by the right hon. gentleman.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—To ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines if Dr. Robertson and Dr. McPhail made reports to the Government on the matter of agriculture; and, if so, to lay a

copy of the same on the table of this House.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I beg to table a copy of the report of Dr. Robertson. Dr. MacPhail has not made any report.

MR. KENT—To ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House an account of the loan authorized by the Legislature at its last session for railway extension purposes, showing, in detail, with dates:

1. Amount of said loan underwritten.

2. Amount subscribed by the Colony to date;

3. Amount received by Colony to-date;

4. Amonnt expended out of the money received from said loan;

5. Amount, if any, received for interest on said loan.

Also, to state whether any amount has been borrowed by the Colony on Temporary Loan since March 1st, 1910; and, if so, to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the bank from which such loan or loans were procured, the purposes for which the same were borrowed, the amount, rate of interest, date and other terms thereof: and to lay on the table all coresspondence and agreements relating thereto.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The statements asked for are being prepared and will be ready on Monday.

MR. EARLE—To ask the Hon. Minister of Justice to lay on the table of the House a statement showing, in detail, all amounts paid to any member of this House for legal services from January 1st, 1910, to date, stating the services in respect to which each such payment was made.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—In reply, I beg to lay upon the table of the House the statement asked for.

MR. EARLE—To ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail all amounts paid to any members of this House for legal services, from January 1st, 1910, to date, stating the services in respect to which each such payment was made.

The statement asked for is being prepared.

MR. EARLE—To ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail all payments made to any members of this House for legal services, from January 1st, 1910, to date, showing the services in respect to which each such payment was made.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg to lay the statement asked for on the table of the House.

MR. ROBERTS — To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary whether Walter Crosbie is in the pay of the Postal Telegraph Department, or any other department; if so, to

state the position he holds and the amount paid him to date.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—In reply, I beg to say that Mr. Crosbie is employed as Mail Clerk on the railway construction service at a salary of $60 per month.

MR. ROBERTS — To ask the Hon. Prime Minister whether the Government intends or not to provide for the erection of lighthouses at Change Islands and the Horse Chops, Trinity District, during the present year.

HON. THE PREMIER—In reply, I beg to say that the matter of lighthouses is receiving the full consideration of the Government, but no location have yet been decided on.

MR. ROBERTS — To ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to state the amount of commission, if any, paid to the Sub-Collector of Customs at Trinity during the year 1910.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—In reply, I beg to say that the amount paid was $51.44.

MR. ROBERTS — To ask the Hon. Prime Minister whether the Government has arranged or will arrange for the S. S. Home to call weekly at ports on the Treaty Shore, leaving Lewisporte one week and Bay of Islands the next, in order to give the Treaty Shore weekly mail service during the present year and thereafter.

HON. THE PREMIER — No arrangements have been made up to the present time. The Government wiil enquire as to whether the proposed change will be in the public interest, and whether it will be feasible.

MR. ROBERTS — To ask the Hon. Prime Minister whether the Government has received any protests against sawmills about to be erected on the three mile limit; if so, to state what steps the Government intend to take in respect to the same.

HON. THE PREMIER—The Government have received protests against the erection of sawmills. They have also received protests against any interference with those at present operating sawmills on the three mile limit. The whole matter is being carefully inquired into by the Government.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain resolutions, which were read a first time, as follows: Public Charities, $296,142; Lighthouses, etc,, $86,329; Agriculture and Mines, $31,420; Roads and Bridges, $175,126; Postal and Telegraps, $520,399; Contingencies, $10,000; Marine and Fisheries, $84,940; Customs, $146,051; Coal and Water Refunds, $67,550; Additional Estimates, $8,000.

The said resolutions being read a second time, it was moved that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister the

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the subject of Education.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—The Resolutions which I propose to ask the House to consider deal with a vote of $7,000 for the establishment of schools in settlements where hitherto there have been no schools established, and for the extension of schools in those places where hitherto schools have been conducted for a few months only in the year to the full school year. The matter of opening schools in places where to-day there are none established has been under the consideration of the Government for some time, and we have had considerable negotiations and correspondence with the Superintendents of Education, with a view to learning the exact number of settlements where there are enough children of a schoolable age to justify the establishment of a school; and also with a view to learning the number of settlements where there are schools open for a portion of the year only. In the past we have been voting sums occasionally to what are known as "sparsely populated settlements," and the present vote is practically along these lines also. I have had a very interesting paper prepared by the Superintendents of Education, some of the figures of which come as a surprise. I do not propose to read the paper to the Committee, as it would be wearisome, and I shall content myself with making special reference to the points they bring out. First, the paper shows that there are 1,267 settlements in Newfoundland. But if you look at the census you will find that the number given is a little more, being something over 1,300. Probably this difference is due to the fact that the Superintendents did not class as settlements places where there are only one or two families living. In any event, they place the total number of settlements in the Island at 1,267, and state that there are 636 where schools are conducted. In other words, they claim that in half the settlements of the Colony there are no schools. Of course it must not be inferred that it will be necessary to establish schools in all these places, for such is not the case. Some are so small, and with so few people, that it will be impossible to give them a school, while many others are quite close to larger settlements, where there are good schools already established. I asked the Superintendents to go into the matter very thoroughly, and they have arrived at the conclusion that there are 64 settlements now without schools, where, in their opinion, there are sufficient children of a schoolable age to justify the establishment of a school. In each of these places, they state, there are twenty-five or more children. There are also 60 settlements where schools are conducted for less than six

months in the year, being open in some cases only one or two months, and there are 200 settlements where schools are open from six to nine months in the year. In other words, there are 260 settlements where schools are not conducted all the year, and 64 settlements where none are conducted at all. I have asked the Superintendents for a conservative estimate of what they think would be the cost of putting schools in all the settlements where there are none to-day, and of continuing for the full school year those schools now being conducted for a part of the year only. They have estimated that $20,000 will be sufficient to effect that purpose. Of course, most or all of these schools at the best will require only a third grade teacher, for none of the children have had the advantages of education. At the commencement, they will all be primary schools, but, as the children advance, higher grade of schools can be established. It may be asked that if this amount will bring about this result, why not vote it this year? The answer is that the Superintendents have already great difficulty in obtaining teachers for the regular schools, and, consequently, it will take some time before teachers are found for any new ones. One of the greatest drawbacks to the progress of our education is the continual leakage in the ranks of teachers; and this is solely due to the fact that the salaries offered have not been very tempting. Stores, offices, and works of all kinds hold out to them better inducements. There are seductive allurements all around them, and, as soon as they give their three years of service, they leave the profession and take up other kinds of work. And we cannot blame them for doing so, for it is only natural that they should try to better themselves in the world. That is the weak spot, and the Superintendents and Boards are at their wit's end to remedy it, and to obtain teachers to fill the places of those who leave. It is hoped that the Superintendents will be able to overcome this difficulty, and avail of the amount which we now propose to vote, and that next year we will be in a position to vote an additional $13,000, to make up the total sum of $20,000, which the Superintendents have estimated will be sufficient to provide schools in every settlement. None of these places is under any compliment for this long-deferred boon. Everyone will admit the principle that every child is entitled to education. All are contributing to the general revenue of the Colony, and, unless it be impossible, they ought to be provided with schools. It is our hope that the Superintendents will have these new schools open by the time we meet here again next year, and that by the following year we shall have reached a point in the history of the Colony where we shall be able to say that there is not a settlement in the Island where children of a schoolable age are not able to re-

ceive an education. I am sure it is a matter of satisfaction to the Committee and to the country to be able to notice the strides that have been made in education during the last few years, and this improvement has been brought about in various ways. Since the Council of Higher Education (this is a misnomer, and its objects are misunderstood by many of the people, for the body is really a Council of Education) has been inaugurated, it has done more to uplift education than anything else has ever done. In this Council we have a body of men who freely give their time all the year round, and who really form a Department of Education. They are paid nothing for their services, although they are active men whose time is fully occupied with their own business. Amongst them are the Principals of the Colleges, who, after a hard day's teaching, deserve some recreation in the open air, but who attend the meetings of the Council and help to prepare the syllabus for the examinations, and all other important work. The Legislature has also contributed largely towards the progress made in education by increasing the grant very considerably. Twenty-two years ago, in 1899, the total vote for education was $120,000; in 1898, or ten years later, it was increased to $155,000; from 1898 to 1908 it went up to $250,000, an increase of practically $100,000 in ten years. Since the present Government has come into power, a further sum of $75,000 has been added, and we are now spending annually on education the sum of $325,000. This is a very considerable amount, and ought to be reassuring to the country as to the desire of the Legislature to assist education. And so it will go on, for in education we cannot look back, but keep on going ahead, and it is reasonable to assume that, when we have provided all the settlements with schools, we shall be able to turn our attention to the teachers and increase their salaries, and in that way give them a continuing interest in their profession, for at the present time their salaries are far from adequate, and although thousands of dollars are spent in training teachers, the money is to some extent wasted, for the majority of the teachers leave the profession as soon as they have fulfilled the terms of their contract. In one year alone over sixty per cent. of the teachers left the profession—surely a matter of considerable concern. With these observations, Mr. Chairman, I desire to propose the Resolutions, feeling sure that the Committee will be glad to increase a vote that is doing so much to benefit the Colony.

SIR R. BOND—I have much pleasure in supporting the principles of the Resolutions before the chair, because they are a continuation of that policy of the advancement of education in the Colony that I have had the honor to inaugurate during the time that I

was the leader of the Government, from the years 1900 to 1908. As the hon. Prime Minister has stated, during that period my Government increased the education grant by the sum of $100,000, a sum equal to that which had been voted in any year for that purpose for all time previous to that period. The late Government did more to advance education than all the predecessors since the institution of responsible government. With regard to the present vote for the sum of $7,000, to be divided among the several religious denominations for providing schools where there are none at present, I have to observe that we have been allocating amounts year after year to meet the alleged requirements of the settlements without schools. I use the word alleged advisedly, because I think that if we could only induce the Superintendents of Education to avail of the enabling clause in the 1903 Act, which provides for the establishment of jointly controlled schools in sparsely populated localities, there would be no need of approaching the Legislature for these "dribs and drabs" votes that are made from year to year. It is almost a crime against the rising generation that thousands of our children are growing up without any education because we cannot sink our so-called religious differences. Why do we not have one school in these localities which are too small to be able to support three? Is it not a crying disgrace that because we are so narrow, so bigoted, and so prejudiced against each other, we cannot avail of an enabling clause that would make it possible to establish an up-to-date school in those settlements, and provide teachers for them, to whom we may be able to pay salaries that will at least keep them respectably clad. Let us take up the present case and consider it. I speak subject to correction, but I understand the hon. introducer to say "the sum that is now asked for is sufficient, we hope to provide schools in the sixty settlements where there are enough children of schoolable age to justify the erection of a school." That is to say, the Government proposes to spend $7,000 this year in erecting and equipping schools in these places, and next year a further sum of $13,000 will be asked for, in order that schools will be provided in every settlement throughout the Island. To meet the necessary requirements it will cost us $20,000. Why? Simply because the several denominations will not avail of the enabling clause. Think of it! Under the provisions of the Bill and the principles involved in it we shall have to provide 180 teachers for the sixty settlements in which schools are to be erected. This is so monstrous and preposterous that I think the time has come when the matter should be looked squarely in the face. I had hoped to have brought in a suite of resolutions dealing with this matter of education, but

I have been unable to prepare them ; however, I may be in a position to do so at a later date. I think, sir, we are going too far with our so-called Higher Education, and neglecting altogether technical education. New industries are growing up all around us, and at the present time we find that all the expert labor demanded by them has to be imported into the Colony. It is a reflection on us as a people and a Legislature that we have not a technical school in the Island, and despite the fact that there is no more subject more worthy of consideration than is technical education, it has been practically ignored by this Legislature. It is most important that the matter be considered, and that we follow the lead that has been taken in the matter by other countries. In the Dominion of Canada the question is receiving considerable attention, and so important does the Government consider it to be, that a special commission has been appointed to consider the matter, and to obtain information and data from all quarters of the globe, in order that the present system might be improved. It has been long established in the various provinces of the Dominion, and I think Nova Scotia was the father of the movement. It has now spread throughout the whole country, and considerable interest has been awakened in it, owing to the appointment of the commission by the Dominion Government. I trust there will be an opportunity of discussing this interesting subject later, and if the Government will give this matter their consideration, I shall be glad to give them my hearty support. If they take no steps in the matter, and I have the honor to hold a seat in this House next session, I shall take the matter up and introduce a series of resolutions dealing with it, for I am a very strong advocate of technical education, and shall be glad to support any measure to have it established on a sound basis.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Just one or two words in reply to the remarks of the right hon. gentleman. In the first place I must say that I fully appreciate the spirit in which he views the matter under consideration and I am, like himself, very sorry to have to say that what has been described as the "enabling clause," in the Act of 1903, which provides for the establishment of amalgamated schools, has not been acted upon, except, I believe, at Grand Falls and one other place. However, that is not the fault of this Legislature but the fault of the system. I do not know if my right hon. friend is looking for trouble. I have more than enough already—but I know that the man who attempts to touch the question of denominational schools will stip up one of the most difficult problems one can wish to deal with. It may be an interesting subject to discuss and during my twenty-seven years of public life the matter has come before me in

every possible shape and I have heard it discussed on many occasions but I am convinced that the present system, which has grown up for so many years, will be a very difficult one to alter. The present case is not as bad as the right hon. gentleman evidently thinks it is, for we do not propose to erect three or four schools in each of the settlements which have none at the present time. As a matter of fact I have gathered from the Superintendents that to a large extent the people of these settlements are of one denomination only; some are all Church of England; some are all Roman Catholic, and some are all Methodists, and consequently no great difficulty will arise as regards the number of schools, and there will not be a need for 180 schools and 180 teachers as the right hon. gentleman contended there would be.

Now as to technical education. I should certainly like to see it introduced into our schools. We live in an industrial age when the application of science to industrial works makes it imperitive that to obtain a position of importance a man must have a good technical education. It would be a great assistance to our young men if we could give them even a higher education, and I would gladly support any movement to bring that to them; but we must be fair to all, and we must first extend the privileges of education to those who at the present time have no chance of receiving any at all. We must be just before we are generous, and there must be no more grants for higher or technical education until the opportunity is given every child to secure a primary education. It is the right of all to receive a proper education. Look around the Island today and you will see that those who are occupying the best offices in the Government service and in every trade and profession are the men who received a good education in their young days. As I have already stated there are 64 settlements in this country where the children are receiving absolutely no education whatever, and they are growing up practically maimed for the battle of life.

While he was on his visit here I had the pleasure of a conversation with Prof. Robertson on the matter of technical education. The Professor has been appointed chairman of the commission on technical education and that commission is going over the world to see how this work is being done in other countries. He pointed out to me how far in advance of us Canada was in the matter of education but that is not to be wondered at when we remember that when it was illegal to plant a potato in Newfoundland there was already a university in Nova Scotia. Canada is ahead of us educationally by one hundred years. We were not allowed to develop as we should have been and it is only during the past forty or fifty years that education

has received any attention. We have made giant strides in recent years and it is our policy to give our people every facility to obtain a sound education. The present measure is a step in that direction and next year we hope to make a further grant of $13,000, so that every settlement in the Island will have a school that is open all the year round.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Just a word to explain what I have said, for my hon. friend evidently misunderstands me on one or two points. I deplored the fact that advantage has not been taken of the enabling clause in the Education Act of 1903, which I had the honor to introduce, but I hope that my remarks did not create an alarm in the breasts of any of my friends opposite. I was not aiming in any way at the denominational school system, for nobody appreciates more than I do the admirable work done upon those particular lines. A few years ago I was asked by high authorities if I would write some information upon the progress of education in this country, and the working out of the denominational system, and I took this ground—and I do not depart from it—that the system has worked on the whole admirable. There are defects in the system and one of the most serious is that to which these resolutions point, and there are localities in which there are no education facilities because the people have not availed of the enabling clause. When I introduced that clause in the educational bill to which I have referred, every religious denomination in the Colony was in favor of it. I take this little bit of credit to myself that in my district three localities have availed of the clause, namely Grand Falls, Norris Arm and Botwood. I exerted what influence I had to harmonize the different denominations there and I am glad to learn that at Grand Falls particularly the amalgamated school system is working to the complete satisfaction of every body. If that be so why not have the section availed of in the localities under consideration to-day? We shall probably want 180 teachers, whereas 60 teachers should be sufficient; then, why in the name of common sense do we not avail of the section. You will never succeed in providing for the schools under these resolutions if the amounts are to be doled out to the different denominations; in fact you are undoing what a united Legislature has decided to be the proper thing to do. I do not object to the vote but I think the time is come when we should look the matter squarely in the face and deal with it as matter-of-fact politicians and as public trustees. It is all very well to have pressure brought to bear by certain ecclesiastical gentlemen, but if needs be we must resist this pressure in the interests of the public, and if we believe that 60 teachers can do the work which it takes 180 to do now

we should resist any pressure from any source. It is disgraceful that there should be throughout the Island a large number of our children without education simply because the people are divided in their opinions as to which altar they should kneel at. Is it not our duty to see that such a state of things does not continue? I do not wish to do away with religious teaching in our schools, that can be arranged for; but I do think it unholy, impolitic, unjust and wrong to have things continue as they are at present and we ought not to pander to it.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am quite satisfied that in the sixty settlements that we are now voting for there will not be more than one school in each. I am quite in favor of amalgamated schools and I voted in favor of the Act of 1903 which contains the enabling clause to which my right hon. friend has referred; still we have to be practicable and we have to deal with things as we find them. We have to look at the fact that only three places in the Island have availed of the clause, and these have no doubt been induced to do so largely through the influence of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. There is, however, not the great need for amalgamated schools that one would think. In the returns which I have before me I find that there are 636 settlements where schools are conducted and in but 102 of these there are schools for more than one denomination. That is not such a great number. It is true that some places have three or four schools where perhaps one amalgamated school would be more advantageous, but on the whole the fact that our education is on the denominational system does not mean that we have more than one school in the great majority of the settlements throughout the Island. The amalgamated school system has its good points but has not received the full support of the people. We must look at things as they are and, as I have said, I am quite confident that none of the sixty settlements that these resolutions provided for will want more than one school in each.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and adopted the resolutions without amendment and recommended the introduction of a bill to give effect thereto.

Ordered that this report be received and that leave be granted for the introduction of the said bill.

Whereupon the bill entitled, "An Act further to amend the Education Act, 1903," was introduced and read a first time, and ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in

relation to the encouragement of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES--In moving these resolutions to authorize the expenditure of $20,000, perhaps it would be well for me to briefly review the work done by the Agricultural Board since its institution. I may say, in the first place, that the work so far has been purely of a preliminary character, dealing with things as they were found, and attempting to create a deeper interest in agriculture among our people. Personally, I am a great believer in the agricultnral possibilities of this country and the work of the present Government has already, to a very large extent, opened the eyes of the people to these possibilities. What we have been trying to do, and what we must continue to do, is to encourage our people to pay more attention to the science of agriculture, and by the circulating of literature and in other ways give them hints which they must be able to grasp and take in. The Bonus Act introduced by the late Sir Robert Thorburn, in 1880, did a lot of good and resulted in the clearning of a lot of land that would otherwise have been untouched; but now it is time to see that all this cleared land should be under cultivation. The opening up of the railways has also been of great assistance to the development of agriculture. Take Placentia Bay for instance. At one time its people were absolutely dependent on the fishery but to-day they are in a different position, and are looking to the land as well as the sea for their support. What has been true of Placentia District will, I believe, be equally true of the districts through which the branch railways, which the Government have contracted for, will run. Good agricultural lands will be opened np everywhere where these lines will be built and our people will be encouraged to pay more attention to it. It is the experience in every country where railway lines are being opened up that people all along them take to the soil. To my mind this is one of the greatest arguments in favor of building branch railways. Now I don't wish to be flattering, but I do think that the initiation of this policy by the Leader of the Government was a step in the right direction, and it is largely due to his enthusiasm—displayed on every occasion and on every platform—that the people are turning seriously to the cultivation of the land, believing that the policy of the Government is a good one. The Premier is an enthusiast himself and imparts his enthusiasm to all with whom he comes in contact. Our first duty was to organize societies throughout the Colony. At first there were many difficulties in the way, many of our people

being busily engaged preparing to go to the fishery. But despite this the commissioners who were engaged in the establishment of these societies were able to do good work, and up to the end of June there were in the neighborhood of 66 societies organized. Each of these societies has done splendid work. They were formed on absolutely non-political lines. I am glad to say they have been of great assistance to the people of this Colony. I have here a list of the places where societies have been formed: At St. John's, Ferryland, Goulds, Trepassey, St. Mary's, Branch, St. Bride's, St. Joseph's, Placentia, Arnold's Cove, Merasheen, Marystown, Epworth, St. Lawrence, Lamaline, Grand Bank, Belleoram, Harbor Breton, Hermitage Cove, Ship Cove, Rose Blanche, Burgeo, Channel, Curling, Stephenville, Port au Port, St. George's, Crabbes, Searstown, LaScie, Seal Cove, St. Anthony, Currant Island, Daniel's Harbor, Bonne Bay, Twillingate, Herring Neck, Little Bay, South West Arm, Lewisporte, Fortune Harbor, Musgrave Harbor, Joe Batt's Arm, Fogo, Change Islands, Bonavista, King's Cove, Salvage Bay, Wesleyville, Musgravetown, Glovertown, Port Blandford, Hant's Harbor, Heart's Content, Dildo, Catalina, Britannia Cove, Freshwater, Broad Cove, Northern Bay, Old Perlican, Carbonear, Harbor Grace, Spaniard's Bay, Bay Roberts, Brigus, Clarke's Beach, Harbor Main, Kelligrews. To each of these societies we sent a quantity of seed potatoes and other seeds. Together with that we distributed a large quantity of live stock among the different districts, and, Mr. Chairman, you can imagine the amount of good that this must have done. There is no doubt in my mind, from the reports from the societies themselves and from individuals, that it must result in considerably improving the stock. We know as far as potatoes are concerned the seed has not been renewed, and for years our people have been digging "marble" instead of potatoes, they are so small. But I am pleased to be able to state that where the yield of one barrel of potato seed was in the neighborhood of seven barrels, now the average yield per barrel is from 20 to 22 barrels. I have testimonials from various people. Take the result in St. John's for instance. I have a statement from David Smallwood, 100 Springdale Street, showing that he sowed two gallons in June, and on October 7th dug 1 1-2 barrels, or at the rate of twenty barrels to one. Another from Mr. Clark, Broad Cove, St. John's West, who sowed 14 lbs. the first week in June, and dug them on October 12th, getting one barrel, or at the rate of 14 barrels to one. Another from Edward J. Snow, Torbay Road, who sowed 13 lbs. June 4th, and dug them Oct. 28th, getting 425 lbs., or at the rate of 33 barrels to one. I might go on to multiply instances. With regard

to our potatoes we have had reports from two eminent experts who visited here. Dr. Robertson, who is one of the greatest agriculturists in Canada, paid us a visit last year, and probably some here attended his lectures in the Prime Minister's office and in the British Hall. This is what he says :

"Your potatoes are very good, so are your carrots and turnips and cabbages. You have good soil here' Soil is a root-hold for the things that live here ; they require the soil chiefly as a root-hold, while they feed through their leaves from the air. They also feed from the soil ; but crops such as potatoes obtain by far the largest part of their food from the air. There would be an improvement in the potatoes if you would always use seed potatoes of vigorous productive strain and nearly all of medium size. The yield would be greater. You certainly have need for selecting varieties suitable to your needs. I have seen some excellent potatoes here, and I have seen others that, unless you adopted the good old Irish practice of boiling them with their skins on, you would be liable to cut away half the value in paring them. The portion of the potatoes nearest the skin is worth much more for food than that portion in the middle. A man who wants to have good crops must take care that they are well born. The first part of that process is the preparation of a seed bed. Thorough cultivation and adequate manure or other fertilizer will allow the young and tender plants to obtain their food and make a good start early. That is a great principle of agriculture. It is most important that a farmer should use good and reliable seeds ; if he gets poor and inferior seeds, and sows or plants them, he is not giving the future plants half a chance to thrive. Frequent cultivation during the growing season is beneficial. It not only keeps down weeds, but it makes conditions in the soil which stimulate the growth of the tubers."

These statements are also backed up by Dr. McPhail, a well known professor, who also visited the Colony last year. He also speaks in glowing terms of our potatoes. His report is being copied, and I hope to lay it on the table next week. He visited most of the farms in the suburbs, and was very pleased with the soil, and he is of the opinion that the more we cultivate the soil the better we are going to do. He contends that the soil is better here than in Prince Edward Island. Then, why are we importing potatoes from that place? Is it because we have not been alive to the possibilities of this country and have neglected to aid and encourage the people. The more we encourage them the better. It is all very well to look after the well-to-do farmer, but we want to place within the reach of the humblest the opportunity to provide for himself. We have heard it said that we want the scientific instructor here. Yet there

are ways of doing without him, and the Government are adopting the method by forming agricultural societies. Through these the people can be kept in constant touch with each other, and learn of what is being done, and the Board has circulated much helpful literature among them. It is not written in technical language, but quite simply, so that the people can quite readily grasp its meaning. Again, for some time Mr. Downey has been writing articles in the newspapers, embodying clippings from the most up-to-date magazines. These have been published without one cent of cost to the Government, and have had good results.

Now we are importing, through Dr. McPhail, 1,000 barrels of potatoes, for distribution in 1911. About 300 barrels of these are already circulated throughout the Island to the various societies. The balance are still at Prince Edward Island, where they are being kept, owing to lack of facilities for storing them here. These potatoes have been picked under the direction of Dr. McPhail, and we are very hopeful that the results from them will be as good as last year. These will replace the old potatoes which have been used for seed for many years past, and in a couple of years we hope to have an entirely new crop of potatoes throughout the Island. The other day I brought in a Bill in connection with Potato Canker. Unfortunately that disease has played havoc with the potatoes in some centres. But the Board has made arrangements to carry out the instructions of Dr. Gussow, whereby plenty of lime will be used in these sections, and, in order to facilitate the procuring of it, arrangements have been made whereby the farmers may purchase it at 15 cents a bushel. Quantities of lime have also been sent to the societies which reported the presence of this dread disease, so that the disease may be quickly killed. The best method by which a Government can aid in agricultural development is by distributing seeds of the very best quality. This the present Government has done. And as we have done with the potatoes, so we have done with the turnip and cabbage seeds. A quantity of turnip and cabbage seed was imported from some of the most reliable firms on the other side and in America, such as J. Carter & Co., P. Henderson & Co., etc. These seeds, as I mentioned just now, have been distributed to the various societies, and the reports have been just as pleasing as in the case of potatoes.

Now I think my hon. friend on the other side, who is an experienced farmer, will agree with me that the Agricultural Board did good service when they imported 500 bushels of Scotch oats, which were sold to the farmer at cost price. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that the yield of these oats was almost beyond expectation, and the people are more than pleased with the seed

and the assistance of the Board, and in future I think we will find that the farmers throughout the Island will plant more oats. Now why was this not done before? There is only one reason. The people had not the assistance which they have to-day. The difficulty was there was no way of threshing, but that has been overcome. The Board imported a machine and last fall we had daily demonstrations of its value, and I have no doubt that in the near future every town in the Island will have a machine. This is but one of the benefits that have come through the instrumentality of the Agricultural Board; there are many other matters which are receiving the deepest consideration. There is the matter of fruit growing for instance. This is a thing our people ought to be encouraged in. The Board have it under consideration, and hope at a future date to induce our people to take it up. Partridge berries have been shipped away from the Colony for a number of years. They are used, as the Committee is aware, for dyeing purposes. But in my opinion the day is coming when we will find a market in our own Colony for these, and it is up to the Board to help this industry along. The other day I read an article in a magazine on British Columbia. In some places there, instead of devoting their energies to the cultivation of potatoes and wheat, etc., they have made up their minds to turn their attention to orchards, and one of the largest fruit exhibitions ever held in Canada was held in British Columbia a few months since. It opened the eyes of the people there as to the possibilities of fruit growing. I do not mean to say that Newfoundland will ever become such a fruit growing country as British Columbia; but I am thoroughly convinced that we can do a great deal more in this line than we are doing at present. Until the Exhibition of last October, nobody believed it was possible to grow vegetables of the quality exhibited. As I have already stated, it was an eye-opener to our people which will not soon be forgotten. And, with the encouragement which the Board is giving by the introduction of new seeds, etc., it will only be a short time before we shall be able to surpass even that. Another matter to which we have been devoting our energies is the improvement of local stock, and to this end last year imported twelve Highland bulls and nineteen shorthorns from Scotland, at a total cost, including freight, of $4,192.56. By the steamer Mongolian, from Glasgow, on November 2nd, we received two more shorthorn bulls, at a cost of $331.20. The Board has no doubt that the distribution of these animals will bring good results. Next year the Government hopes to import a similar number, and in this way it is hoped that within two or three years the whole stock of the Island will be revolutionized. Last year, also,

three stallions were imported by the Board; and, through the instrumentality of the Premier, a number of Sable Island ponies were secured without costing the Colony a cent. They were a gift from the Canadian Government. The Board then distributed them among the various agricultural societies, and it is hoped, within a few years, that their introduction, with others yet to come, will result in these useful little animals taking the place of the dogs. Where there are so many of the latter it has been found practically impossible to do anything in the way of sheep raising, and the desire of the Government is to substitute these ponies in their place. It is a matter of great importance that our people should be encouraged in the raising of sheep, and, with this object in view, the Government and the Board have for some time been making extensive investigations, with a view to determining the quality of sheep best suited to the conditions of this Colony. Up to the present, however, we have not arrived at anything definite. It is pleasing to note, however, that the people are just as much interested in this matter as the Government, and that the agricultural societies have invested parts of the grants given them by the Government themselves in getting sheep. There is nothing that will benefit this Colony more than the introduction of a good breed of sheep. The more of them we breed the better. It is the intention of the Government this year to import a quantity, and these will be distributed as all the other animals have been. Some little time ago Mr. Dodd, on the West Coast, imported some 800 sheep; and if these flourish there it will not be difficult for the societies to get and keep them. Another thing that would greatly benefit the Colony is the importation of pigs or swine. There is not a day but that I get a letter saying that the people are not being encouraged in the breeding of pigs, and can the Department assist them. We have also made arrangements for importing 250 of the best breed this year, and we will distribute these in the same way, free of cost. It has to be borne in mind that the people in the outports are not able to afford any great sums for the purchase of these animals, and this assistance is very necessary.

Again, sir, what has been done with regard to poultry? The exhibition held last year was an eye-opener to many who saw the exhibit of poultry. Why should we not raise far more poultry than we do? Our people have had no encouragement in the past, but we hope in future to give them a great deal. Indeed we have begun to do so. As in the other branches, our people needed instruction in this also. There is the care of the hen, for instance. Our people have always had an idea that it was necessary to keep them altogether away from the cold, if they were wanted to lay

well. From our friend, Dr. Robertson, I find that the cold makes no difference to them, and all that is wanted is to keep them in a place where they can get about and "scratch for their living." I saw some very fine birds at the exhibition, of very excellent breed, and I believe the day is not far hence when a great improvement will be noticed in the poultry stock throughout the Colony. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me ask your attention to even another matter in which the Board have been able to interest themselves. I refer to peat cutting. My friend, the member for St. George's, made some investigations and reports on the peat properties at Wesleyville, Gambo, Brigus, and elsewhere; and I think from his reports that the possibilities of peat fuel for Newfoundland are ideal. Last year the Government were able to secure the services of four expert Irish cutters, who came here and gave demonstrations of peat cutting all over the Island. The time they spent in giving demonstrations was as follows: Torbay Road, St. John's East, 20 days; Petty Harbor, 14 days; Maddock's Cove, 7 days; Kelligrews, 19 days; Holyrood, 3 days; Conception Harbor, 3 days; Brigus, 2 days; Bay Roberts, 3 days; Spaniard's Bay, 3 days; Wesleyville, 4 days; Newtown, 5 days; Cape Freels, 2 days; Pound Cove, 2 days; Brookfield, 3 days; Pool's Island, 1 day; Greenspond, 2 days; Bonavista, 17 days; Muddy Brook, 3 days; Elliston, 2 days; King's Cove, 5 days; Broad Cove, 1 day; Catalina, 1 day; Flower's Marsh, 1 day; Hant's Harbor, 2 days; Trepassey, 21 days; St. Mary's, 14 days; Branch, 2 days; St. Bride's, 6 days; Tesselo, 2 days; Patrick's Cove, 4 days; Point Verde, 4 days; Harbor Grace, 2 days; Carbonear, 2 days; Victoria Village, 1 day; Renews, 14 days; Witless Bay, 6 days; Cape Broyle, 3 days, Ferryland, 3 days; Tor's Cove, 2 days.

The reports of these men have been laid upon the table. It is the intention of the Board to have two more of them out this summer, to give further demonstrations. Personally, I am fully confident that the time is not far distant when we shall have peat fuel manufactured on a large scale in Newfoundland. As to the ideas of those who have used the peat, I have only to refer you to the reports received by the Department from such men as Rev. Fr. Walsh, of Renews; Dr. Hogan, of St. Mary's; Fr. Renouf, of Trepassey; and many others. Take Father Walsh's report. Writing on December 15th, he says:

"About half the people of this parish cut more or less peat last season. The quantity ranged right along (mostly 500 to 1,000) from 100 to 300 briquettes per family. The nuns and myself had each about the latter. The peat was burned by the residents, and, when thoroughly dried, was considered as pleasant as wood or coal. For

myself, I may say that I intend cutting peat the coming year, and I have put the question to the people, and they have said: "Yes; undoubtedly," also. You should note that there was not time for a fair trial last season. We barely got the art, as all the men were at the fishery (June 24th) when work was started here. Peat should be cut early in April, or the end of May, or before the fishing comes on. A regular plan of draining bogs should be begun, and the face of the cut turned towards a drain. The tendency is for all to cut a hole, and then, before the peat is reached, there is an overflow of water, and the work has to be discontinued. The people should be encouraged (maybe helped) to build houses for storing the dry peat. Under existing circumstances they have no place to store peat, and, of course, no place to keep it for winter use. Unless the peat is dry, and is kept as dry as fire-brick, it is no use as fuel."

It is no use delaying this Committee by reading you the reports and opinions of all these gentlemen. Suffice it to say similar reports have been received from Mr. Hart of King's Cove, B.B., Mr. C. C. Pitman of Lamaline, Mr. J. T. Young of St. Bride's, Dr. Murphy of Bonavista, and others. There has been laid upon the table of the House a synopsis, or rather a full report, of all the information in connection with this industry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, only a word or two more and I will have done. I have in my mind the observations of the Vice-President of the Manufacturers' Association, Mr. Browning, at the opening of the Exhibition in October. Among other things he stated that there was a prejudice in the minds of Newfoundlanders against the home-made article. I think the same applies to what is grown in the ground. Our people seem to think that imported vegetables are much superior to the local grown, when it has been amply demonstrated that such is not the case. Now, Mr. Chairman, this prejudice must be removed, and our people encouraged to support home industries. The experts we had here in connection with the exhibition bore testimony to the good quality of our vegetables, and if we could only succeed in impressing this fact upon the minds of our people, it would mean that henceforth the large amount of money now annually sent abroad for produce would go into the pockets of our farmers. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that I have already detained the Committee too long, and I only hope that my explanation of the Government's policy has been sufficiently clear for you to understand the work that we have undertaken, and been able to accomplish in a very limited time. I beg to move the adoption of the first resolution.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask whether it is the intention of the Government to put these resolutions through this afternoon. There is a great deal of in-

formation bearing upon the expenditure and work of all branches of the Department of Agriculture and Mines during the year which I think should be in the possession of this Committee. Last year the House voted an amount of $20,000 under statutory authority, and we are now asked to increase that vote to double the amount, namely $40,000. There has been a large amount of work done, according to the explanation of the Minister. The Committee, however, are not in possession of any of the reports of the work performed by the various agricultural societies or the commissioners who have been going through the country the past year. Now I think it absolutely essential that the members of this Committee should have this information, so that we may be able to intelligently discuss the vote. We have been furnished with a report of Dr. McPhail, and that is the only information that we have at present. There have been three commissioners at work, Messrs. Seymour, Downey, and Devereux, and I suppose they have each made a report. Then Professor Robertson made a report, and there is the regular report of the Board. None of these is available to the Committee. I would ask the Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to put these resolutions thro this afternoon.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—No, we do not want to do so.

MR. KENT—I thank the Hon. Minister, and I trust he will furnish the Committee with the desired information.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered, that this report be received, and that the Committee have leave to sit again to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Sale of Seeds" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill for the Extension of the Bounty on Peat.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and passed the Bill without amendment.

Ordered, that this report be received, and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Roberts gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, March 6th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 6th.

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

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I beg leave to present a petition from John S. Rowsell and others of Bonavista. Petitioners state that along the east side of Beaver Pond there are 100 acres of good agricultural land, and they ask for the sum of $200 for the purpose of constructing a road to this place. I am entirely in accord with the prayer of this petition and give it my hearty support.

Also a petition from Shalloway Cove, St. Brendan's, asking for the sum of $400 to construct a bridge at that place. I would ask that these petitions be received and referred to the Departments to which they relate.

MR. SEYMOUR—I beg to present a petition from the residents of Harbor Grace. It is largely and influentially signed by the residents of Harbor Grace proper, Riverhead and Bear's Cove, asking for an elective Road Board. We hope to be able to take up the consideration of this matter, and give the people full charge of their road affairs. Harbor Grace should have a local council and I give this petition my hearty support.

MR. PARSONS—I support the prayer of the petition and hope that the near future will witness the introduction of the better system.

MR. DOWNEY—I have two petitions or more than ordinary importance to present from the people of Codroy Valley. They are signed by Mongr. Browne and all the male residents in that section.—They are for two facilities which are of the greatest possible importance for the proper carrying on of agricultural pursuits. First petitioners ask for a sum of money to construct a bridge across Grand River. The farming section of that portion of the district is 16 miles from Little River station. The construction of this bridge would mean a saving of eight or nine miles, and this would perhaps make all the difference between profit and loss. The cartage for four or five miles would make the pursuit of agriculture an almost entirely prohibitive one. Codroy Valley is the garden of Newfoundland, and the industry of the people would be far greater than at present if the ordinary facilities were in reach. One essential is good roads. Roads to the farm are as tools to the tradesmen.

The other petition asks for telephone extension. The people live

16 miles away from the railway station. During the months of October, November and December they ship their produce. At the present time a man hauls a load of produce 16 miles to the station. He finds that the train has not arrived. It is cold weather and his potatoes become frostbitten, with the result that they are no good to sell. Now, if there was telephone connection, this would not happen, for the man could find out what time the train was expected, and thus reach there in proper time. I consider that the people of St. George's are entitled to special consideration and I trust the Government will see its way clear to grant them their request in this matter. In the past the people of the district have been discriminated against and even now there are many things done that are unfair to them. Two years ago, I might say, it was impossible to get a share of the railway work when they sought for it. They cannot participate in the Gulf sealfishery which is their natural heritage. This year I made a special appeal to the merchants and captains for berths for some of the men in my district but I was unable to obtain them, and I consider this a great injustice. They are debarred from many of the advantages with which other districts are more blessed, for that reason I trust that the Government will meet them in their present request.

MR. PARSONS—I ask leave to present a petition from His Lordship Bishop March and others of Caplin Cove, asking for a grant of $300 to be expended on the extension of the wharf there. This wharf is in use from one end of the year to the other for fishing and other purposes and I therefore ask that it receive the best attention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. SEYMOUR—I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

MR. EARLE—I beg leave to present a petition from a number of inhabitants of Cat Harbor on the subject of telephone extension to Ladle Cove; also one from Henry Shea and others of Ladle Cove on the same subject; also one from Carmanville and one from Musgrave Harbor, also in support of the petition. There is a great need for the system on the shore and I have already presented petitions on the same subject and tried to show to the House the necessity there is to have it installed. It has been suggested that a line run from Newtown to Cat Harbor and from Cat Harbor to Musgrave Hr., and it may be thought best to have the station at Musgrave Harbor, but these matters will rest with the Government. I do hope that the requests contained in these petitions will be taken into consideration, and I have much pleasure in presenting them.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from

the District of Bonavista, which I have the honor to represent. It is a very largely signed one, and the petitioners ask that a breakwater be built at Cat Harbor. This petition is very similar to many presented during this session on the same subject. The only difference is that in the other cases they wanted the breakwater at Deadman's Bay instead of Cat Harbor. You may remember that when speaking on one of these petitions a few days ago I suggested that Cat Harbor would be a better place for the breakwater. These people asked that it be placed there and say that it will make the harbor a very good shelter for vessels, and that it could be done at very little expense. It would be quite a large harbor and be able to hold a great number of schooners.

In whichever place it is put, if the Government decides to grant the prayer of the petition, it will be very beneficial. It is a well known fact that between Pool's Island and Seldom Come By there is no port whatever where a schooner can harbor with safety, with the exception of Newtown. If this breakwater is placed there it will be a great benefit to the fishermen, especially in the fall of the year, when they have to put up with great suffering and hardship for want of a harbor. I earnestly ask that this request be granted, not only for the people of Bonavista, but also for those of Green Bay, Fogo and Conception Bay.

I have also a petition from the inhabitants of Bar Harbor, a distance of about three miles from Salvage, asking for a sum of money to build a road to connect them with Salvage. A few days ago I was down in the northern mail boat, and I visited this place. There are about one hundred inhabitants in this little settlement. They all have to go to Salvage for worship and for everything else, and there is no road whatever. They ask for some $250 to enable them to build this road. I give this petition my most hearty support, and ask that it be referred to the Dept. of Public Works.

Ordered that these petitions be received and referred to the Departments to which they relate.

MR. ROBERTS asked the Minister of Finance for details of $500 paid Dr. Keegan and charged to contingencies account, also if he were paid any other sums in connection with his visit to England last year.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS — The Government a year ago decided upon effecting absolutely essential improvements to the hospital. These involved equipping two operating rooms and furnishing them with everything of the most up-to-date design in the way of appointments, instruments and appliances; it also involved the providing of the modern equipment of a laundry, where some three thousand pieces per week could be laundered, and

a kitchen where the food could be cooked .for two hundred persons including patients and attendants, having special reference, moreover, to the cooking for invalids in hospital. In view of these circumstances the Government sent Dr. Keegan to inspect the most modern hospitals in the British Isles, Canada and the United States, so that he might select all this equipment as a result of personal inspection, and they allowed him five hundred dollars for expenses. I might explain that the Government in deciding to allow Dr. Keegan $500 for this work considered that they were giving him very modest compensation, seeing that the last Government allowed Dr. Brehm the sum of $450 for attending the Tuberculosis convention.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the bill entitled, "An Act to extend the operation 5 Edward VII, Cap. 8, entitled 'An Act to encourage the Manufacture of Peat,'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with messages requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act further to amend the Crown Lands Act, 1904."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. KENT—I would like to observe in reference to the section that has just been read, that I notice there are several departures in the new bill now under our consideration from the law as it stands at present under the Act of 1903, and the amendments since made to it, departures that are very sweeping in their operation, and that therefore should be carefully considered in every respeet before the measure is passed. Thus, the section which has just been read provides for the amalgamation of the conditions relating to timber and pulp licenses, which were formerly kept apart and distinct from one another. Not only is this so, but a far greater power and discretion is given to the Governor-in-Council under the present Bill than was contained in the former Act, and I am afraid it will not be found that the giving of this wide discretion to the Governor-in-Council will be to the benefit of the Colony. Our timber areas are perhaps the greatest of the assets which we possess, and they are becoming more valuable year after year, and we should therefore exercise great care in dealing with them. The legislature is the custodian of these assets and the Department of Agriculture and Mines is entrusted with them. That Department is a most important one for it has to deal with agriculture, our mines and our

forest wealth, and upon the way in which it deals with these great natural resources will depend in no small measure the future possibilities of the Island.

The present Bill also extends the period within which the mill is to be erected upon the area granted, or at least power is given the Governor-in-Council to extend it, which amounts to the same thing. In fact, as far as the Legislature is concerned, there is no time limit at all, and the section as it now reads is wholly inoperative and of no effect for it simply amounts to this, that the time allowed shall be a matter for the Governor-in-Council to say that the mill shall be of the capacity to cut a thousand feet per day for every ten square miles contained in the license, whereas in the former Act it was for every five square miles only. It is only when a person acquires an area of ten square miles that he can be compelled to erect a mill upon it. As the Bill now reads it is possible for a man to have ten areas of nine square miles each and to hold them without erecting a mill on any one of them, or without even intending to do so, but to hold them for speculative purposes only. It may be contended that this argument would apply in a less degree to the Act which is now to be repealed and that may be so, but granting that it does, now is the time to remedy it. There are many possibilities involved in the points that I have raised, and I mention them just now because it may not be the intention of the Minister in charge of the measure to leave it as it stands at the present time.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—I do not quite follow the objection which my learned friend has raised to the section which has been read as to pulp licenses. The nature of the proposed amendment is this: Under section 33 to 35 of the Act of 1903 pulp licenses were granted to cover an area of from five to one hundred and fifty square miles, and subject to certain conditions set forth in the Act. It was found to be impracticable, for nobody erected or sought to erect a pulp factory under a license granted under those sections. If the hon. gentleman will look at sub-section 2 of section 35 of the 1903 Act he will see that one of the conditions was that the licensee should expend not less than $20,000 in erecting buildings and machinery necessary for the manufacture of pulp; but this was found to be so unworkable that in 1906, by section 10 of the Crown Lands Act of that year, power was given the Governor in Council to grant to the holder of a license to cut timber the right to cut timber for pulp, and the section then went on to say that if the Governor in Council were satisfied that $20,000 had been spent in erecting a pulp factory, the holder might be relieved of the obligation of erecting the saw-mill provided for in section 25 of the 1903 Act. I think my learned

mittee what would be a reasonable limit. But here the limit as regards time and money is absolutely left to the Governor in Council. In other words, the House surrenders all control over the definition of what is reasonable as regards either time or expenditure in connection with both pulp and paper factories. Further, I think that very different condition would apply in the case of the erection of timber mills or lumber mills from those which would apply in the case of paper or pulp mills. One, of course, would be a very much larger undertaking than the other, and for this reason I think that the distinction which formerly existed between the conditions governing paper, pulp and lumber mills ought to be maintained, and that proper limits as to the time and expenditure and conditions under which the licenses would be granted in each case ought to be defined.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—On the face of it that sounds reasonable, but when you come to work it out practically you find the difficulties. When you come to consider the erection of a pulp factory it is not merely a question of erecting a building in a certain place and installing machinery. It would be easy, of course, to figure out how long that would take and what it should cost. But there is the question of the water power, and anyone who has kept in touch with the large industries operating at Grand Falls and Bishop Falls knows that the water power is the most important factor in connection with a pulp factory and that may cost a hundred thousand or five hundred thousand or a million dollars to develop. Now if you put in any limit which will apply to application for a pulp factory then you are going to put in a limit which will simply stop business being conducted, and which will simply remain as a dead letter upon the Statute Book, and any party wishing to erect a pulp mill will simply have to come in and make a special agreement or conditions with the Government in the same way the Harmsworths and others have done. After giving the matter a great deal of consideration, the Department of Agriculture and Mines came to the conclusion that this was the best way to get over the difficulty which has been before the Department not only this year and last, but for a number of years past, and which has become more urgent since the question of building pulp factories has come more to the front. What we want is to get more pulp factories, both in Newfoundland and Labrador, and the Government think that the best and easiest and most satisfactory way to deal with the question is to leave it to the Department or to the Governor in Council, when an applicant comes and states what kind of a factory he is going to erect, to say what are proper and fair and reasonable conditions, both from the stand-

business to carry it on. When in Committee I shall be glad to point out from time to time in what way the various sections cover and embrace all the good and necessary points of the Imperial Act. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. KENT—I think this Bill embodies a very desirable principle—the principle of taking proper and necessary precaution in the handling of explosives, and, I don't think the hon. introducer of this Bill could have followed a better precedent than that embodied in Imperial Legislation. It is true that many of the details of the Imperial Statute are not applicable here, but in the main principle of legislation of this kind it is generally safe to follow what has been enacted in England after every care and precaution has been taken for the safety of the public and the proper conduct of the business. We here in this Colony have had very little reason up to the present to investigate the matter of the handling and storing and importation of explosives. It is only within recent years that the business of the country has drawn our attention more particularly to this matter, and certainly the law as at present embodied in the Consolidated Statutes is anything but satisfactory and provides no protection to the public in respect of accidents in the handling of explosives. The Act appears to go on the lines of issuing licenses to firms and taking precautions beforehand regarding explosives while in the control of those who handle them and also for the punishment of those violating the laws in respect of explosives. These I think are very proper precautions, and I have much pleasure in according my support to the Bill.

HON. THE PREMIER—I ought to have said that I am very much indebted in this matter to the Government Engineer, Mr. Hall, who has fully informed and instructed me in relation to this whole measure. He appears to have the matter at his finger ends and has gone very fully into it. He has written me a very comprehensive letter dealing with the 130 sections of the Imperial Act, showing the points that it will be necessary for us to have regard to here. I think it is due to Mr. Hall to mention the valuable services he has rendered in this matter, for he is a very busy man and must have devoted much of his own time to this matter.

This Bill was thereupon read a second time, and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of the Municipal Bill.

HON. THE PREMIER—I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. It is an amendment to the present law of 1902. There are seven amendments altogether which the Council ask to have made in relation to the Municipal Law. I may say that the legislation asked for has been forwarded to the Government to have introduced, and except in so far as having to introduce the Bill the Government is not specially concerned in it. I am sorry I have not had the advantage of being able to discuss merits of the Bill with the Mayor. Unfortunately he has been laid up with a slight illness, but I am pleased to be able to state that he is now fast recovering and I hope that in

point of the applicant and from that of the Government. Ever since we have had our Crown Lands Act, the license for a saw mill was subject to special conditions, and it was left to the Governor in Council to make these conditions, and if this was proper in connection with saw mills twenty-five or thirty years ago, the argument is the same to-day in connection with pulp mills.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—There is no need of my adding anything to what the Attorney General has said, but I think it would be only right to mention the fact that the department has had great difficulties in the past in connection with pulp and timber licenses, and this fact, I am sure, will be borne out by my hon. friend, the member for Twillingate. It seems that there has always been a lot of trouble in changing one license to another. It seems only just and reasonable that the Governor in Council should have the power to impose conditions as to time and expenditure. There is no doubt in my mind that if this amendment goes through it will certainly aid the department considerably.

MR. CLIFT—Having had some personal experience in connection with the working of this Act, I can quite appreciate what has been said by hon. members on the other side of the House, and so far as I am personally concerned I shall be only too pleased to do anything I can to help the passing of such a measure as will greatly facilitate the dealing with our timber areas, whether it be for the purpose of cutting lumber or the manufacture of pulp. I have not had time since this Bill came before the House to give it that consideration that I should like. Other matters have claimed my attention, and if the Minister would be good enough to defer further consideration of this Bill until to-morrow or some other convenient time I would be glad to go into it then. I do not think any useful purpose can be served by rushing the measure through, and perhaps if we think it over a day or two longer we can arrive at a more perfect measure. I would ask that the Minister hold it over until to-morrow or next day for further consideration. I may state that, as far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the measure. My only desire is to make it as perfect as possible.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I am quite prepared to postpone this matter. I would therefore ask that the Committee rise.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture

and Mines, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions for the Encouragement of Agriculture

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. KENT—I have asked for certain information in this connection and I think the Resolutions should be deferred till the information is furnished. The Resolutions were deferred accordingly.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Committee have leave to sit again to-morrow

Second reading of Explosives Bill.

HON. THE PREMIER—In moving the second reading of this Bill, I desire to point out briefly the meaning and effect of the Bill and the object in bringing it in at the present time. As will be noticed the Bill is to regulate the manufacture, storage, importation and sale of explosives. I think it will be admitted by all that these are four very important questions, and the legislation dealing with them is not alone of a technical character but of very serious importance to the public generally, to parties engaged in the business and to those employed in their manufacture. The present Bill contains, I think, either by express enactment or by implication, all the necessary and important sections of the Imperial Act of 1875 and the amendments that have been made from time to time, and also powers to make regulations to cover everything of importance in that Bill. At first it was thought that a reenactment of that Bill would meet out case, but on giving a careful study to the measure it was found that the Bill was entirely too cumbersome and entirely too elaborate in many cases, especially in relation to the various bodies that are incorporated in the Bill to make it possible to apply it to this country. If any person is interested in following the Bill historically, because after all it is a matter of great interest, I shall be glad to let them see a copy of the Explosives Act of 1875 and the various Acts in amendment thereof and all Orders in Council and Orders of the Secretary of State made under the Act with the annotations and notes. Now I may say that last year the Canadian Government were anxious to deal with this matter, their legislation being to a certain extent somewhat like our own, which is very defective, but which so far has served its purpose. It is so defective that we do not know where we stand to-day as regards the whole question of explosives. Anxious to proceed cautiously and carefully in this matter, the Canadian Government last year obtained the services of Captain Desborough, who is Inspector of Explosives in the Home Office in London, and during last summer a conference was held in Canada, presided over by the Director of Mines, and attended by all the Deputy Ministers of Mines of the various provinces of Canada, also by the representatives of the manufacturers of explosives in Canada, and also by others interested in the transpor-

tation and storage of explosives. At that conference Captain Desborough made a very interesting address dealing with all the various questions involved in the legislation that they proposed to introduce, but principally dealing with the question of the authorization of explosives, the classes of buildings where they are to be manufactured and stored, and from which they are to be sold ; the number of people allowed to work in the various buildings ; the question of storage and transportation; the whole question of the importation of explosives and the question of inspecting and sampling explosives, and also the question of the investigation of accidents in relation to these factories, and many other useful and interesting matters. Now as a result of those proceedings an Act was framed, and the Bill that I am now submitting for the consideration of the House is practically a verbatim copy of the Act which was the result of that conference and which was submitted to the Canadian Parliament at the beginning of the recent session. It is not intended that this Act should come into operation at once. It will not come into operation until a day to be proclaimed, it may be a year or six months from now ; but in the meantime it is hoped that such regulations will have been made as will make the Act fit in smoothly with all parties interested in this business and at the same time not interfere with the laws which are at present in force. It will be seen, of course, from a perusal of the Act, that there are many matters dealt with that do not at present concern us ; but we are now beginning the manufacture of explosives in this Colony, and we shall be dealing with the sale and storage of explosives and the construction of works and their operation afterwards, and it is important that we should have a law dealing with all the various branches of these dangerous operations. In the past we have been singularly fortunate in being free from any accidents in this respect, although we have had some accidents due largely to want of knowledge on the part of our people in the handling of explosives, and want of proper care on the part of those supervising their use.

The third section of the Bill deals with the authorization of explosives. In other words, no person will be allowed to have in possession or import, store, use, or manufacture any explosives not authorized. There are some kinds of explosives very dangerous to use, very easily exploded and composed of ingredients cheap in their way, very often cheaply sold, and not as effective or valuable, but sometimes more dangerous in handling. Further, they are very often passed off on those who do not understand explosives or the ingredients they contain, and it is proposed here to give the Minister authority to say what shall or shall not be imported or sold or manufactured.

The fifth section says that no person shall carry on any of the following processes dealing with explosives except under regulations. The sixth section provides for the licensing of factories. Sec. 7 provides that Minister may issue permits for the importation, sale and transportation of au-

thorized explosives. Section 8 provides that special permits may be granted to import for scientific research. Section 9 provides that applications for factory or magazine licenses have to be made to the Minister, such applications to contain a statement of the maximum number of persons to be employed in each building ; the maximum amount of explosives or ingredients to be allowed at any one time in any process ; the nature of that process; and a great deal more information which will have to be given before people will be allowed to enter into this business. Section 10 refers to permits to manufacture for experimenta' purposes. Section 11 deals with any material alteration or addition to a licensed factory. Section 12 follows on that and says that a factory shall not be affected by any change in the person of the owner. Section 13 deals with the licenses to be issued and the sub-sections deal with the applications to be made for the certificates and licenses. Section 14 deals with the appointment of inspectors of explosives and sub-inspectors and it is proposed that the police in the outports shall act as inspectors, which they are quite able to do. Section 16 deals with enquiries into explosives. Sec. 7 is really the important section, because it gives the Governor in Council power from time to time to make the regu'ations Section 18 and the following sections deal with the penalties under the Act. Some of them at first glance seem to be high, but we have followed the English Act and when we get into Committee on the Bill it may be desirable to alter these penalties or make them more discretionary. In England the penalties are high because they apply to companies composed of individuals who have been acquainted with explosives all their lives and when they make a breach of the regulations they generally do it with their eyes open, knowingly. But here where the people with a very few exceptions are not acquainted with this class of offence, I think the penalties should not be too high but reasonable.

Chapters 40 and 41 of the Consolidated Statutes are repealed. Chapter 40 deals with the storing of gunpowder in the towns of St. John's, Harbor Grace and Carbonear, and Chapter 41 refers to the storing of dynamite and other explosives. With regard to these two chapters it is hard to say how we stand to-day. The powder magazine on Signal Hill is under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Mr. Cantwell is at present in charge and it only contains powder for use in the noon day gun. In relation to dynamite and powder and other explosives being used, stored, sold and imported, up to the present very little supervision has been exercised. True, we have been fortunate and have had very few accidents, but if this business is inaugurated and even if these people never come here, seeing the large quantities of explosives that are carried fr o m time to time by schooners, etc., and stored by private parties, the time has come when the matter should be put upon a firm basis, and every possible restriction made to conserve the safety of the public, and at the same time not make it needlessly difficult for those in the

business to carry it on. When in Committee I shall be glad to point out from time to time in what way the various sections cover and embrace all the good and necessary points of the Imperial Act. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. KENT—I think this Bill embodies a very desirable principle—the principle of taking proper and necessary precaution in the handling of explosives, and, I don't think the hon. introducer of this Bill could have followed a better precedent than that embodied in Imperial Legislation. It is true that many of the details of the Imperial Statute are not applicable here, but in the main principle of legislation of this kind it is generally safe to follow what has been enacted in England after every care and precaution has been taken for the safety of the public and the proper conduct of the business. We here in this Colony have had very little reason up to the present to investigate the matter of the handling and storing and importation of explosives. It is only within recent years that the business of the country has drawn our attention more particularly to this matter, and certainly the law as at present embodied in the Consolidated Statutes is anything but satisfactory and provides no protection to the public in respect of accidents in the handling of explosives. The Act appears to go on the lines of issuing licenses to firms and taking precautions beforehand regarding explosives while in the control of those who handle them and also for the punishment of those violating the laws in respect of explosives. These I think are very proper precautions, and I have much pleasure in according my support to the Bill.

HON. THE PREMIER—I ought to have said that I am very much indebted in this matter to the Government Engineer, Mr. Hall, who has fully informed and instructed me in relation to this whole measure. He appears to have the matter at his finger ends and has gone very fully into it. He has written me a very comprehensive letter dealing with the 130 sections of the Imperial Act, showing the points that it will be necessary for us to have regard to here. I think it is due to Mr. Hall to mention the valuable services he has rendered in this matter, for he is a very busy man and must have devoted much of his own time to this matter.

This Bill was thereupon read a second time, and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of the Municipal Bill.

HON. THE PREMIER—I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. It is an amendment to the present law of 1902. There are seven amendments altogether which the Council ask to have made in relation to the Municipal Law. I may say that the legislation asked for has been forwarded to the Government to have introduced, and except in so far as having to introduce the Bill the Government is not specially concerned in it. I am sorry I have not had the advantage of being able to discuss merits of the Bill with the Mayor. Unfortunately he has been laid up with a slight illness, but I am pleased to be able to state that he is now fast recovering and I hope that in

a day or two he will be out. He was very keen on these amendment, as also were his brother Councillors. They all think the amendments will be of service to the city and will help them to carry on the administration of civic affairs.

The first section will enable the Council to charge 6 per cent. on all taxes which have not been paid, which shall begin to run one year after they have become due. In other words people will have twelve months before they have to pay their taxes. From year to year large amounts of arrears stand on the books, sometimes as high as $10,000 or $15,000. Of course the amounts making this total are in many cases small amounts ; and would hardly pay the Council to retain legal services, and even if they do, it is difficult to recover anything, because the people are poor and have very little to attach. But it is not only these people who don't pay, rather those who are able to pay but are really too indifferent. I am quite sure there are people well able to pay and who have no desire to refrain from paying, but neglect to do so, and go on doing so for years. Under this section the Council will be entitled to interest at 6 per cent.

Section 2 proposes to repeal section 117 of the Act of 1902. You will notice that that is the "special appraisement" section which deals with the appraisement of lands and houses which occurs between the triennial appraisements, and the Council ask that the machinery of section 117 of the Act be abolished, and that the whole court of appraisement be handed over to the Council. Suppose a house goes up in the interval between two triennial appraisements, surely the Engineer or the Secretary would be well able to appraise that house. It would probably be at the same rate as the houses two or three doors down the street. Take Cochrane Street, Prescott Street or Military Road, a'l the houses on these streets are pretty much the same, having regard to the amount of rent paid, and why the Council has asked for this particular amendment I don't know. However, when we get into Committee we will discuss that. Section 3 merely says that the Council shall fix a scale of charges to be paid to licensed cab drivers driving within a radius of 12 miles from the City Hill in St. John's. This question of licensing and supervising the cabmen has occupied the minds of the Council for some time, and they have had quite a lot of discussion about it, and they think that not only wi'l it be in the interest of the public but also of the honest cabmen.

Section 4 is in relation to the registration of horses and vehicles. Section 5 is an important section. It gives the Council power to grant permission to lay cables and pipes underground and dig up the streets for such purpose, and gives the Council power to charge a small tax, and the Council propose to fix that charge at so much per foot. That may or may not be a sound way of fixing the tax. A good deal will depend upon the distance to go.

Section 6 gives the Council power to purchase land and other property for the use of the Council. That is merely to get over the question of the purchase of

the Seamen's Home. In looking over the Act it was found that they had no such power. Under the Act of 1890 there was such a power, but in consolidating the Acts that seems to have been omitted. Under the 36th section of the Municipal Act no erection can be made without submitting the plan to the Council for approval, and section 27 deals with the inflammability of buildings in certain places. There is a doubt as to whether those sections apply to wharves. The Council are of opinion that these sections do not apply to sheds built upon the wharves.

These are the only amendments that are proposed, and with this explanation I beg to move the second reading of the Bill, and when we get into Committee tomorrow we can discuss the points which are capable of amendment.

MR. KENT—I think it is safe to say that an amendment of the Municipal Act is desirable ; we might say that every year. That arises from two causes ; first because of defects in the existing law, and secondly, because the city is growing and its needs are becoming more urgent. Of course the details of this Bill will be discussed in Committee. I notice the intention of the Council to regulate the charges of cabmen and I have no doubt that as between the cabmen and the public this is very desirable. But as we are going to have taxicabs here this year I think it would be a good thing to give the same power to the Council to regulate the affairs of taxicabs also. I think that the time has come when the law relating to the Municipal Council should be codified and incorporated in one Act. At the present time it is very confusing to look up any matter in connection with the relation of the Council to the Government and in this respect I would like to suggest to the City Council the desirability before the next session of the Legislature of doing something in the direction of consolidating the law in relation to the city. I think it necessary that the rights of the citizens and the Council and particularly the rights of the Government in relation to the Government of the city should be clearly defined. Those who have had practical dealing with this law, I feel sure, will agree with me in what I say and the fact of amendments being made annually is the best evidence that these Acts should be codified.

The Act was then read a second time and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of the Bill relating to motors.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Speaker, in asking for the second reading of this Bill I may say that this one also comes from the Municipal Council, and this is the result of great deliberation and care on their part. You will notice that Section 2 of the Bill says, "In lieu of the fees in Section 2." This has relation to Chap. 18 of the Act of 1906 which was the first Act on this matter and Section 2 provides for the payment of the fees in the schedule. If you look at this Bill you will see that the schedule of fees is as follows:

Motor cycles	$ 5.00
Motor cars up to 10 h.p. ..	12.00
Motor cars from 10 to 20 h.p.	18.00

Motor cars from 20 to 60 h.p. (in addition to $18) per h.p. ..... .50
Motor cars from 60 h.p. upwards (in addition to $18) per h.p. ..... .75

Horsepower under this schedule is to be determined according to the standard or scale of the Royal Automobile Club of ———, which I take it means England. I was looking on Saturday into the English Act on this matter and I found that the scale is:

Under 6½ h.p.	£ 2.2
Under 12 h.p.	3.3
Under 16 h.p.	4.4
Under 26 h.p.	6.6
Under 32 h.p.	8.8
Under 40 h.p.	10.10
Under 60 h.p.	21.00
Over 60 h.p.	42.00

Or about $200 for a motor in England over 60 horsepower. All motors here—I do not know much about them—I shou'd suppose are of very small horsepower and the owners will not object to paying a reasonable a mount for the privilege of having them. In a small town like St. John's and in fact in the whole of this country, the right to use a motor, especially those large motors, is a much greater right than in other countries. They take charge of the whole road, pedestrians have to get out of the way, horses to fly in all directions. I was on LeMarchant Road one beautiful summer evening after tea between half past seven and eight—Le Marchant Road is a little park in itself and there were hundreds of people out with their wives and children—when up came one of these motors leaving in its train a cloud of dust which was not allayed for nearly 15 or 20 minutes and scattering the pedestrians in all directions. For these immense machines, and for this right it is desirable and it is just that the owners should pay a small fee. In other countries greater restrictions are placed on the holders of such a privilege and it is impossible to inconvenience the public to such an extent. My experience is, not from being in them, but from looking at them, that consideration is given by the owners and drivers to those who are on the road and I hope that this will continue. And I hope that they will remember that the man walking along has as much right as the man in the motor or the man in the Victoria. One has as much right to get out of the way as the other . With these few remarks I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. ROBERTS—Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that we have not down in Twillingate District any necessity to run out of the way to save our lives from these motors. We have to come to town to get that experience. But before the Bill goes into Committee I would like to point out that in some progressive towns in the States instead of having to get out of the way of the motors, the law is that if a motor runs over or into any one the driver is imprisoned for six months, forfeits his motor and is never allowed to drive again. I think a clause to this effect would be the proper thing in this Act .

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be

referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister, the Bill entitled, "An Act to further amend the Education Act, 1903," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

MR. KENT gave notice of question.

MR. CLAPP gave notice of question.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House I would ask that we adjourn until to-morrow at four o'clock, in order that we may all have an opportunity of attending the obsequies of the late Canon Dunfield. I am sure that we all here, and the public at large, must have been shocked on hearing on Saturday of his sudden and early demise. To all appearance he seemed to be in the prime of life, going round and attending, as was his custom, to all the various duties connected with his work in the city. And although he had been ill for some few weeks, no one anticipated that one so strong and well could be so near to death. It is but another illustration of the solemn fact that "in the midst of life we are in death." In his case it can be well said that he has closed a career of forty years of extreme usefulness, of duties well and zealously performed, and he has left behind him an example not alone to his church, of which he was a great strength and ornament, but to all churches. Canon Dunfield was a man of the very broadest views, and essentially a worker. A man like Canon Dunfield can not be claimed for any one creed or church. He belonged to all creeds and all churches. That it is which made him a national character. That is why to-day the whole country mourns his sudden demise. Although having many duties to perform, Canon Dunfield never showed any desire to have them lightened, and in many cases he sought and carried out work which he had no responsibility to perform and no objection to undertake. The morning after the fire, at the time when the whole of St. John's East was practically wiped out, and all during that year those who were on the Relief Committee will remember the labors and know the work of those with whom they came in contact. He was not on that Committee, if I remember rightly, but we were often in contact with him and we all remember his work for the starving and destitute people. Many of you will remember the Trinity Bay disaster and the many poor fellows who lost their lives in that unfortunate occurrence. He was the man who organized and dispensed the relief in connection with it, and like everything else that he touched he carried it through to the end in a way most satisfactory to all. It is only a few weeks since he assumed, in conjunction with my friend, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Parsons, of the Penitentiary, and one or two others, the difficulties and responsibilities of distributing the funds in relation to the Regulus disaster. I simply mention these as but items in a busy life.

For many years I have had numerous opportunities of discourse with him on educational matters. As one of the educational committee of the Synod, he came many times to confer with me on education and to plead with me for larger grants for the poor children. He was one of those great big unselfish men to whom nothing was a trouble, prepared to do everything and carry everyone's burden; one of those who undertake too much and ultimately drop in harness. It is so in some cases. And it was the case of the late lamented Canon Dunfield. And if it is possible in such a sad case, especially sad considering the circumstances surrounding his wife and family, if it is possible in such a case to draw from his death anything consoling, it is the satisfaction that he has left behind him the memory of a well-spent life.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that this House is pleased with the graceful appreciation which the Premier has paid to the late Canon Dunfield, a just tribute to a just and great man. Those of us who belong to the same communion as the late Canon will feel grateful for such words falling from his lips. In the death of Canon Dunfield we have lost not alone a strong adherent to his own Church, but a man enthusiastic for the betterment of the people, not alone loyal to his own religion, but a man strong in Christianity. The death of Canon Dunfield, as the Premier has said, is a loss to the whole country; he was a man very hard to replace, a man who worked for the betterment of every person with whom he came in contact. He was particularly interested in the unfortunate, and especially the orphans. His whole life was wrapped up in a desire to care for those in need and in adversity. And I think that when he is laid in his last resting place his memory will live for many years to come. My last active connection with him was in the work of distributing the Regulus-Golden Arrow Fund I remember him at the meetings when the distribution of the funds was taken up, and the way in which he took hold of the matter was characteristic of the man. He was prepared to meet every emergency, not as a member of a certain church, but for the relief of everyone of every creed or class. I well remember his first remarks to us when he said, "Gentlemen, I hope you understand that anything I do in this connection will be done simply in the interests of Christianity." An expression of a sentiment characteristic of the man. I have much pleasure in expressing to the Premier the appreciation of the Anglican communion for his courtesy in moving that adjournment of the House, so that we may all have an opportunity of attending the funeral of Canon Dunfield.

MR. KENT—I do not think it is necessary for me to say very much in addition to what the Hon. the Prime Minister has said. The whole community to-day is mourning the loss of a great man, a great Christian, and above all a great philanthropist. I have known Canon Dunfield from the time when I was a small boy and from that time up to the present day I think there is no man for whom I had greater respect, or

who I felt was held in greater respect and love by the whole community. Canon Dunfield was a many sided man. Besides his devotion to the church of which he was a minister, he was a Christian devoted to the needs of all communions. He was also one of the few amongst us who possessed those scholarly attainments, which I regret are not so prevalent as we should like. On the lecture platform he had few equals in this town, and it was always a pleasure to listen to him. He was a great man in this respect as well as in other respects. I think that the whole House will join with the Prime Minister in the tribute of respect in adjourning this House to enable members to attend the obsequies of so great and good a man.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn till to-morrow, Tuesday, March 7th, at four of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 7th.

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

The HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY laid upon the table of the House the Report of the Postmaster General for the year 1909-10; and the Returns of the Reid-Newfoundland Company (in accordance with the contract of 1901) for the year 1909-10.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

MR. KENT—To ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the table of the House the reports from the various agricultural societies recently formed throughout the Colony; also reports from Messrs. Downey, Seymour and Devereux, or any of them in connecton with the subject of agriculture.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES — Mr. Speaker, I beg to say in reply that there are no reports beyond that I tabled the other day.

MR. KENT—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing, in detail, all monies spent by his department from Main Line, Local or Special Grants at Conception Harbor, with name of parties, amounts and object of payment from March 1st, 1901 to date.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the required information.

MR. KENT—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing, in detail, all amounts which have been paid to each of the following—Lawrence Sullivan, Joseph Treahy and Patrick Larracy, all of Conception Harbor, in the District of Harbor Main, since the 1st of March, 1909, to date.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —I table that information.

Mr. KENT—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing, in detail, all moneys paid, with names of parties, dates and amounts of all moneys spent on the main line of road from Hr. Main to Healey's Cross, to Brien's Bridge, North Arm, in the District of Harbor Main, from January 1st, 1910, to date, with vouchers.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table that information.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines the House resolved into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act further to amend the Crown Lands' Act, 1903."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Minister that without any desire to delay the further progress of this measure, I have received a message from Sir Robert Bond saying that owing to the snow blockade on the railway he is unable to attend this afternoon and that under the circumstances he would ask that this Bill be deferred or at least not taken out of Committee until he has had an opportunity of expressing his opinion on the matter. He does not wish to delay the business of the House, but I think that owing to the snow blockade it is a very fair request. I may say that this request refers to the Resolutions on Agriculture, which come next on the Order Paper. He is anxious to be able to express his opinion on both these matters. There has been no train to-day, and I believe the express is not expected until about midnight.

HON. MIN. AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, I shall be very glad to accede to the request of the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition. We shall read the Bill through to the last section and then rise.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Committee have leave to sit again tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines the House resolved itself into Committe of the Whole on the "Resolutions for the encouragement of Agriculture."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to regulate the Manufacture, Storage, Importation and Sale of Explosives."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. KENT—I beg to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to section 18 of the Act. That appears at first sight to be a very arbitrary extension of power to give to an Inspector. The directions of the Inspector are conclusive upon the owner and he is bound to comply with them under a penalty of five hundred dollars, no matter how unreasonable they may appear to be. This

might entail a very great hardship which in the opinion of those who have a skilled knowledge of storing explosives, would be absolutely unnecessary. I think that large powers should be allowed him, but I don't think his directions ought to be taken as conclusive.

HON. THE PREMIER—To a certain extent I agree with the hon. member, but in the first place he will notice that the Governor in Council under section 17, may make regulations to be observed by Inspectors. In other words that Inspectors under this Act will to a large extent be governed by the rules and regulations prescribed by the Governor in Council. Of course for many years very little will be done with this Act, but it has been drawn with a view to covering the whole business as it may grow. Beyond some two or three places, there are no explosives used now, and I have no doubt that, with the exception of any little work in connection with the manufacture of explosives, things will go on much as they have been doing. But it is when we get to storing and manufacturing large quantities of explosives that the work of inspection will arise, and in that case I should suppose that the manufacturer or person storing or selling it will be safeguarded by the competency of the inspector and also because he will be acting under the rules and regulations of the Governor in Council. Then you will notice that section 18 provides that the penalty shall not exceed five hundred dollars. That gives the right to the man complained against to set up any reasonable defence and the court before whom the case is tried may fine him as low as one cent or as high as $500. I have no desire to put it in the power of the inspectors to be unfair to any one, but it is a dangerous business and requires to be strictly looked after.

MR. KENT—It must be recognized that the instances of storing explosives will multiply throughout the country. Now, Mr. Hall is an excellent man, and I think that if he was able personally to give his supervision to these magazines and stores no doubt could be entertained as to the reasonableness of these requirements, but from what I know of the work imposed upon Mr. Hall it is not likely that he will be able to take up this work, especially as the number of stores, etc., will be increasing and will require more or less regular inspection. Personally I think it would be fair to the owners if some reasonable provision were put in the Act to protect them against unreasonable requirements of unskilled inspectors. I refer to this simply because I think that the working out of that section as it stands might be unreasonably hard on the owners of these stores and magazines. It is true that they are safeguarded by the rules of the Governor in Council, but everyone recognizes that there is a great deal of difference between making rules and carrying them out. I think it would be fair to give the owners some right as against arbitrary or unreasonable requests on the part of inspectors.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, that is the very point I am directing my arguments towards. I am pointing out to the

hon. gentleman that the penalty here can only apply when the party is brought before the Court Then the Court will try the reasonableness of the order. As a case in point, take the case of a manufacturer down in Catalina or Bonavista. The policeman there, who is the inspector under the Act, goes in and makes some order which the proprietor of the factory refuses to carry out. He is taken before the Court and the Magistrate tries the reasonableness of the order. Now, there is no reason why a policeman should have a man up, or ask him to do anything unreasonable; he has no interest in securing a conviction. It is not the same as under the License Act where he might have an interest in the fine. In this case he has no interest save that of carrying out the law. However, I shall raise no objection to any amendment the hon. member might suggest.

MR. KENT—Why not insert "reasonable" before "order" in sertion 18.

HON. THE PREMIER—Very well.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Bill with some amendment.

Ordered that the report be received and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Motor Car Act, 1906."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BENNETT—Before section 1 is adopted I would like to say a few words. It strikes me that in passing a section of this kind we are extending to the Municipal Council powers that I do not think they are entitled to. The section imposes fees on "all motor cars owned in the Electoral District of St. John's." Now sir, I submit that outside of the Municipal limits of St. John's anything that appertains to the affairs of the District should be left to the representatives of the District. Supposing a man living at Kilbride owns a motor car and wishes to use it to go to Ferryland daily, or a man at Waterford Bridge owned one and wanted to use it to go to Topsail daily, what right have the Municipal Council to tax them, or where does its jurisdiction come in. I do not know what the 1906 Act says on this matter, but I just take the section as I see it here, and I think it should be amended so that only vehicles using the streets of the city of St. John's, whether owned in the city or outside it, should be liable to a tax. I think that the Municipal Council have no right to control the suburban parts of the electoral district of St. John's, and as a representative of St. John's West I protest against any such right being given them.

HON. THE PREMIER—I have no objection myself to the amendment proposed by the hon. member, except merely to point out that that is the law at present. The law of 1906 is as follows: "Every motor car owned in the electoral district of St. John's East and West shall be registered, etc." I would merely say that when the Mayor spoke to me

about this legislation he said that the Council wished to make these proposed alterations and asked me if I would bring them in, and I told him I would; but I told him I cou'd in no way assume any responsibility in relation to the principle contained in the amendments. The present amendment is more in relation to fees than jurisdiction, as will be seen from the first section of the present Bill; but, as I have said, I have no objection to the amendment if the hon. gentleman desires it.

MR. BENNETT—I do not see why a man owning a motor car and using it outside the city limits should be taxed. It is all right to tax him once he comes within the Municipality, but we should not give the Municipal Council the right to go outside the Municipal jurisdiction. That is the point I make. I think that if the municipality ever includes the electoral district of St. John's it will be time enough to give them that right.

MR. KENT—I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for St. John's West, Mr. Bennett. Personally, I think all motor cars in the country ought to be registered and numbered. This ought not be confined to any particular district, but I think every one should be registered and pay the fees imposed by this Act when they come to use the streets of the city. There is no reason, as Mr. Bennett pointed out, why a man owning a motor car at Petty Harbor or any of these places should pay a license fee while a man at Topsail or Kelligrews would not, that is provided they do not use the streets. However, the question of registrationis only a matter of detail. The principle is to make them subject to the fee, and I think this section ought to be extended to include all motor cars using the streets of the city of St. John's. I submit that that must have been the intention of the Municipal Council.

HON. THE PREMIER—I would suggsest that this section should stand for the present in order to make the necessary amendments suggested by the hon. members, because it will be necessary to amend the section of the 1906 Act. In the meantime I will go on to the next section. Under this the Inspector General grants the certificates to chaffeurs. I might point out that someone has to be selected, and I suppose the Council thought that the Head of the Police, being in a sense an independent person, would be the proper one to conduct the examinations. I suppose a person desiring a certificate would present himself to the Inspector General, who would send for some recognized chaffeur that understood the matter,who would take the applicant out and see that he understood the handling of these machines before he could get a certificate.

MR. SQUIRES—I would just like to say a word as to the payment of these fees to the Municipal Council. These motor cars are not dependent upon the roads within the city limits, because as a matter of fact they make more use of the roads outside the city than in it ; no man would purchase a motor for the bare purpose of riding on the city streets. They run through all the districts in Conception Bay and as far down as the District of Trinity, where the heavy cars, especially, cause considerable damage to the

roads, and particularly to the small bridges. I think that the fees collected should be paid into the Department of Public Works, and divided proportionately amongst the districts whose roads are used by these cars.

MR. BENNETT—I am glad my friend, the hon. member for Trinity, has brought this matter up. I agree with him that these cars are mostly used on the suburban outport roads, and any person who has any connection with the road work in the different districts will admit the great damage done to the roads and bridges by these cars. Now all this damage has to be met out of the ordinary grants, and I think if the Municipal Council collect three or four thousand dollars we are certainly entitled to our share of it for the upkeep of these roads. I fail to see why the Municipal Council should take it upon themselves to appropriate this money. We ought to have some share of the money collected.

HON. THE PREMIER—Of course there is a great deal to be said in favor of the principal referred to by the hon. member for Trinity, and also by my colleague, Mr. Bennett ; but it will be found that when you come to subdivide the amount you will have very little to give to each. There will be about sixty cars, paying a fee of $40. That is $2,400. Divide that up amongst the various settlements and you would have but a few dollars a settlement. The difficulty is to begin. Once you begin it, every settlement from here to Trepassey, every one in Trinity Bay, and every one in Conception Bay would want a part. You will also have to take out of that the cost of examining chaffeurs and the expenses of administration, and when these expenses are met you will probably have the amount reduced to $1,200, and if you divided that amongst all the settlements in the districts referred to you would reduce the whole thing to an absurdity. However, I have no objection to its being done if the roads are being used and if there is anything substantial to divide, my only fear is that when expenses are met the amount will not be worth dividing.

MR. EARLE—I think a way out o f the difficulty would be to put a tax on automobiles throughout the whole country, and then allow St. John's a reasonable amount of the money received.

HIS HON. THE SPEAKER—While I do not think that there is anything important in this measure, yet I would like to say a few words on it while it is in Committee. I do not think that there will be found any difficulty in dividing up this fund. At the present time only a small number of cars are in use, and only a small amount, about $1,800 or $2,000, will be received ; but this legislation is looking forward to the time when there will be a great number of cars here, and the tax received equal to six or seven thousand dollars, and if that sum were divided amongst the districts most used by these autos, would it not be a great help? For instance, take my own district, Port de Grave. Cars are driven through it, over the roads there, day after day. Now my district grant is a very small amount, and if we got only $100 from this tax it would mean one-sixth of the total special grant. The autos are driven five miles in the out-

ports for every one in St. John's. They damage the bridges and roads to a considerable extent, and if this fund were divided up among the districts most frequented, we should have something to fall back upon to put our roads and bridges back into good condition. Now, another point. I take it these prices are laid down more for the purpose of taxing cars which are used for pleasure than for the car which is used for hiring. At present there is only one car on hire, but there are more coming into use. The cabmen find they have to go into the business, and own motor cars for hire. They are not doing it for pleasure, but through necessity, and I think they should not be taxed in the same way as those who use their cars for pleasure only. I merely throw this out as a suggestion to the Committee.

MR. KENT—I agiee with the remarks of the hon. member for Trinity, Mr. Squires. I think that the principle is a good one, but I do not think it could be considered at the present time, for the reason that this Act in its present form was and is from the Municipal Council, and the Municipal Council in framing the Act had regard only to St. John's, that is the city of St. John's, and if we go outside its scope and consider the damage done by these cars through the country, other considerations would come into play, and perhaps the tax would be considerably increased. Now the tax paid here is smaller than is paid in England and other places. For instance, a 60 h.p. car in England would have to pay a tax of 50 pounds a year. I do not know to what purposes this tax is devoted, but this fact must be recognized that on account of these big heavy machines touring the districts, the bridges are often sprung because of the recoil, and a lot of damage is done by them. This has been the case in my own district, the small bridges are not built to withstand the impact of these heavy machines. Now, while I quite agree with both Mr. Squires and Mr. Bennett as to the desirability of extending the benefits from this tax to other parts of the country, yet I think that as the City Council are the sponsors of this Bill, because the Prime Minister when introducing this Bill told us he was only introducing it on their behalf, that due regard must be paid to that fact in considering this Bill.

HON. THE PREMIER—I am prepared to consider both those propositions. First, as to the owner of a motor running for hire paying a smaller sum. I think it would be unreasonable that the one run for hire should pay as much as the one run simply for pleasure. As to the other mattei, I have no objection to consider that either, but I have no authority to speak on behalf of the Municipal Council. If we have say $1,000 to divide, we will find that there will be very little to go round when we have divided it and sub-divided it again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act further to amend the Education Act, 1903."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Bill without amendment.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Bill be read a third time to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up, entitled, "An Act to encourage the establishment of Cold Storage Plants in this Colony" without amendment.

MR. KENT gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 8th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 8th.

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

HON. COL. SECRETARY—I ask leave to present a petition from George Warren and other residents of Heart's Content, asking for a grant to construct an agricultural road. The road referred to leads to a number of farms in the vicinity of Northern Point. There is at present no access except by footpath, and petitioners are desirous of having a road made so that they may be able to bring in their manure in the spring and take out their produce in the fall. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Public Works, and later on I shall be glad to consult with my colleague and see whether it is possible to allocate a sum of money in connection with the road referred to.

I also ask leave to present a petition from John King, Ronald Stone and other residents of Smith Sound and vicinity asking that a lighthouse and fog alarm be placed on the Horse Chops, between English Harbor and Catalina. Petitioners are of the opinion that the said light and fog alarm will be of great importance to the fishermen, not only of Trinity District, but the whole northern portion of the Island. I understand that a number of petitions will be presented this session in connection with this matter. I may say that I have for some years advocated the erection of either a lighthouse or a fog alarm on the Horse Chops, and if it is found that both are necessary I shall be glad to give the matter my full support. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and I trust that the Government will be able to give it favorable consideration.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES — Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from J. O'Connor and others of Tickle Cove, asking for a sum of money to build a road over certain bog land to the main

road. I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition and ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from Sydney LeDrew and other residents of Burnt Arm, in the electoral district of Twillingate, on the subject of a motor ferry service between this place and Botwood. The petition is largely signed, and sets out that the establishment of such a service would be of great use to the people there. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition, and hope it will be possible to do something in the matter.

Also a petition from the residents of Moreton's Harbor. Petitioners ask for a sum of $60 to enable them to erect a railing along the road leading to French's Cove. At present this road is very dangerous without such a railing, and I hope that the petition will receive the consideration it deserves.

I also ask leave to present a petition from Edward Bugden and others of Flurry's Bight, asking for a sum of $80 to enable them to construct a launchway to facilitate them in carrying on their operations as fishermen. I have much pleasure in supporting these petitions, and ask that they be referred to the departments to which they relate.

MR. ROBERTS—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petitions presented by Mr. Clift, especially the one in reference to a motor ferry at Burnt Arm. If the Government are going to take the matter into consideration, it might be wise to create a service that would relieve the Clyde from calling at Botwood, which is forty miles out of her way, and not only causes delay in the transmission of mails, but is a great inconvenience to passengers. I think a ferry perhaps a little larger than the one asked for would do the service on that bay. I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition.

HON. MIN. AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Plate Cove, asking for a sum of $250 to build a road through a piece of agricultural land. I have much pleasure in giving the petition my hearty support.

SIR ROBERT BOND—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the Rev. James Whittle and other inhabitants of Grand Falls, in the district of Twillingate, desiring to draw the attention of this House to the inadequate postal facilities of that place, and asking that a suitable building may be erected to meet the requirements of that important town. The present small building now in use was erected by the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company about five years ago, to be used temporarily, pending the erection of a permanent building ; but up to this moment nothing has been done, although promises were held out, to alter the existing condition of things of that period, viz., five years ago. Grand Falls has a population of about 2,000 people. The present structure is doing service not only as a post office, but also as a telegraph office and savings bank. The dimensions of the building are twelve by fifteen feet, and you will readily agree that it is impossible to conduct the business of that place in it.

Grand Falls is a most important town, and I am glad to say its importance is increasing. I am advised that the customs revenue is perhaps the largest outside of St. John's in the Colony, and I think there is reason to believe that the revenue this year from Grand Falls will reach the neighborhood of $200,000, and, in view of this condition of things, I think the Government should immediately take steps to erect a public building in Grand Falls that will meet the requirements of post office, a telegraph office and a savings bank, and other purposes. I don't think that it is necessary for me to multiply words in arguing the prayer of the petition, because I am sure that both sides of this House appreciate the desirability of fostering such a great industry as exists at Grand Falls.

HON. THE PREMIER—In reference to the petition just presented by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, I desire to say that the needs and necessity for such a building as petitioners refer to, are, I think, amply borne out. The Government have long ago seen the need for such a building. The little house there now is not sufficiently large for a waiting room, not to speak of a post office, but the delay in putting up a suitable building has been due entirely to two causes. First, the difficulty of selecting a suitable site. Negotiations have been going on with the Harmsworths for the last year in relation to a site for a public building. A year ago the Government decided to put up a departmental building, embracing a court house, custom house, telegraph office and savings bank—in fact sufficiently large to accommodate all the public offices, but the first difficulty was in the selection of a site that would accommodate those going to use these offices. But now the difficulty has been got over, and a site has been procured convenient to all. The next difficulty was that the company were unable to put up the building. The Government saw that it would be very convenient if they could have got the company to give a figure for the building, but that could not be arranged, and the Government had to fall back upon getting tenders and contractors and having the plans drawn, and as a matter of fact the plans are now in the hands of the Government, so that the petitioners can look forward to having a suitable building in the near future. I am entirely in agreement with the hon. member with regard to the importance of Grand Falls. It is a very large town, and quite a number of people are engaged there permanently, and it would not be becoming to the public service to have the building which is there now continued any longer.

Ordered that these petitions be received and referred to the department to which they relate.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

MR. KENT—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail all payments from the Main Line, Local or Special Grants, on the Bishop Cove Roads, in the District of Harbor Grace, from April 1, 1910, to date.

MR. KENT—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement in detail, with names of parties, dates, and amounts of all

money spent at Co'lier's, in the District of Harbor Main, from the Main Line, Local or Special Grants, from April 1st, 1910, to date.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —In reply to the hon. member, I would say that these statements are being prepared, and will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. KENT—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether Jas. R. Vinnicombe, of St. John's, was employed by his department in connection with Marine Works in the District of St. John's East ; and, if so, to state the nature of such employment ; how he was paid for such services, by salary or commission ; and to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail all moneys paid to or through the said Jas. R. Vinnicombe from January 1st, 1910, to date.

MNISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—In reply, I might say that, this information was tabled about the 4th of this month.

MR. KENT—To ask the Minister of Maiine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in detail amounts paid for material, supp'ies, hire of vessels, names of men employed, with amount paid each, in connection with the erection of Marconi stations ; also specifying number of stations, and where each is situated at Labrador, from January 1st, 1910, to date.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to lay on the table the statement asked for.

MR. CLAPP—To ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs if he has any knowledge of any payment made to him—Hon. M. P. Cashin—or anyone on his account, in connection with the Royal Commission on West Indian Trade and his attendance before that Commission.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS — In reply, I would say that, as far as I know, no payment has been made.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Manufacture, Storage, Sale, and Importation of Explosives" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engiossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act further to amend the Education Act, 1903," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions for the Encouragement of Agiiculture.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

(In the speech of the Minister of Mines and Agriculture, when introducing the Agricultural Resolutions, Placentia Bay appeared in the report for Conception Bay. The sentences shou'd have read : "The opening up of the railways has also been of great assistance

to the development of agriculture. Take Conception Bay, for instance," etc.)

SIR ROBERT BOND—The question of Agriculture is a great theme; it is one that has engaged the attention of some of the greatest men the world has produced, from the time of Cato, the great Roman Censor, who was a practical and scientific farmer, and wrote a treatise on Agriculture, down to my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, who has introduced this bill, and impressed himself upon the future by the novelty of his proposals and the consequences of his action. Agriculture has engaged the attention of this Legislature many times in the years that have passed, many schemes had been propounded, but I regret to say without any material success until the year 1908, when the movement approved by all progressive countries for the promotion of Agriculture was adopted almost unanimously by both branches of the Legislature of this country. The present Government has destroyed the effect of that movement, as I shall presently show. I did not have the privilege of listening to the whole of the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture when he introduced this Bill on Friday last, but from what I did hear him say, and after perusing his report on the work of the Agricultural Board for the year ending 31st December, 1910, I am led to the conclusion that the "New Agricultural Policy" of the present Government, which was heralded with such a flare of trumpets on the part of the newspapers supporting the Government, consists—first, in finding something to do for their supporters in this House; 2nd, in prescribing what these hon. members shall do, as a sort of justification for their appointment; and 3rd, in destroying the foundation that was laid by the late Government upon which it might reasonably be hoped that an agricultural population might be built up from native material. Agriculture, the great Lord Beaconsfield declared, was "the invention of the gods and the employment of heroes." Agriculture, the Minister in charge of this Bill has declared, is the invention of the People's Party and the employment of needy supporters. I do not use the word "needy" offensively, but as conveying the idea of men who have no profession or business of their own and who must needs have employment at the hands of the Government if they are to devote time to the business of this House. Last session an Act was passed by the Legislature which inaugurated this "new agricultural policy," at the tail end of which was inserted a clause that the "provisions of Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes, (second series) shall not apply to any person who may be appointed members of the said Board of Agriculture." I was not in this House when the Act was under discussion, but the wording was so adroit and apparently so innocent that those who sit on this side of the House permitted it to pass without question or comment. It was never supposed, of course, it could not have been contemplated, that there was wrapped up in that section an element destructive of the very first princi-

ple of the independence of Parliament. This tail-end section was the kernel of the Act, the other sections, as we now know, were but the shell in which the kernel was concealed and protected. Sir, if it had not been for the passing of that section, Messrs. Seymour, Downey and Devereux, members elect for Hr. Grace, St. George's and Placentia Districts, could not have retained their seats in this House, for having accepted offices of profit under the Crown, in accordance with our Legislative Disabilities Act, their seats must have become vacant. The Legislative Disabilities Act was passed to secure the independence of this House. The great Mother of Parliaments—the British Parliament—has ever recognized that in order to maintain the honor of the nation it is essential that Parliament, which is the source of law, authority and power, shall be composed of free men, men wholly independent of Government support or emolument. This ideal has been embodied in its legislation for hundreds of years, and has been adopted and carried out in all the legislatures of the world that have taken the British Parliament as their model. The British Parliament has declared that "if any member accepts any office of profit from the Crown during such time as he shall continue a member, his election shall be and is hereby declared void, and a new writ shall issue for such new election as if such person was naturally dead." Our Legislative Disbilities Act, to which I have referred, is based on the Imperial law, and provides "Whenever any member of the House of Assembly of this Colony shall—

1. Accept any office, place or appointment or emolument from or under the Crown or the Government ; or
2. From any board or public body, the members whereof are nominated by the Government . . . he shall by writing under his hand tender to the Governor the resignation of his seat in the said House of Assembly, or his seat shall thereupon become vacant."

There are sections in our Legislative Disabilities Act defining offices that may be held without violating the law, but they do not apply to the cases I have under review, and hence arose the necessity for what I have termed the "tail-end" clause of the Agricultural Act of last session ; a clause that at once destroyed the independence of the members I have referred to ; that deprived the respective districts they represent of that free and independent representation that they believed at the period of election they had secured ; that has violated the compact of honor and trust between the electors and the elected ; and that has brought discredit and I think dishonour upon this House. It was, I submit, never contemplated by this House when it passed the Agricultural Act of last session that such a disgraceful condition of things could or would ensue. These three members who to-day support the Government are their paid servants, and their very existence as officials and emoluments they enjoy are subject not to the will of this Legislature but to the favor of

the Government that appointed them. Sir, these members by continuing to hold office of profit have a direct personal pecuniary interest in the legislation that is now under discussion, and it cannot but be clear to the House that their continuing to hold a seat is a breach of trust contrary to public policy, incompatible with the spirit of our parliamentary constitution, and with that independence and freedom which lie at the very basis of representative government. Follow this matter to its logical conclusion. If a Government may, in the manner I have described, appoint three of its supporters in this House to positions of emolument, it may appoint twenty-three, and thus we might witness a corrupt Government sustained in office for four years by the purchased support of a majority of this House. The three members to whom I have most regretfully to allude, according to the public accounts, are drawing salaries at the rate of eighteen hundred dollars per year. This in itself is disgraceful when we have regard to the services rendered. There is no departmental officer in the Colony, taking into consideration the responsibilities of office, who is so well paid as these three men. But the question is a minor consideration, and apart from the all-important one with which I have dealt, we have to ask ourselves what are they doing, what work of public utility are they performing? Agriculture is a science. Will any one contend that one of these hon. members possess a theoretical or a practical knowledge of that science? A theoretical knowledge can be obtained by close study, and a practical knowledge by employment. The hon. members themselves will scarcely have the hardihood to advance either qualification as a justification for their appointment. If they were scientific men, learned in the science of Agriculture, or practical men engaged in the pursuit of Agriculture, the Government might set up a plea on behalf of their appointment. But, seeing that they are neither scientific or practical, we are forced to arrive at the conclusion that the Government appointed them simply and solely in order to provide them with jobs at the public expense. Now, in the second place, we have to consider what it is that the Act defining the "New Agricultural Policy" prescribes as the duties of these three members who, with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and a Secretary, constitute "The Agricultural Board." They have to compile "Agricultural or farm notes," whatever that means, for the local press; "to deliver lectures on Agriculture throughout the Colony"; to "compile an Agricultural Primer for schools"; and to superintend the formation of Agricultural Societies in all the electoral districts. In this twentieth century, when knowledge runs to and fro and is ever increased, and every intelligent man is heir of all the ages, in respect that the knowledge accumulated by scientific and practical men in all ages and in all parts of the world is readily obtainable through books and pamphlets, does it not appear as the highest folly to pay three men at the rate of eighteen hundred dollars per year each to

"compile farm notes," and "an Agricultural Primer." For one hundred dollars we might obtain a supply of such literature sufficient to meet our present requirements a hundred thousand times over. As regards "the formation of Agricultural Societies in the Electoral Districts," could not any intelligent man in those districts superintend the formation of Agricultural Societies without the assistance of three unscientific and unpractical men from the House. They have done so before, so presumably they can do so now. But of what practical use is the "formation of Agricultural Societies" where there are no farmers? In every country in the civiltzed world there are Agricultural Societies, but they consist of farmers; they are formed the world over for stimulating agricultural effort amongst farmers; they are associations of farmers who meet to exchange ideas and to profit by the experience of their respective experiments. That is precisely what Dr. Robertson told you. In his most admirable address, a copy of which has been tabled as a report, he said: "We have found in Canada that Agricultural Societies are an effective means of attaining the improvement of farming methods and of awakening further interest in further improvements." Mark what he says, "for the improvement of farming methods." That means that where farming is an industrial occupation Agricultural Societies are an effective means of attaining the improvement of methods emp'oyed in the cultivation of the soil. It does not mean that by such societies you are going to make farmers out of fishermen, for they do not know anything about "farming methods"; nor can they know until they are taught. Outside of the city's suburbs and two or three other small localities, you have no farmers. Then what is the use of Agricultural Societies, and employing at an enormous wage three able-bodied men to go around this country proclaiming such nonsense as a "New Agricultural Policy?" It is a wilful waste, as I said the other day, of the public funds. If you want to distribute a few garden seeds or animals amongst the poor fishermen, it can be done with greater satisfaction to them by forwarding direct to their address.

In the third place. What was the foundation laid by the late Government upon which it might reasonably be hoped that an agricultural population might be built up from native material, and that this "New Agricultural Policy" is designed to destroy? It was outlined in a speech delivered by me in this House on the 5th of February, 1908, when introducing Resolutions for the establishment of a Model Farm and Experimental Station in this Colony. I cannot refer you to the official records for information on this point, because I find on reference to them that the report of what I said has been deliberately cut out. However, I have a copy of the official report before me which I happened to have amongst my private papers. On the occasion referred to I ventured to express the opinion that the mistake which ran through the whole of the so-called agricultural policies of preceding Governments was

the attempt to create farmers out of fishermen, and to blend the two industries of fishing and farming. I endeavored to prove from the history of past efforts that a man could not possibly succeed if he tried to combine these two distinct occupations, for each occupation required the whole time and attention of the man who would be successful. That while it was commendable to encourage the fishermen to raise such vegetable products as were necessary for his own use, to lay down the principle that the fisherman could at the same time become a successful farmer was entirely a mistaken idea. Surely there is no necessity to labor the point that a fisherman cannot be made a farmer any more than a farmer a fisherman, except by devoting his whole energy and attention to the particular industry. I then proceeded to point out that if this country is to be successful in keeping within its bounds the large sums of money that are now sent abroad for agricultural products, it can only be accomplished in two ways, the first was a speedy process, the second a slower process. To accomplish the end desired by the speedy process it would be necessary to hold out liberal inducements to practical farmers in other countries to come to this country and settle ; the slower process would be to educate the youth of this country in the science of agriculture. The resolutions which I introduced in 1908, and which were adopted almost unanimously by both branches of the Legislature, dealt with the slower process, and provided for the establishment of model farm and experimental station where youths from every district in the island might obtain a thorough knowledge of agriculture. I visited, at my own expense, the greatest Model Farm and Experimental Station in Canada, at Guelph. I interested the head of that establishment, Professor Creelman, and the Government of Ontario, under whose control is the Model Farm at Guelph, in our undertaking, and the ablest man in Canada in respect to Model Farms, Professor Zavitz, was, through the courtesy of Professor Creelman and the Government of Ontario, sent down here free of charge to the Colony to advise us as to how best to proceed with the undertaking. There was the greatest difficulty in obtaining the services of a suitable man to take charge of the undertaking at any salary, because of the manner in which the undertaking was attacked by the press now supporting the Government, and the manner in which Professor Zavitz was personally attacked by that press ; but at length the late Government succeeded in inducing a graduate from the Agricultural College at Truro to come here. Just tbout this time the late Government went out of power, and as soon as the present Government obtained power they proceeded to destroy the work of their predecessors in office. The gentleman in charge of the station was forced to resign; the farm was given over to a political supporter without either scientific or practical knowledge of agriculture; then it was placed under the control of the Board of Agriculture, of which Messrs. Downey, Seymour and Devereux are the principal components, and

I observe from the report of that Board which has been tabled that "the Board" has recommended that the propeity be got rid of, as in its opinion the continued maintenance of the establishment is simply a case of throwing good money after bad, and the property cannot be maintained for less than "two thousand four hundred dollars a yeai" Then we aie told by these three wise men of the East that the property may be "leased to some enterprising farmer for a number of years, and thus enable the Colony to secure some return on the investment, without having to face the certain loss involved by the annual outlay that is inevitable at present." Think, sir, of the colossal impudence of the suggestion! What was intended to be an educational institution for the youth of this country; a nursery for the growth and production of an agricultural element in this country; a school from which every other school in this country might obtain a theoretical and practical knowledge of agriculture is to be abandoned on the suggestion of Messrs. Downey, Seymour and Devereux in order that they may receive at the rate of eight hundred dollars per year each out of the money voted by this House to promote the advancement of agriculture. It is a case of throw ing good money after bad, they say, to expend two thousand four hundred dollars in educating the young men of this country in the science of agriculture, but it is eminently proper to take five thousand four hundred dollars out of the Agricultural Grant to support themselves in luxury and comparative idleness. This, then, is the "New Agricultural Policy." Sir, I can imagine with what contempt that distinguished gentleman, Professor Robertson, must have regarded this so-called "New Agricultural Policy." No living man has ever advocated the establishment of model farms and experimental stations more strenuously than has Professor Robertson. His brilliant career is reflected from those great institutions in the Dominion that are rapidly converting the prairie of the Northwest into the granaries of the world. He was the guest of the Government during his brief visit here. A guest cou'd not very well condemn his host. He was therefore silent in respect to that which has been his life work—the inestimable value of Model Farms and Experimentl Stations.

It is only a few days ago that Premier Murray, of Nova Scotia, at a banquet in Halifax, declared that the Model Farm and Agricultural College in Truro is the most valuable asset in the Province of Nova Scotia.

Let us look further afield. In 1864 agriculture was at such a low ebb in Denmark that the people were fleeing from the country. To-day this little kingdom, through the instrumentality of Model Farms, of which it has 32, is supporting a population of of about two million people and is exporting agricultural products to the value of fifty million dollars annually. The area of Denmaik is only 14,700 square miles; the area of Newfoundland is nearly three times as great. Much of the little kingdom is tempest swept and desolate. The climate is very variable, violent winds, rains and fogs fre-

quently occurring, and the temperature ranging from an extreme of 85 degrees in summer to 22 degrees below zero in winter. Yet, sir, in the face of these natural difficulties it now, in proportion to its size, leads the world in agriculture. The proportion of cattle to its area is 92 per hundred acres, as compared with 75 in Great Britain. Denmark exports meat, butter and eggs to the value of ten million pounds sterling. While the total agricultural exports work out at five pounds sterling per head of population, Canada and the United States only export to the value of two pounds per head. These figures show how advanced Danish agriculture must be, and this progress is entirely due to the establishment of Model Farms and the intelligent use of modern methods of agriculture. In view of these facts, does it not strike you, Sir, that it is a monstrous shame that forty thousand dollars per annum, or the interest on nearly a million and a half dollars, should be practically thrown away, and the foundation laid by the late Government of a Model Farm be destroyed, to serve the caprice and to met the demands of the three hon. members to whom I have ben obliged to refer in this connection ? I shall test the sense of the House on this matter by moving an amendment to this Bill repealing the third section of the Act of last session.

MR. DWYER—Mr. Chairman, I have a few words to say, too, about the help the Government has been giving to agriculture. We have been told a lot by the Minister and by the Premier about the Sable Island ponies that were imported to help the fishermen in agriculture. We have been told how useful they were, and how they were used in the outports to which they were sent. These ponies were nearly wild, and the fishermen that got them had to break them in. Now, Sir, I think that a fisherman would rather take hold of a whale than one of these ponies. I heard a little story that happened in one of the outports, where some men were trying to break in one of these ponies. There was a river near the place where they were breaking him in They had a great deal of trouble with that pony, and one man in trying to get out of the way was kicked by the pony and driven right across the river. These ponies may be good enough to bring out a load of firewood, provided they do not get stuck in a snowbank, when the drivers have to take the ponies on their shoulders and bring them across to the other side. It is surprising how the Premier got to think of these ponies. He got them for nothing. Did not pay a cent for them. But he had to pay the freight, equal to about $13 a head, and I think, as a practical man, that they were not worth that much to the people of this country. If the Premier wanted to help the fishermen-farmers he should have given them a good, sound, domesticated pony, and not one of these half-wild animals that you can neither get into a stable nor out of it. The next thing the Minister spoke of was the agricultural bulls. Now, I think he made a bull when he got them at all. These animals cost from $100 to $130 each. They were got here to improve the breed of our cattle.

MR. BLANDFORD—Yes, it is pretty bad.

MR. DWYER — The animals you brought to improve it were worse. Picture to yourself these wild animals, covered with long hair and with horns with a span of five feet. They were like that. I saw them myself. These animals were brought from Scotland or Ireland, they were very savage, and were never put in a house. In fact they were so wild that I heard that when they were being shipped at Glasgow they killed a man on the pier. But these animals were considered good enough for the outport men Then, again, all kinds of agricultural seed was imported and sent to the fishermen-farmers of the country. These seeds were sent to the Agricultural Societies all over the country. In fact, not only did they give away the imported potatoes, but they bought 100 barrels from a local dealer and distributed them also. Now, the dealer was not supposed to know where they came from. How did the Agricultural Societies know but these potatoes were grown in one of the canker-infected districts ? Now, with reference to these infected potatoes, as I said the other day, there was a man going around with samples of these potatoes to the different farms, and showing them to the farmers. Think of the risk that was run. Why he might have spread that disease on every farm he went on. I do not think that the Minister displayed his usual caution when he sent that man around. Then he went on to speak of the agricultural show, which was a great success.. Now, sir, in 1906 the Agricultural Society had an agricultural show, and the exhibits there were so good that His Excellency said they would do credit to Canada. And these exhibits, many of them, came from that experimental farm that the present Government thinks so little about.

Now, sir, it is very nice, as I have said, of the Government to give these animals and these seeds. Of course they are giving something to themselves also. The Premier got $6,000 for going home to that Hague Arbitration. Now, sir, the Minister of Justice sent me a copy of the proceedings of that Arbitration. I have read it through carefully, and the Premier's name is not in it at all. I looked very carefully at the part devoted to Newfoundland, and the Prime Minister's name was not mentioned once. Still, sir, he told us he had no axe to grind. Well, sir, I suppose Sir James Winter had the axe, the Minister of Justice was turning the stone and the Prime Minister was pouring the water on. Then, sir, we find that the editor of the Chronicle got $2,250. He had something to do with the tax on the iron ore at Bell Island, and as the Prime Minister has got $6,000 why should he not get $2,250. It is a sort of admiration party, "here you take this and I'll take that." Then, sir, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines is doing a lot for the country. In addition to the free seeds he is going to give free pigs to the people ; but, sir, you will find that no Liberal gets one. If you do not give out these free pigs and free seeds you know that the people will not leave you there. Now, sir, a few words about the Premier. I do not wish to say anything to hurt

his feelings. The other day when I spoke of contracts badly drawn, and through which the country has suffered, he turned around and insulted me, and the next day the editor of the Chronicle said I was squelched. But, sir, I was not squelched, and the Premier had no right to talk to me like that. Many men in the street have said to me, why did you not say this or that. But, sir, I have made it a rule, as Sir Robert Bond said the other day, if I cannot say good of a man I will not say evil. But, sir, I am a farmer and proud of the position I occupy in the country, and it is just as good as the Premier's, if not better, because I make my way through this country honest'y and fairly, and I doubt if the Premier can say as much. Then, Sir the Premier spoke about the agricultural bonus act,and how it was carried out, what a benefit it was. Well, Sir, there was a lot of land cleared and money paid, but half the surveyors, and those who looked after the measurements and the payment of that money, ought to be in the Penitentiary. The Bonus Act was a very good one, and the country would have been the better if it had been properly carried out. But with thè present Government it is always give, give, give,and take, take, take.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, I do not now propose to reply to the very able and interesting speech of the Leader of the Opposition. My only purpose in rising is to reply to the personal matter referred to by the member for St. John's East. He has considered it worth his while to refer to an incident some days ago in which he was the aggressor, and not myself. He can remain in this House until he becomes part of the chair he sits on before he shall have anything aggressive said to him by me or any other member on this side of the House. I have been here now for 27 years, and I have never yet said a word to any member unless I have been provoked. The hon. member thought to be smart the other evening. He made an unfounded charge against me, and if he had a spark of honor he would now take it back. He asks why I take it to myself. Because he made me. His references could apply to no other man. The intention was perfectly obvious. I am the only man it could have applied to. He said I had drawn contracts by which the Colony had lost ; he mentioned the 1898 and the 1901 contracts. You see then why I take it to myself. He says he does not mean me. Who else could it mean ? Could he say anything more damaging ? I am a lawyer. I have to live by my reputation as a lawyer. What right has he to make a charge like that against me ? That question was not before the House ; we were not talking about any such contracts. He went out of his way to make a charge which he must know is false. I had nothing to do with the 1898 contract until it was on the table. I never saw it till the time I voted for it. He may say he did not refer to the 1898 contract or the 1901 contract. Well, then, I will amend and say, any contract he likes. I say there never was a contract I had to do with that the Colony lost one cent by. He can take them all in. If I said anything severe to the hon. member the other night

I said it under stress of what he had said ; I said it in annoyance and self-defence. Why does he not blame his colleague, Mr.Shea, who was one of the Executive that made the 1898 contract ? If anyone is to blame, surely it is he. Then why not blame him ? I had nothing to do with the '98 contract ; he had. And I have never heard that there was anything wrong with the 1898 contract. I did not make the 1901 contract either. I had nothing to do with it. I was a member of the Government that made it, and that was all. And that contract is all right. I never heard anyone charge that it was not. It was supervised by the present Chief Justice Horwood, then Attorney General. I had nothing to do with it. I had not the dotting of an "i" in it. The Colony never lost a cent under that contract, made by Sir Robert Bond. You have had only one arbitration under it ; that was in relation to the telegraphs. The Government wanted the telegraphs back ; and Reid, the contractor, said, "You can have them back if you pay me any loss I can show from it." The Government agreed. He appointed one arbitrator. Newfoundland appointed two. Two of the arbitrators gave an award, which I think was excessive. Our own judge gave it against us. As to the Lyttleton award, again we sent to England and got the most competent judge we could get, and again the award was against us. These are, perhaps, the matters the hon. member had in mind in his attack on me. Anything I said to him the other evening I said only in the heat of debate ; and as to the publication in the papers of anything I said, I give him my word that I had nothing to do with it, and I would willingly have suppressed it. I had nothing to do with the making of any contracts ; I made no contract by which the Colony lost one cent ; and I challenge anyone to produce a case where the Colony has ever lost one cent through me.

HON. MIN. AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, if I could use the same choice language as the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I would gladly do so in reply to my hon. friend the member for St. John's East, Mr. Dwyer, so that my remarks might not be taken to reflect on him personally. He has made two or three charges against the present Government, and against some things which are done by the Agricultural Board. I was rather surprised to find that my hon. friend did not know a Highland bull when he saw it. I thought anybody would know it. I believe it is the first time he ever saw one in his life. But let us get on to other points. He has been representing St. John's East for a number of years, and he has never opened his mouth for the advancement of agriculture in the Colony. He has never done a thing, except where there was a possibility of advantaging himself. What cattle were distributed through his instrumentality in former times. He knows how long he was a member of the Board. What did he do there ? Were there not occasions when, as a member, he was trying to sell his own cattle to the Board ? We are not distributing the cattle now under the old system ; not one head of cattle or one

pound of seed has been given to individuals. They are all given to the agricultural societies. I challenge my hon. friend to contradict that statement. We have seen for a number of years back the results of the old system. My hon. friend knows how, under the late administration, every Tom, Dick and Harry would be continually making applications to him for an animal or an implement ; and very frequently the request was granted irrespective of any good it might do or might not do. Now, we give it to the Societies and they distribute it. He makes another charge on a subject that he knows nothing of at all ; the Sable Island ponies. The first time he ever saw one was at the Agricultural stables. It is no wonder he did not know more about it. He says that it cost $13 a head to bring the ponies here. I can tell my hon. friend that that statement is quite incorrect. The fact is that these animals were a free gift obtained by the Premier from the Government of Canada to the Government of Newfoundland ; they cost us nothing. These animals have now been distributed to all the principal centres in the Island. It is an unfortunate thing that we find the only practical farmer we have here does not know a Highland bull or a Sable Island pony when he sees it. The only thing he knows is something against the Government. He never mentioned the good the Agricultural Board did for him when they went down and thrashed his oats for him. He was one of the old Board, and should have had one of these thrashing machines here years and years ago. Then we would have more oats grown here today. I have to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his remarks in connection with the Agricultural Board. It was only right and proper for the right hon. gentlemen, from his position in this House, to criticise and pull to pieces in all possible ways what we are doing. But I remember sitting in this House when he brought in the Model Farm Act ; and I have no doubt that portions of that Act were workable. I do not altogether believe in the Model Farm. It would have been a machine which, once started in motion, would by this time be costing us three times as much as present policy. In the first year when Mr. Clift introduced the Bill he asked for $20,000 for the Model Farm ; that was only a part of what was asked for Agriculture. Our policy is as yet in its initial stages ; but I think credit is due to my hon. friend while he was in office. I am quite prepared to believe what the Rt. hon. member stated, that in the number of years he has been farming, he has spent about $50,000 ; but I would like to know whether that $50,000, which he has spent as an individual, has done much good. It may have done some, and if we had a number of other men interested in farming and who would spend a like amount of money, it would be a great advantage to Colony. My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, has said that a farmer has got to be one thing and a fisherman another. That is his opinion. I have a different opinion. It is this : that we can do a great amount of good if, by our agricultural policy, we can even get

the fishermen to raise enough of agricultural products to supply their own needs. Now, we are establishing Agricultural Societies throughout the Island, and if, through the aid of these, tho the day may be far distant, Mr. Chairman, when we will have scientific farmers, we can educate our fishermen-farmers to supplythemselves, I think we will have done a great deal of good for Newfoundland. There is one other thing, Mr. Chairman, and that is that I am convinced that it was practically impossible to have the Model Farm Act carried out in this country, as proposed or suggested by the Rt. hon. the Leader of the Opposition. His idea, if I am correct, was to have two representative students from each district come on here to St. John's and be educated in farming. Well, we might have been able to get two or three students, but as soon as they were educated in that art or science, the very next thing that you would find they would be leaving our shores and making for some agricultural country.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on the subject of the present resolutions and the amendment that has been proposed by the Rt. hon. Leader of the Opposition. I said the other day, in speaking before this Committee, that the Department of Agriculture and Mines had under its control three departments through which, if there is to be any development of our inland resources, such development must come. You have under the control of that department, agriculture, the cultivation of the soil, and the other industries allied to it ; you have also the development of the mineral resources of the country ; and you have also the protection and the development of its forest resources. These are the three great natural resources, on land, of the country—in fact, I might say, the three great natural resources of the present century—and upon the proper management, care and development of them will depend to a large extent, if not entirely, the future that this country has before it. We are dealing this evening with one of these departments, with the department of agriculture, which is the oldest of them all, and the most important, because the most universal of them all. It is one of these subjects which come home to every man in every department of life. Consequently, it requires that greater care and attention should be devoted to this matter of agriculture than any other matter demanding the attention of the Department. I am sorry to say, Mr. Chairman, that the policy of the present Government is not one that would recommend itself to a person who desires to see a future for the agricultural interests of this country. If we are ever to become an agricultural country, the lines which ought to be followed are those which were laid down in the Experimental Farm Act of 1908. This is the departure from which dates the improvement of agriculture in every country. Until the time that experimental stations and model farms were brought into practical operation, agriculture was going on from century to century, from age to age, in which I might call a rut ; it had not expanded, it had not devel-

oped. The different products adapted to different countries and different soils had not been properly understood, and most of the countries were suffering from retrogression in this matter which, with the help of experimental stations and model farms, had to be removed. I was reading the other day a speech by the Hon. Sydney Fisher, the Minister of Agriculture in the Dominion of Canada. He is Minister of Agriculture and Mines in the present Liberal Administration. He referred back to the fact that in 1885 the first departure for improving and encouraging agriculture had been made in Canada. At that time the Conservative Government was in power there, and the Hon. Mr. Carling was the Minister of Agriculture of that day. He had a Committee appointed, and the result of the deliberations of that Committee was that the establishment of a Model Farm was recommended. Mr. Fisher, in his speech the other day, referring to this departure, said : "In 1885 Mr. Gigault, the member for Rouville, an earnest and studious man, who appreciated the interest of the people whom he represented, moved for a Committee to consider the agricultural industry of Canada. The Committee sat—I had the honor of being a member of it myself—and for a long time we did a great deal of hard work in obtaining information as to what other countries were doing for agriculture. The report of that Committee recommended the establishment of experimental farms and the result was that Hon. Mr. Carling, then Minister of Agriculture, in 1866 introduced a Bill to establish experimental farms. This was really the first purely agricultural work which the Department of Agriculture attempted to do since the confederation of this Dominion. All honor to the Government of that day, all honor to Mr. Gigault who instituted the work, who brought forward the question and with a great deal of labor, thought and study, presented a report of the greatest value to the House. I say again all honor to the Government and all honor especially to the present Sir John Carling, then Minister of Agriculture, because I know that in doing what he did then in the institution of experimental stations in Canada, he met with but a lukewarm assistance or support from his colleagues or from the House . He, however, carried it through successfully and he was fortunate, as well as wise, in the choice of the gentlemen whom he chose to carry out that work. He called to his assistance Mr. William Saunders, of London, now known all over Canada, and I might say, all over the agricultural world as Professor Saunders, Director of Experimental Farms for Canada, and gave him an opportunity to study, work out and establish an organization of experimental farms and stations in Canada, which would do something for the progress of agriculture in Canada.

To-day the work of our experimental farms is a monument to the foresight, the skill, the energy and study of Professor Saunders. Our present organization is on exactly the same lines although somewhat amplified. Professor Saunders has

done a work which is recognized and acknowledged by everybody to have been of inestimable advantage to the agriculture of the country. The system is a monument to that gentleman which ought to last and ought to be recognized by everybody in Canada."

Now, from that date begins the present progress and deve'opment that has taken place in the Dominion of Canada in the matter of agriculture, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that when the experimental farms Act of 1908 was passed by this Legislature we were turning the first sod in a policy which would have had results equally satisfactory to those produced in Canada had it been properly carried out. We had everything, I think, that could recommend the carrying out of this policy. We had the experience of experts who had worked the same policy in Canada. We had here, as the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition has stated, Professor Zavitz, who had been most prominently identified with this work. We were in a better position in that respect to have this position successfully carried out than was the Dominion of Canada, because we could profit by their experience. It is a pity, Mr. Chairman that this work has been marred. I think I stated the other day that on one occasion Professor Robertson said that thirty years ago Canada had practically to undo all that she had up to then done in the matter of agriculture, and I fear, Mr. Chairman, that the resu't of the policy that the present Government is pursuing will be seen in the course of a year or so, and that they will then realize that it is necessary to undo all that they have done and they will have to start again upon the lines laid down in the policy of Sir Robert Bond in 1908. Now, Mr. Chairman, all the expenditures being incurred under this head is money thrown away. The expenditure last year amounted to $50,000. There was a vote of $20,000 and an overdraft on that vote of nearly $30,000. This year we are asked to vote $40,000. These amounts are being largely squandered. The composition of the Board itself, Mr. Chairman, is, I think, one that throws very little credit on the Government. We have had three members of this House appointed as members of that Board. Their salaries have each amounted to $1,800 a year. The Legislative Disabilities' Act was specially amended to allow these three members to take a seat on that Board. Now if there was anything in the past history of these gentlemen which picked them out of the whole country as being of exceptional merit, or specially expert through training, experience and education in matters of agriculture, the Government might have some show of justification for their action, but even then, Mr. Chairman, I think that, if the Government were desirous of getting a person of that character who occupied a seat in this House, the proper thing for him to do would be to resign his seat before going under the pay of the Government. But they come in here and the Legislative Disabilities Act, the only protection that the people of this country have against legislators being in the permanent pay of the Executive

Government of the country, is deliberately repealed ; and not only that, Mr. Chairman, but the very three men who to-day occupy the position of that Board were here and voted for that very repeal—practically voting themselves a salary of $1,800 a year. There is nothing in the history of Messrs. Devereux, Downey or Seymour that would pick them out in the country as expert agriculturists. They are three very good men, but to rate them as expert agriculturists and ask that this safeguard of the Legislature and country should be set at nought in order to provide them with salaries and permanent positions is, I consider, a disgrace to the country. This, of course, Mr. Chairman, is a matter of constitutional rights. While it does not bear directly upon the policy of the Government, it shows by comparison and by analogy what the whole drift of the policy of the Government in this respect amounts to. The policy of the Government, sir, neither in itself nor in its tendency will ever do any good of a permanent nature to the agricultural interests of the country. It will for a few years keep followers of the Government satisfied with themselves and with the Government because they will enjoy the favors which the distribution of these large sums of money enable the Government to hand out, but as to being of any permanent advantage to the agricultural interests of the Colony I do not think that even a majority of hon. members opposite are in their hearts convinced that any permanent good will come from the policy.

We are told, Mr. Chairman, by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, that it is impossible to carry out the Experimental Farms Act of 1908. Well, I should like to have some better authority for that statement than that of the Minister, for, as I have pointed out before, the experience of every other country in the world has been in direct opposition to the statement of the Minister, and if the experimental station had got a fair show, if those who came here to inaugurate it had been treated with anything like decency and courtesy by the papers of the country—I am not referring to attacks on the policy that were legitimate, but I am referring to the manner in which the men themselves were criticised, so that others were deferred from coming in to help carry on a work of such benefit—the experimental farm would have produced good results. It stands to reason, Mr. Chairman. I am not a farmer, and know very little about farming, but I have read from time to time matter pertaining to farming, and I have spoken to farmers. It stands to reason that the free distribution of seeds, etc., is a very small way, and may be a very harmful way of dealing with agriculture. Even in the report which the Minister of Agriculture has tabled here to-day you will see in going through the remarks of Professors McPhail and Robertson there are two sides to every improvement in seed growing. There is the seed itself, and the ground in which the seed is set. Now the Government are simply doling out the seed without any consider-

ation of the soil. In this respect Professors McPhail and Robertson are most pointed in every instance to keep the two together, but indiscriminate distribution of seed is harmful unless it is accompanied by some instructions, and in this respect the literature that has been dealt out in the form of leaflets is of no assistance. You must have the proper scientific blending together of seed and soil, the proper preparation of the soil, and the selection of the seed. These are absolutely essential to the improvement of agriculture. In this respect in every other country you have these experimentations, and schools are being used more and more as expository farms, where the farmers of the neighborhood can go and see illustrated the matters they are dealing with day by day on their farms.

MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I beg to call your attention to the fact that it is half past six.

The House rose for recess.

MR. KENT (Continuing)—Mr Chairman, before we adjourned this afternoon, I referred to the mistake, as I think it, that the Government has made in not continuing the policy embodied in the establishment of the experimental station. I tried to point out to the Committee the harm which would result to the agricultural interests of the Colony by reason of the departure which the Government had inaugurated in the policy of extravagance and of wasteful work in this very important branch of the industries of the country. I referred also, Mr. Chairman, to the indemnity which was given to members of this House for taking their places upon the Agricultural Board, which was established by the Act of last year, at a salary of $1,800 a year. This matter was one which, I think, is a very bad precedent and one which is subversive of all ideas that are entertained in English-speaking countries where free Government is established regarding the integrity and impartiality of the members of the Legislature. I remember when this Bill was going through the House, but I have no exact recollection of the clause to it. I attached no importance to the matter, because it did not occur to anyone to think that an indemnity of this nature would be covered up in any clause inserted by reference only in a Bill. If it was the intention to violate this most essential principle it should have been expressly stated in the Act. Members would naturally be inclined to think that such a clause as that dealt with matters pertinent to the bill then before the House. [Hon. Minister of Agriculture—What do you mean by "covered up."] I mean what I say. No person would understand from that section that any indemnity was held out to members of the House to violate one of the fundamental principles of free government. If the hon. members intended to provide places on this Board for members of this House they should have said so in the Act and not repeal by inference sections which were entirely irrelevant to the Bill before the House. On the question of providing indemnity for members there is one precedent where this House did so, but in that case the names of the parties, and the

reasons, were given expressly by the Act. That was under the Winter-Morine Government. In this case the same procedure ought to have been followed. We are told that the Act to establish the experimental station can not be carried out. That is a mere statement without proof or any attempt to show in what direction or why it cannot be carried out. That Act could be carried out with great benefit to the agricultural interests. If any member of this House will take up that Act and go through it he cannot but be impressed by the fact that it embodies a scheme for the betterment of agriculture similar to that which has been followed in other countries. I have the Act here before me. The first section provides for the establishment of an experimental station and model farm. That was in course of accomplishment at the time that this destructive policy of the Government was inaugurated. And the objects for which that station was to have been inaugurated are fundamental and essential to proper agricultural development. The second section embodies the objects which the model farm was intended to carry out. The objects are, amongst others, to determine the adaptability of crops, grain, grasses and root crops, and all others, which can be grown in this latitude. That is a most desirable object, and one which it is very easy to accomplish with a proper man in charge and at a farm or station as it was intended to be established, and as a matter of fact it would have easily accomplished that object. The experience of the man who had charge has been referred to; everyone in this House knows the knowledge and experience of Professor Zavitz. Another object was to discover the method of producing the best results from the crops which were found to succeed. It was to verify facts and conduct experiments on the physiology of plants and animals the diseases to which they are subject, and the remedies which are suitable to them. That has been done successfully in other countries, and the equipment necessary to accomplish this could very easily be obtained for a mere proportion of the amount now to be allocated. I should say, the money now being squandered on agriculture. The amount now squandered on agriculture, if applied for the purpose of carrying out the objects of this Act, would have produced, in the course of a very few years, a permanent and lasting farming class in this country. After all, Mr. Chairman, the real object and purpose of the deve'opment of agriculture is to equip Newfoundland with a class of people who are distinctly farmeıs from one end of the year to the other, devoting themselves to farming exclusively. And unless you do that, unless you establish these people in the great fertile land of the interior, and also near the sea coast, you will never be successful in making the agricultural industry of this Colony anything but a mere accessory to the fishery. And that was the object of the Act which the present Government have mutilated in the manner which I have pointed out. The fishermen of Newfoundland is a man of great adaptability and if he devoted himself and his energies exclu-

sively to farming he would make as good a farmer as he is now a fisherman. But you cannot take a man from the sea and put him on the land unless you give him proper instruction and teach him how to farm in a modern and up-to-date manner. If, Mr. Chairman, you have a class of farmers in this country, farmers who devote the whole time to farming, you will have also an effect upon the fishermen who have their little farms as accessories to their fishing work. It is the same with the man in St. John's who is not engaged in the fishery, but often has his little farm from which he relies on to provide supplies for himself and his family. But the men who are to supply the markets of the country must be farmers first, last and all the time. As to the present system of instruction, we have a wide distribution of stock and seed, and no attempt at instruction at all beyond the distribution of some pamphlets which it would require a professor of agriculture himself to expound. The Act of 1908 provided for an experimental station. It provided also for the instruction of agricultural students, practical farmers ; in other words, at that farm or station people would be trained from every district in the Island, and their work would act in their neighborhood as a centre for the dissemination of knowledge and practical lessons from the farms which they would operate in the various districts. Besides, under that Act you would get agriculture taught in a proper way, by trained teachers in the schools throughout the Colony. It would encourage the promotion of small farms for the purpose of exposition to the people of the principles of farming. Under the present system you have nothing like that. Under the present system you are practically scattering widespread throughout the country seeds and stock of all kinds, which, as I pointed out before recess, will have no other effect than to keep back agriculture in the condition in which it has been always in this country. There is no advantage, no progress in this kind of system, if it can be called a system. We had the other day a Bill before the House to regulate the sale of seeds. That Act is, in my opinion a pointed instance of where the policy of the Government will be lacking in efficient results unless a station such as that called for in the Act of 1908 is established. Seeds are imported under certain conditions and requirements by that Act, but who is going to test or judge of their condition. We all know that if seeds are imported a large portion of them won't fertilize at all. Others are weeds. This was a great grievance in Canada, and this is one of the causes which called for an Act somewhat similar—the fact that there were seeds that did not produce, or that what they did produce were to a large extent weeds and consequently harmful and not the product which the purchaser of the seed intended. It was found that the rules governing the matter were absolutely useless unless they had a person who knew exactly how to test the seeds imported. The experience has been that farmers of years of experience cannot tell the unproductive seeds in a parcel from the productive seeds,

or the weed seed from that which it was the intention should when cultivated produce a valuable product. It was only through the proper and scientific testing as contemplated in the Act of 1908 that this difficulty was overcome in Canada and to-day very little of the seed utilized by the farmers of Canada is not productive and good seed. But this Act here is entirely in keeping with the policy of the Government. It is simply a groping in the dark ; it is a destructive policy ; a policy which, while pretending that something has been done, every person who has any knowledge of the subject is aware that no effective or efficient results will accrue from. Again, Mr. Chairman, the literature which has been distributed by the Government is not literature which is based upon any knowledge of the conditions of this country. The conditions of this country are different from the conditions of any other country. It is not because we are close to Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island that the literature that applies to either of these places should apply to Newfoundland. Take the case of England and Ireland Surely no person will contend that the literature relating to the agriculture of England would apply to the agriculture of Ireland. The soil of Ireland is entirely diffe-rent from the soil of England and for the same reasons the soil of Newfoundland is different from that of Canada. The farther away you are from the mainland the more the conditions which exist on the mainland are altered. The soil is different ; the climate is different, and the whole circumstances of farming are different, and for that reason the literature which has been distributed throughout this Colony, if it is ever read, and I don't believe it is, is not only useless, but positively harmful. The Act of 1908 contemplated literature which would deal with our own conditions, and which would be a real instruction to those engaged in agriculture. You take a pioneer farmer, a man of experience from any agricultural country. If he came to Newfoundland he would not be satisfied with the knowledge he had gained from reading the literature of his own country. He would go to the place where he intended to farm and he would acquire a knowledge of the conditions of the soil, the climate and other conditions, and he would govern himself accordingly. If we are ever going to have in this country an agricultural people, and I believe with proper foresight and management and with a proper establishment of instruction and experimental stations and model farms, that we can make this country a great agricultural country. To-day we are importing quite a number of agricultural products which would be grown in this country, and not only should we be able to supply our own wants, but we should be able to export agricultural products as extensively as the fishery products now being exported. But in order to do this we shall have to seriously attack the problem of agricultural development. We will have to seriously face the questions that will be necessary to produce these results and spread throughout

the country in the fertile lands in the interior a class of men that are distinctively farmers. The present policy is never going to do that. It will never get past the state where it is now, and the longer it is in existence the more evident it will become to the people that if any progress is to be madein this respect, all that has been done will have to be set at nought, and we will have to begin again where we began in 1908 and lay down the foundation of agricultural industries. Just as Canada in 1905 and 1906 courageously faced the problem, that it was necessary to get right down to the root of the subject and take hold from the beginning and lay a foundation such as that upon which they have since built the agricultural policy of Canada, which has become one of the greatest agricultural countries of the world. There are other countries which are a standing proof of the same policy. Sir Robert Bond has referred to Denmark, which, in its climate and other conditions, more or less resembles Newfoundland ; and we might refer to other countries such as Belgium, Germany, England and Ireland, all of which are built up on the principle of scientific agriculture through the medium of experimental farms. We will have to go back to the beginning, or we will have to remain where we are at present, absolutely devoid of any agricultural development beyond what we had 50 or 60 years ago. I quoted figures in this House last year which showed that the total amount of money of our principal agricultural products was the same in the year 1850 and 1860 as it is to-day. At that time I qouted from a pamphlet compiled by the Honorable Patrick Morris. In fifty years hence, if the Government continue the present policy, the people of this country will be able to refer back to the report of Mr. Seymour, to show that the products of agriculture were the same in 1910 as in 1960. But I hope the policy will not be continued, and that the Government will still be open to the conviction that they are not taking the right course to establish in this country an agricultural industry on the lines which the country expects and desires to see. If the hon. members read the reports of these scientific gentlemen who visited this country during the last year or two they will see there pointedly brought before them the fact that proper instructions and proper training under the conditions and in connection with the country and climate, and particulars of farming are necessary before any good results can be acquired. I would commend to the serious study o f the Minister of Agriculture the reports of Dr. Robertson and Dr. McPhail and others. The Minister of Agriculture, in his report, quotes from Dr. Robertson's report. I have not seen that report itself, though I have seen an address which Dr. Robertson delivered.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—If you will permit me to explain, I might say that Dr. Robertson has not made different reports. In Dr. MacPhail's case, a letter was written to the Premier, and I think you have that there. Dr. Robertson gave a public lecture in the Prime Minister's office, and I think that

was copied verbatim. This is his report.

MR. KENT—Iwas misled by the word report.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I have given the Leader of the Opposition a full report.

MR. KENT—I referred to this as the report because it is called a report in the Minister's report. I was going to refer to the fact that if the Minister had examined these reports he would have found that Dr. Robertson and Dr. MacPhail, Dr. Standish and Mr. Moore, and every other person who has made a report, has kept all the time before his department the necessity of a proper scientific handling and management of seeds. The distribution of seeds and stock, if not carried on under proper conditions, is harmful. Dr. Robertson in his report, after referring to the potatoes, says—"The first part of the process is the preparation of a seed bed. Through cultivation and adequate manure, or other fertilizer, will allow the young and tender plants to obtain their food and make a good start early. That is a great principle of agriculture. It is most important that a farmer should use good and reliable seeds ; if he gets poor and inferior seeds, and sows or plants them, he is not giving the future plants half a chance to thrive. Frequent cultivation during the growing season is beneficial. It not only keeps down the weeds, but it makes conditions in the soil which stimulate the growth of the tubers." Now any person reading these few sentences must be impressed by the fact that there is something else besides merely giving a man the seed and telling him to put it in the ground. Dr. MacPhail points out the factors which bring about results. He says they are, 1st, "Proper addition to the soil in the shape of fertilizer, to make it more pliable and clayey ; 2nd, the use of proven seeds ; 3rd, instead of planting the whole potatoes, to divide the large ones into three pieces ; 4th, to set the potatoes three feet apart, instead of 18 inches ; 5th, to gather the potatoes before the stalks become bl..k at the roots." All these are points in a science with which the man who is talking is familiar, and which he hopes the Department of Agriculture will appreciate and put into practice. Then, if you are going to have an agricultural people, spread throughout this country, it must be borne in mind that the care of a farm doesn't merely consist in planting your seed and reaping your harvest after it has become ripe, and in the meantime going away to engage in some other operation. A farm, to become productive, requires constant attention right through the season, every day of the year, and without this the object all desire to obtain can never be accomplished. I think that it is a matter of regret that the Government has made this departure. I think that if they had followed out the policy which has proven so successful in every case in which it has been tried, that in a short time we would have in this country a large agricultural industry. Last year we voted $20,000, and the Government expended nearly $50,000. We are now being asked to vote $40,000. One of the facts which have been pointed to by the Gov-

ernment as testifying to the success that has attended their efforts in the matter of agricultural development, was the exhibition which was held here in St. John's last year. That was a very fine exhibition, but the products that were there exhibited were not the result of any action taken by the present Government. We might have had a similar exhibition in Newfoundland ten years ago. I admit, and I think every person will admit, that the exhibition was a very good illustration of what the country is capable of producing, and in view of the excellence of the products there exhibited, it is a pity that these products are not properly handled. The exhibition in itself placed it beyond doubt that we are capable of developing our agriculture to such an extent that the country will be able to produce all that we shall require, but that the success of the agricultural shows at the recent exhibition was in any sense due to the Government, or its agricultural policy, no person with any sense will believe. There were exhibits from all parts of the Island, even the most remote districts, that showed that this power of production, if properly used, extends throughout the length and breadth of the Colony. Most of these products were produced not by the ordinary fisherman-farmer but by those in the districts like St. John's and St. George's, where the farming industry is more developed than it is in other parts of the Island, and by those who can afford, through having leisure and means, to devote themselves to it. No, Sir ; as I said before, I think that the keynote of the Government's policy is indicated in the section which repeals as far as it goes the statute that is popularly known as the "Placeman's Act," and I am convinced that the intention of the Government is not the improvement of agriculture, for, if it was, the first thing to do would be to appoint an agricultural board composed of men of science in agriculture, or at least men who have spent their lives in farming. I am quite confident, sir, that, unless the Government sees fit to revert to the policy of experimental farming, within a few years we shall have made no progress whatever, and be compelled to start again on the lines that have been followed in other countries.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I would like to refer to a few of the remarks made by my hon. and learned friend, and I shall endeavor to show him that several of the statements that have been made by him have been based upon facts that are not correct. In the first place I may say that he is entirely in error when he thinks that the only farmers in the Island are those who live in the vicinity of St. John's, and I wish to assure him that there are many other places where farming is carried on on comparatively as large a scale as it is by those who live near the city. Let us take St. George's, for instance. If my learned friend will refer to my report on the exhibition he will see that there were 73 exhibitors from that district, and that they were awarded 42 prizes. Another district, on the north side, which he may not consider an agricultural district, Fogo, had 53 exhibitors, and won 42 prizes.

St. John's, it is true, won most of the prizes, but farming has been carried on here for a longer time than it has been in other places, and there are many who engage in it in their leisure time. However, even in the city, much interest was awakened in agriculture by the policy of the present Government, and it is not surprising that there were 208 exhibitors in St. John's East who were awarded 202 prizes, and 203 exhibitors in St. John's West who were awarded 151 prizes. I must also bring to the notice of my learned friend the district of Bonavista, where there are places that, from an agricultural standpoint, are second to none in the whole Island. He evidently does not look upon Bonavista as an agricultural district, but there were 68 exhibitors from that place, and the number of prizes won by them was 46. That compares very favorably with the work of other districts, and especially so when we consider that during the long period that the district was represented by members who sat on the opposition side of the House the district was shamefully neglected by the Government then in power. Since the present Government has come in power they have done all they could to rectify matters, and I am glad to see that a marked improvement can already be noticed. I was glad to hear that the learned gentleman could take no exception to the exhibition, the success of which was very largely due to the work of the Agricultural Board and the untiring efforts of the Prime Minister. When he went to the country in 1908, the leader of the Government advocated agriculture on every platform, and told the people of its advantages and the opportunities we were throwing away by not taking what nature had provided us with, and the impetus which the Government's policy gave to agriculture brought about in some measure at least the agricultural exhibition which was so successful, and which will not be forgotten for many years by those who were able to see it. It was an eye-opener to the 60,000 people who went to see it, for they saw there what they had never seen before, and learned for themselves what the country could accomplish. I am sure that my learned friend, if he attended the exhibition, was quite pleased with it, and that he saw there splendid exhibits from all parts of the Colony. In the district of Bonavista for the past twenty years we have neglected agriculture, but now the people have awakened to the fact that our land is fertile, and they reap a good harvest. But, Sir, what they reap now will be increased three-fold within the next few years, for we shall do away with the old seed that we have been planting in the past and import good seed, for, as both Professors MacPhail and Robertson have pointed out in the reports, good seed is the secret of the whole matter. My learned friend quoted from these reports, but he took care to quote only those portions which suited his own arguments, and he did not give those who heard him a proper idea of the matter contained in the report.

My learned friend argued that we were by our agricultural policy only providing for our political friends, and that same line of

argument was followed by the Leader of the Opposition in the afternoon. He will not find many who will be in accord with such an argument, for the people know that our policy is to encourage the fisherman-farmer, so that those who toil at the fisheries during the summer months will find on their return home that their gardens have been attended to by their wives and children, and that they have grown enough vegetables to supply them during the winter. The Leader of the Opposition has always been opposed to the fisherman-farmer, but I am in favor of him, and believe in him. Look at the people o f Gooseberry Island, in my district, who raise all the potatoes and cabbage that they need. If they can do that surely other parts of the Island can also do it. Perhaps the most absurd argument that was advanced by my learned friend was that all the literature that was circulated was of no avail. I can assure him that it has done good work, and it has been very helpful to the people, and I know this is so, for we have received letters from many who read them. His argument that nothing will result from the present policy was also a poor one, and he knows every barrel of potatoes that was planted last year yielded over twenty barrels, and this will mean a bigger increase still next year.

Now, sir, there is only one other remark made by my learned friend that I wish to reply to. In referring to the individual members of the Board of Agriculture, and my hon. friend must have included me as one of them, he said we are a disgrace to the Colony. Well, sir, I state here that I am no disgrace to the Colony ; neither are those associated with me in this work. They have given their valuable time, and the best that was in them, to this work, and, therefore, why should not they be paid ? That does not come with good grace from my hon. friend. It may be alright and fair for him to criticise us in our official capacity, but when he brings it down to personalities, I am not going to stand to be called a disgrace to the Colony.

MR. KENT—I had no idea of casting any reflection, neither did I intend to, on the hon. gentleman. I dealt solely with the Agricultural Board as a Board, and not as to the character of the gentlemen composing it, and I say here and now, as I said before, that this Agriculture Board is a disgrace to the Colony.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—So far as I am concerned I bear no animosity towards my hon. friend, but that was the interpretation I put on it. If I have construed it wrongly, I retract, but then let us take up the argument from the standpoint of the Agricultural Board. I do not think, neither does any hon. member on this side of the House, think with my hon. friend, that they are a disgrace to the Colony. They are doing a great work, a work that has never been done before, and they will continue doing that work. They are doing a work that should have been accomplished years ago by the Government.

MR. DWYER—I wish to make a few remarks about the show which we had last fall. Sir, we had exhibits from Bonavista, in a space ten feet square or more.

Well, sir, the pity of it, they did not compete with any other place but Bonavista. Like the exhibits from other districts, they simply compete against themselves. Bonavista did not take first prize from the general exhibits, but it got the name of taking the first prize from its own people ; but why, sir, not have an agricultural show at Bonavista, and let the people see what was exhibited ; it would be an object lesson to them. The fisherman-farmer would then have a better chance against the farmer. I cast no reflection upon the fisherman-farmer. So far as my little knowledge goes, they are an adaptable class. I have gone among them and helped them, and was not paid for it either. I think we are in duty bound to have an agricultural show in those places where the large exhibits come from. I am sure that if the same amount of money that was spent on the last exhibition would be spent on these it would be money well spent. In 1906 we had an exhibition in the British Hall. There were large crowds there too, and strangers who were there could not believe that such exhibits could be raised in the country. We got from the Government $600, I think, and we collected from the farmers about $500, and with that money we had a very good show ; but, sir, this show cost thousands, and it ought to have been a good show. It was well conducted, too. There were secretaries, men with ribbons, everywhere you went. Well, sir, let us have shows where there are agricultural societies, and give good prizes.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I am more than surprised at the remarks of my hon. friend. We expected to hear something good from him. He was in the Legislature when I came here.

MR. DWYER—And will be here after you, too.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—He told us about Bonavista and its exhibits. Why, he does not know the first thing of what he is talking about. In the general competition Bonavista took its prizes in competition with every district in the Island. But my hon friend did not exhibit anything. I wonder why, because the exhibition was non-partisan, everyone had a fair show there. It was perhaps the best of its kind ever held in the country, and I may inform my hon. friend the sole benefit from such exhibitions will not be given to St. John's alone, but we hope to hold them in Placentia, Trinity, Harbor Grace, Bonavista, and other places.

MR. DWYER—I said on a former occasion that I would give my reasons for not competing. For this reason, I visited the farmers—and I would like to state here that I am always welcome at mine—and at the places I visited I saw that my own vegetables were not as good as theirs, and that I would not get first prize, and I would not be satisfied with any other. Well, sir, I went to that exhibition, and instead of seeing the prizes given to the largest exhibits, I was astonished to see that they were given to the medium. The reason for this is, I surmise, because the judge thought that the largest were raised for exhibition purposes only, and I saw the exhibits of my friends, who had the lar-

gest turnips, as the case may be, thrown outside. The judge may be a clever man, but his decision was a departure from the rule here. It was the custom to give the prizes to the largest exhibits, but still I think that the man did his duty. I think the Minister visited my farm in company with Dr. Robertson, and Dr. Robertson said, sir, that my product was good enough to be sent to England.

HON. THE PREMIER — It was not my intention to speak on this measure this evening, because I felt that any point raised would be fully met from this side of the House by the Minister in charge, and by other members, but I think it is only right and fair to this House, to this Committee and the Government, to very briefly make answer to the attempt made to discredit the actions of the Government, first as regards the appointment of the Board, and secondly as regards our agricultural policy. We were told here by the Leader of the Opposition that a wrong was committed in the appointment of this Board, that it was a violation of the "Placeman's Act," which prevents the members of the Legislature from taking any offices to which pay is attached, except those named in the Act. In other words, that we had violated the constitution by appointing Messrs. Devereux, Seymour and Downey ; and the hon. member, with all the force and ability for which he is noted, having made the point, amplified it as strongly as possible, with the object of making it appear to this Legislature, and the country at large, that some great wrong had been done. Why, one would think from his remarks that we had done something never done before, and something that we had a right to be ashamed of. He then went on to point out to this Legislature that the Act passed a year ago by this Legislature could not have been understoood by the Opposition, that they did not understand the meaning of the section, that they never contemplated this, and the hon. member for St. John's East followed in the same strain, and both of them told us that they did not understand what it meant. Let me tell you that that section could not have any other meaning, and we gave the Opposition full notice of what we were going to do. It simply meant that members of this Legislature could not be appointed to this Board. We gave them clear notice, I say, and now, after the Act has been in force for a year, the Leader of the Opposition comes in, and says that they did not know what it meant. Well, the Committee can place any meaning they like on that statement. We will give them the benefit of the doubt, but they voted for it and passed it, and never said a word against it, and if it was doubtful, it was all the more reason for demanding what it meant. They were here a year ago, when this section was approved and passed by the whole House. Is there anything covered up in this ? What we have done, we have done in the open, and not behind closed doors ; and now frightened at the success of the Government, the Rt. Hon. Leader brings to the support of his party that ingenuity by which he can make black appear white. But in doing this we have followed precedents

that he has supported in this Legislature. We have followed the precedent that was established as far back as 1889, and the section passed last year is verbatim with the one passed in 1889 In 1889 the Government of the day decided on building a railway to Port aux Basques. They started at Whitbourne and got as far as Placentia Junction, a little further on the road. In the session of '89 a bill was passed to appoint railway commissioners under that Act. They appointed Mr. W. B. Grieve, then a member of this House, Mr. W. J. S. Donnelly, then a member of this House; they appointed Mr. A. F. Godridge and the late Mr. P. J. Scott, both members of this House, and Mr. Pitts and Mr. Monroe, members of the Upper House. Now this is the very same section as was passed in the '89 Act, and these men sit on the Board in the same way and under the same authority as those members of the House sat on the railway commission. Was that a violation of the constitution? Was that smashing down the bulwarks of the Magna Charta of our liberties? Are we not following a precedent cited in this House over and over again?

But the history of that Act does not end here. That autumn there was a general election and the Thorburn Government were defeated, and the Leader of the Opposition came back as the first lieutenant of Sir William Whiteway, and sat on the Executive, and with Whiteway and myself appointed commissioners, members of the House, under that very Act, and for over a year they sat on that commission and received pay, though members of the Legislature, and that pay was allowed under that Act. Why, we were elected in 1889, in the month of November, and if you will look at the Gazette of December of that year you will see that the late Mr. Rothwell, the late Dr. Dearin, the late Mr. Edward White, Captain Eli Dawe, and the late Hon. James Fox, gazetted as members of that commission, and everyone of these men were members of the Legislature. There was nothing wrong about that, but it is all wrong for us to appoint a board under the identical section. There was nothing wrong with the liberties of the country. They were not undermining our constitution. They were perfectly right then, but we are perfectly wrong now. But it does not stop there. The Government of the day, with the express sanction of the Legislature, appointed these men. Thorburn had appointed certain commissioners, the Whiteway Government dismissed them and appointed others. And where is the difference between Downey, Devereux and Seymour coming here last session and accepting an appointment under the very same section, a section copied verbatim et literatim, and a section for which the Opposition came down here and voted for. What nonsense a year after to tell us these men voted for that section without knowing what they were voting for. It is too absurd, and whilst it is all very well to try to create an alarm outside the House, and try to make some advantage and work ill for the agricultural policy of the Government, it cannot have any effect on this Committee or Legislature, and they will

not be deceived by any such argument. "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander," and what is right in '89 and '90 is right to-day.

But we did not stop there in 1889. The Leader of the Opposition, the very first summer he was in office as Colonial Secretary, was on a commission with Capt. Eli Dawe, the late James McGrath and the late Mr. Edward White, to carry out the Bait Act and those gentlemen were members of the House of Assembly. These men sat for two years. Was that a violation of the Placeman's Act ? We did not go outside the House to get strangers, we took men out of this House, members of our own party, elected to this Legislature, and I can cite numerous cases as precedents. We come to 1898 and we find the case referred to by the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Kent. In 1899 we find the late Capt. Dawe, the late Mr. Carty, my friend, Mr. Watson, and Mr. Alan Goodridge and others, all members of this Legislature, took work from the Government for over six months. The Legislature was asked to indemnify these men for accepting Government work for over six months. The law is that they were not allowed to work for emolument from the Government for over six months and the Legislature idemnified them. In this Act we are authorized to do that. That is the result of the section and that is its object.

Then we came to a later case. In the years 1901-2-3-4, the late Government required a man to carry out the Whaling Act. They did not go outside the House. They appointed Mr. Way, then a member of this House. And if I had the power to call Capt. Bonia here as a witness, he would tell you that he carried out the Bait Act for four years when he sat here as a member for Placentia. Everyone of these cases were violations of the Placeman's Act, but it was right for Bonia because he was a member of the late Government, right for Mr. Charles Way because he was also a member of it ; but it is wrong for Devereux, Downey and Seymour. Now there is another case I might quote, in answer to an argument put forward this evening. Under the 1898 Act, the Government of the day were called upon to compensate the Municipal Council for taking away the promenade. The Governor in Council had the right to appoint an arbitrator. They did not go to get a stranger outside the House. Whom did they appoint ? They appointed a member of the Executive Council and a member of the Legislature, Capt. Eli Dawe, and gave him $2,000, and he gave it to himself for giving the Municipal Council an award of $250,000. They did not go outside the House for a stranger. They appointed Mr. Dawe and Mr. Baird, who acted with Judge Conroy, the Council's arbitrator, and Dawe was paid $2,000. That job could have been given outside the House, but there was no necessity. Mr. Dawe was a member of the House. He was a Departmental officer, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, at the time. Now, sir, I have no fault to find with that appointment. If I had an arbitration to-morrow, and needed a man upon whom I could rely, I could not find a better man. Was

it proper to appoint Mr. Dawe ? Was it proper to appoint Mr. Baird ? But our case is stronger, much stronger. We have done nothing that is not right. We have asked the Legislature if they would amend the Act, amend the constitution, if you like, and the answer was "yes." We appointed these men. We say that we will appoint a Board of five, and the Act says that members of this House of Assembly may be members of the Board, and the Legislature assented. We made the appointment. Was there anything wrong with that to deserve the censure of the Rt. hon. the Leader of the Opposition ? He told us that we have been riding roughshod through the constitution, whereas, as a matter of fact, we are as mild as mild can be in comparison to what has been done in past administrations. We have done nothing without the direct authority and sanction of this Legislature. Why, past administrations have farmed out offices for their supporters. They gave positions for six months to one and another and voted the same salary to each one of them, and when we ask this House for permission to appoint these men and get their assent, we are told forsooth, "The new policy of the Government consists of three things : 1st, the finding of something to do for their supporters in the House ; 2nd, prescribing for what they are to do ; and 3rd, destroying the foundations of the work of the late Government." I did not know that there were any foundations to destroy. At least we found none. There was not even material on the ground to build foundations. Foundations, indeed ! To hear the Rt. hon . gent'eman speak, one would think that he had left behind him a structure that only required a little more to be done to make it perfect Structure ? There was no structure, not a vestige of one. Not a vestige to indicate that an agricultural policy had ever been considered. If there is a lawyer in the House, it is not wrong for him to take large fees, it is not wrong for him to take $1,000 or $10,000 from the Government. That is no violation of the Placeman's Act. I was a member of the late administration for eight or nine years, and for only three or four of these did I hold office, and in all these years I had large fees paid me by the Government, and no one ever thought it wrong for me to take them. If there is a lawyer in the party, and there are lawyers in every party, he can make thousands of dollars a year, and no one will say it is a violation of the Placeman's Act. But if you pay one cent to the unfortunate laymen, the unfortunate outport representative, then you are cutting away the very foundations of the constitution. Now, sir, we have been perfectly open in this mater, perfectly open. We have done nothing that the whole world could not see. As I said before, we might have carried this work out as other administrations have done. Under the administration of 1899, I think there were five Receiver Generals in one year. Mr. Shea was Receiver General, Captain Kean was Receiver General, Mr. Dawe and Mr. Morine were also Receiver Generals. Each got six months out of it. There were four or five men in the same

job, all done to avoid the provisions of the Placeman's Act. There was never a word against that, but now what we do is blue ruin. The country is gone, sold, and now look out for Confederation. I might say, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see why this argument was brought up to this Committee by the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, because he must have known that there are many, many precedents which have been much stronger evasions of the Placeman's Act than is contained in that section, and no one in this Committee nor outside of it will receive without question the statement that when this section was proposed last session and passed both Houses of the Legislature, three or four readings in each House, the Opposition members voted for it without knowing what the meaning of the section was. Now, really, Mr. Chairman, when we boil the whole thing down, it simply means that the gentlemen on the other side of the House are sad and sorry that our policy is so successful, that we are working, and that the country believes that we are working to carry out this policy. We have it on the evidence and testimony of Mr. Kent and the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, that the commencement of agriculture in this country dates from 1908. Then began the experimental farm, that came to nothing. Nothing but a farm, nothing but untilled land, with a stable and a few buildings. We have started this policy of ours, and it simply means that those on the other side of the House have one policy and we have another. It is simply the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. They are sitting there in the cold shades of opposition, and everyone knows their game, and that is to get back. They were turned out by the country and we were put in their places. It is only natural that they should want to get back. They want to return to office and get their pay. We are in the way, and it is only natural, and only what we expect, that anything we propose here in the way of a policy will meet with opposition. Now, what is the policy ? Until the year 1908 we had none. I do not want to reflect upon the Heads of the Department previous to 1908. As far as they were able, Mr. Clift and Mr. Dawe arried out the policy, whatever it was. There were two or three stallions out at the agricultural stables, two or three sows, and a boar and a few sheep.

MR. DWYER—What about the bulls and other cattle ?

HON. THE PREMIER—They were all sold previous to 1908. I will make a return, if the hon. member wishes, of the amount of cattle that went out in the years previous to 1908. I am not reflecting on that policy, or on the Ministers who had to carry it out. They carried it out and did their best with the means at their disposal. What I want to emphasize is this : That 1908 was the starting point of agricultural policy. The late Government was in favor of an experimental farm, and the present Government does not believe in it. The experiments that we require are being made all over the world to-day, and we have only to avail of what is being done and not put the Government

to the expense themselves. On the same principle, we ought to have experiments in every other science and every other profession and trade, as in agriculture. We get the best breeds of everything, and the best seeds are secured, and if we want an analysis of our soil, it can be sent away and done very cheaply. We do not want half a dozen scientific professors out at a model farm, training a number of boys who will then go to Canada and practice there. Now our policy is this : that all the experiments that are being made all over the world are available to us. We do not want anyone to come here and show us how to set potatoes. We have found that out for ourselves. We had the very best authority on potatoes last year, Dr. MacPhail, and he had no use for a model farm in this country. neither had Professor Robertson; and he and every man on record in relation to experimental farms do not agree with experimental stations for this country. Now, the same may be said of all, as may be said of potatoes. Why, Professor Robertson said, when he had gone through the farms of the country, that we should double our potato crop. We can take out of the ground just double what we are taking now, if we go about it the right way. What is true of potatoes is true of all the other crops. Now, what is the average crop of potatoes here ? Seven barrels to the barrel. That is the average all over the Island.

MR. DWYER—That may be the average when the fisherman sows. It should not be. On my farm it is not seven.

HON. THE PREMIER—I quite agree with the hon. member. But we must take things as we find them. It is probably not so on the farm of the hon. member. On the farm of the hon. member the yield is not seven, but probably 17 or 27. But I am talking now of the average yield all over the Island. If you go to the farms in the nearby settlements you will probably find the average yield is eight to twelve barrels, but all over the Island the average is only about seven to the barrel. Now, we want to raise that average. We want to double or treble that yield, and we are going about it this way : We imported last year 1,000 barrels of the best seed potatoes, and the average yield was over twenty barrels to the barrel. We got as high as thirty to the barrel.

MR. DWYER—If they give them the same treatment as the others, you will have the same results. The fisherman-farmer attends to other work, and, even if he got new seed, it would not produce any better results than the old, with the attention he gives it.

HON. THE PREMIER—My answer to that is that my experience has not led me to form so low an opinion of our fishermen-farmers as that expressed by the hon. gentleman. He is quite ready to see where a profit comes in for himself, and he has only to be shown how to do a thing and he will do it. It is quite true that he may put seed in the ground and go away for two or three months, and the potatoes will not be attended to until he returns ; but he has not been taught any better. All the experimental farms in the world

are not going to show that man how to cultivate potatoes. You will have to go and show him. But these fishermen-farmers are quite the equal in intelligence with any other class. Take the ordinary fisherman of Newfoundland. He goes into the woods, cuts down the timber for a boat, bends them on, and afterwards navigates her. Is there any reason to say that this man is not able to cultivate a barrel of potatoes ? I wish the intelligence of the fisherman and his application and industry were applied to every avocation in this country. I make bold to say that, if you go to any outport, and take any ten women there and show them how to cultivate potatoes, and then go back there in a year's time, they will be able to teach you themselves. All we have to do is to show these people how and they will learn. Show them how to till the land, how to select the seed, how to sow the seed. Now, as to stock. We are not doling out an occasional bull or sheep or pig. We are going to do something on a large scale, something that will touch every settlement and every home and every man in the Island. What is the use of waiting for the development of an agricultural policy that will take a hundred years to fructify. Do something immediately, and get results. We started at the beginning by appointing a Board, who, we are told here this evening, knew nothing about the matter. A man does not require to serve his whole life at any calling in order to master it. Four or five years is considered sufficient for a man to master even the art of agriculture. But when these men were appointed, they were not supposed to know all the details of agriculture as well as my hon. friend on the other side, who has been at it all his life, and who, I should imagine, is not only a practical farmer, but also a scientific farmer. Why, some of the largest farms in the world to-day are being run by men who have very little knowledge of farming. It is more a question of engineering, of putting the machinery together and operating the machines. An intelligent man, with proper machinery, can do almost anything in the farming line today if he has even an elementary knowledge of agriculture. Now, the Leader of the Opposition has told us that he has spent $50,000 on his private farm. I have no doubt he has. I have no doubt his opinion and advice in relation to farming operations would be of great value to the people of this Committee and to the country. But I know that he will admit that there are other people who have spent money in farming. For fourteen years I operated my own farm, and spent as high as three and four thousand dollars a year on it, and I know a little about farming. I have also given much study and thought to the question, and I have visited all the experimental farms and model farms in Canada and some in the United States and England, and I hold to my opinion to-night, against the opinion of anyone here, that the policy of agriculture we have embarked on, the policy of improving stock and seed, and of establishing agricultural societies all over the country, is doing more for agriculture than all the experimental farms you might establish in the country for the next fifty years.

As to the men on the Board, the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition stated they were not fit to be on the Board, they knew nothing about agriculture, they have no practical knowledge ; and my hon. friend, the member for St. John's East, went so far as to say that they are the last men that should be selected. Yet, when the Leader of the Opposition wanted a man to preside at the head of the Agricultural Department of this Colony as Minister of Agriculture, he appointed Capt. Eli Dawe, an excellent Captain, a man conversant with all the various departments of the fisheries of the Colony ; but Captain Dawe would be the last man in the world to claim he was an expert in agriculture. Yet he was selected by the Leader of the Opposition to fill the high and important position of Minister of Agriculture for a number of years under the late administration, and I was a party to that appointment. My reason was this, because he was appointed to do the administrative work. He was not going to go out and select the seed or bulls or sheep. He was simply going to administer the work of the Department and no better man could have been selected. That was why we selected him, and not because of any particular fitness from an agricultural standpoint. Then he left the office and was appointed Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Leader of the Opposition selected Mr. Clift to fill the position in the Agriculture and Mines Department. It was not that Mr. Clift had ever given any special attention to agriculture, but because he was a man capable of administering the Department. Now, for the same reason these men were appointed on the Board. Not because they had any special fitness by reason of their acquaintance with the practical part of agriculture, but because of their capacity as organizers, and because of their intelligence to observe anything necessary to make our policy successful, and because of the capacity they have of imparting their knowledge to others ; and I think the exhibition we had last fall, and the success of the societies all over the country, the success of the importations of agricultural stock and seed, the general stimulating effect of their work all over the island, is our justification for the selection of these men. I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, if those on the other side of the House were not separated from us by mere accident of opposition and Government, if they were members of this Government they would be defending the action of the Government in this connection, and throwing up their caps as sharers in the policy we have inaugurated. The Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked : "What is the use of establishing agricultural societies in the outports where there are no farmers ?" Why ,sir, there is no district in the country in which there .re not a few well conducted, largely productive farms. They are in Placentia and Trinity, in Bonavista and Bay St. George, and in almost every other district. Go to Mortier Bay and many other places that I could mention and you will find some of the largest and finest farms, and all these want some little encouragement and help, and something to stimulate and en-

courage them, and that is what the Board and societies are doing. Twelve months ago there were only two societes in Newfoundland ; to-day there are 775 agricultural societies in this country, established for the encouragement of farming. Every one of these societies has a grant to do what they think best with. They can buy threshing machines or bulls, or seeds, or anything they like, absolutely free and unfettered. A hea'thy rivalry has been created all over the whole island, as was shown by the exhibition held last autumn. Every one of these societies has an intelligent school teacher as secretary, and they are doing their utmost to disseminate information all over the island, and the healthy rivalry that exists among them is an incentive to agriculture and must have a good effect. With these societies at work, we can never go back to where we were before, never make any retrograde movement, but we will have better stock and better results than ever before. Only two years ago the Government corresponded with the Reid-Nfld. Co., the Coastal Co., and other companies and pointed out that the agricultural policy could never come to anything unless the farmers got low rates of freight on agricultural produce. It was no use of a man in Kelligrews raising a barrel of potatoes if he could not send it down to the Labrador or Bonne Bay, or wherever he wanted to. It was no use in a man in Bonne Bay raising produce if he could not send it to Placentia or Burin, or wherever it was wanted. We made arrangements whereby these companies have agreed to take a barrel to any part of the Island for twenty-five cents, or to the Straits or Labrador. A man from Kelligrews can send a barrel to Bay of Islands by rail and from that down the Straits for twenty-five cents, and so on all over the Island. Now, what was the effect. These companies are carrying to-day 50 per cent. more than they carried two years ago on account of these rates. It is no inconvenience to them because the trains and steamers are not filled, but it means a lot to the man who has produce to sell. That is a sample of what can be done without any expense and with very little effort ; and if nothing else was done by the Government that alone would be a justification for the appointment of the Board and for the policy we have embarked on. My hon. friend referred to the manner in which Professor Zavitz was used by the press when he came here, the manner in which he was attacked. I do not know anything about that, and I do not justify it. If any unprovoked attacks were made on Professor Zavitz or anyone else, they did not have my endorsement, and I do not approve of them ; but I want to know the facts before I give any opinion as to what was said and what was done. To hear some people speaking, you would imagine nothing was ever said by the papers supporting the other side about anyone. You can take the papers from one end of the year to the other representing the opposition, supported by them and written for by them, go through the fyles during the last two elections and see some of the things they said about me. I suppose I have some right to be pro-

tected as well as Professor Zavitz. The ordinary animal is protected under the game laws ; but I cannot claim protection and must say nothing about it. I do not want to come in here and make any complaint about what has been said and written about me. I have no doubt I deserved some of it ; but I can only say I know nothing about what has been written about Professor Zavitz or about anybody else, so far as that is concerned. As regards the observation made by the hon. member that his debate on the model farm was deliberately cut out of the official records. I know nothing about that either. If they were cut out I did not cut them out. The observation was evidently meant to apply to someone on this side of the House, if it had any meaning at all. If the whole paper was taken and mutilated, what have I got to do with it ? What has the Government got to do with it ? I do not even know to what the hon. gentleman refers. I say it is not fair or just for such a statement to be made ; for it implies to those who do not think and do not understand, that some person on this side of the House had some motive or object in mutilating the book. I know nothing about it, and I am sure nobody on this side of the House knows anything about it ; and I court the closest enquiry, whether by the police or by this House ; and if anyone has done that deliberately I should be the first to vote that they be properly punished. Now, Mr. Chairman, I must apologize to the Committee for having occupied their time so long about this. As I said at the start, I did not intend to speak to these Resolutions, because I believe that the matter is one which can be best dealt with by the Minister and those associated with him. But I believe that when a charge is made in this House the explanation should go forward to the country concurrently with the charge.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—I should be quite satisfied, sir, that this indictment of the Government should go forth side by side with their defence. But as that is not possible it becomes necessary for me as thoroughly as possible to take up the observations that have fallen from the hon. the Prime Minister. He has been, I think, singularly unhappy in his choice of expressions. He has ascribed to me things I never intended and certainly never said. For instance, he says that a lawyer can take all the fees he can lay his hands on, or all that the Government will give him, and he does not come under the Placeman's Act. What a statement to put forward ? A lawyer lives by his profession, by the fees that he obtains from every side. He is not debarred by the Disabilities Act from obtaining a fee. But the Placeman's Act debars a member of this House from sullying himself. It declares that a member of this House who holds a position of emolument without the permission of his constituents shall be considered dead. That is the same as the English Act. What comparison is there between the lawyer and the men whom I have indicted here for a crime under the Disabilities Act ? There is none. It is amusing that a lawyer should put forward such a plea. It shows that he has a

rotten case. Fancy comparing the position of a lawyer earning his daily bread with the position of three men violating the Placeman's Act. Again, sir, the Prime Minister said, what would it matter if a wrong had been committed. It would be nothing novel or new but it is wrong every time. I charge now again that by the Act of last year you have done a thing unparalleled in this country or in any other country I know of under the British Crown. The special plea put up will not alter the matter.

Again, sir, we are told that we are frightened at the magnificent and unparalleled success of the agricultural policy of the Government. What an absurdity! What is there to be frightened at except that we are flinging money away right and left without any return for it. We found that the Government had spent $100,000 without any legislative authority at all. Our fright is based upon that, not upon the agricultural policy which is as much a farce as the Solling process that was going to put up 150,000 quintals of fish. We are told that the whole fish trade of the country was to be revolutionized by the Solling process Imagine a lot of people sitting down and wrapping up in paper 150,000 quintals of fish! We were told just now that the pepole of this country did not need to be told how to plant potatoes, such was the wisdom of the fisherman-farmer. He wanted no teaching. Well, the present Government sent to Prince Edward Island and brought down Dr. McPhail, and for teaching us how to plant potatoes they paid him $844.92.

THE PREMIER—He came down free and for nothing. We only bought potatoes from him while he was here.

SIR ROBERT BOND—I suppose he made his profit out of the potatoes? Anyway there is a charge made for $844.92 paid to Dr. McPhail without any explanation whatever. We are told that the great exhibition frightens us. Well, it was a decided success; a decided success. It did credit to the Committee. But I would ask my friend opposite whether he will contend as a sensible man that that exhibition is going to creat a new industry in this country. What did that exhibition go to show? It went to show that the farmer of means, and the gentleman farmer cultivating a garden could make a most creditable show of vegetables. It did not show we had a regular agricultural class. It showed what Mr. Knowling and Mr. Dwyer and other gentlemen could do, and what the fisherman farmer could do in his little garden plot 15x10 or more. But it was not an agricultural exhibition such as is held in other countries. It did not exhibit the productions of a farming class, because we have none. I do not say we cannot produce as good vegetables as could be desired, for we can. I do not expect the fisherman farmer to produce an article equal to that of P. E. I. You can never make a farming community out of fishermen. If you had an agricultural college in Newfoundland you could educate the children of the fishermen to farming. But the idea of taking a man accustomed to the jigger or net, and by some sort of legerdemain

make a farmer of him is the greatest absurdity possible. Of course I know you will at once make an appeal to the gallery and shout, "Oh, you are speaking against the fisherman!" He is always the "poor fisherman" except when you are taking hundreds of thousands of dollars out of his pocket and putting it into your own.

I said, sir, that the Prime Minister is very unfortunate at his illustrations. I brought up the case of the Auditor General. I said it was a case without a parallel. The Prime Minister sought to convince this House that because Mr. Berteau was sent some time ago to examine public accounts in the Customs' Department, and work within the scope of his duties under the Audit Act, and one which occupied only four or five sittings at the most, that it was proper to employ him for a year at the head of the Savings' Bank. What a statement! We are referred to the lawyer who is allowed to take his fees. Where is the parallel? It is the profession by which he earns his bread. We are told that Captains Dawe and Bonia and Mr. Way performed certain work in connection with the fisheries and that I was a party to their performing it. Well, they did not come under the Disabilities Act and so they were doing no wrong in it. But I am talking of these three gentlemen who do come under the Disabilities Act. If they had performed work for six months or three months or one month they would not have come under the Act. It specially provides that a man can fill a position for six months. But it debars such men as my friends opposite who have held their positions for more than six months. I was told that my arguments were calculated to deceive the House; but I think it is the Prime Minister's which do that, not mine. We are told by the Prime Minister that in 1889 I was a party to the appointment of the Railway Commissioners. I was not a party to it. I was not a member of the Government or a supporter of the Government at the time.

HON. THE PREMIER—I did not say that. You asked for a precedent and I said that in 1889 Sir Robert Thorburn's Government appointed Railway Commissioners, and he put in a similar provision in the Act, and members of the House of Assembly got paid under it.

SIR ROBERT BOND—Where is the parallel case? There is no argument in that.

HON. THE PREMIER—You appointed Commissioners under it three months afterwards.

SIR ROBERT BOND—I did not. The Commissioners were appointed under an Act specially authorizing it, and they never received one cent.

HON. THE PREMIER—I will give you the facts later.

SIR ROBERT BOND—Then produce them later; that does not alter the case. I say this is not a parallel case. No Act was framed which authorized you to appoint those three men. The late Government appointed those Railway Commissioners under an Act of Parliament. That was their authority. But what authority has this Government for their appointment? You passed that Act of last session yourself as a whitewashing Act. That is

not a parallel case to a Government acting under an Act already on the Statute Book. That is a totally different case. Again, sir, we are told that in 1899 the Government of Sir James Winter put in an Act to whitewash his wrongdoing. Is that a parallel case ? If there is any parallel at all it is in that Act of Sir James Winter's Government. And the Prime Minister knows that I forced Sir James Winter's Government into passing that Bill. He will find it in the records. I condemned it then, and I concondemn it now. Sir James Winter did an unlawful act. He was forced in this House to use a brute majority to indemnify the men who violated the Act. Then we are told the Whiteway Government employed men to carry out the Bait Act. Every one of these cases is totally different. The men who acted under the Bait Act acted under the Disabilities Act. If the gentlemen to whom I painfully made reference this afternoon had acted for six months then they would not have committed the crime to which I take exception. But these men have occupied these positions for twelve months and to-day they are voting for their salaries themselves. Isn't that totally different from the men who acted under the Bait Act.

HON. THE PREMIER—With regard to the Placeman's Act, a lawyer when acting in the capacity of counsel for the Crown is exempt from the Act. Not as Attorney General, but as counsel for the Crown ; and it is in that capacity that every member of the Legislature is allowed to take fees. That is the rule and that is the law. "Any person acting as attorney, solicitor, advocate or counsel for the Crown, the Government, or for either branch of the Legis'ature, or for any public department, public board or public body in any civil, criminal or quasi criminal proceeding." In other words, any member of the present Government party who happens to be a lawyer can take $10,000 or $20,000 a year and he does not offend the Placeman's Act. But once you bring in a Bill to enable a layman to earn something then you are striking at the foundation of the constitution. That is the sum and substance of our offence. My hon. friend said that he had not accused me of removing the reports of his speech on the Model Farm. What could be the object of stating that if not for the purpose of implying that some wrong had been done ? It would not be the first time that documents had been cut out of the books. He did not say that it had been done by somebody on this side of the House, but that is the obvious inference.

SIR ROBERT BOND—My only reference to this matter was that I regretted that I could not refer to my speech on the Model Farm because it had been deliberately cut out of the reports. I did not say it had been done by a member of this Parliament.

HON. THE PREMIER—I accept that explanation, but the hon. member knows what the effect of the implication will be when the public reads the papers to-morrow. Of course he does not care or has no use for the papers, but I say that it is important that side by side with that statement should go forth a

contradiction of that statement. If it was deliberately done, I know nothing about it, and I court the closest enquiry into the matter. It must have been done by some silent admirer of the right hon. member, who is hoarding away these valuable documents. I have the pleasantest recollection of hearing the speech delivered. It represented a great deal of labor. For this I am always prepared to give the right hon. member credit. No man in this House is as industrious as the right hon. member. I say that after close observation, but at the same time there is no man more dangerous. He is able to make black white and white black, and I know it from close association with him, and if I have any failing in that respect I lay it entirely at his door. Then he talked about the indictment of these three men. They have been indicted for doing what others have done over and over again. These three men that have been indicted ought to be sent for and asked what they have to say before sentence is passed. I hope all the indictments will be as harmless as this one. The members concerned have nothing to be alarmed over. They have as much right to fees as anyone else in the Act, and if the Act does not give it to them then we must amend it, and not make fish of one and flesh of another. Then my right hon. friend harped back to the Auditor General's accounts I am not blaming him for his censure of the Auditor General, because he is only the instrument under the Audit Act, and no matter how closely you may sail to the wind there will have to be expenditures on executive responsibility. Every day something crops up for money that has not been voted, and the Government of the day have to make these expenditures and ask the Legislature to authorize them. I am surprized that the hon. gentleman has taken the Auditor General's report on that point seriously. Over and over again it has been done in relation to the late administration. When we came here two years ago the first thing we did was to pass the Loan Act to pay the bills left by the late administration. Look up the Auditor General's report on that and you will find some very interesting matter. And now we are told that we have expended $100,000 over the estimates. How have we done that ? $15,000 in the district of St. Barbe on extension of telegraphs. Is there anything wrong with that ? $25,000 on agriculture more than was voted. Where did that go ? For improved stock sent all over the Island. On lighthouses a very considerable amount ; new post offices all over the Island ; additional subsidies for steam to Labrador, Fogo, and Fortune. That is where the $100,000 went, and why should it not go to the people who paid it ? Is it not better to pay it to them than to squander it on useless and unproductive services ? As I said before, we do not hope to convince the hon. member or his friends that we are doing right, but all this criticism and opposition will not deter the Government from carrying out its policy. Everything we promised we are going to fulfil, and without increased taxation, and all the bitterness and regret has been because there will be

nothing left for the other side to do.

MR. DEVEREUX—Mr. Chairman, so much has been said during the last few hours about the Agricultural Board, of which I am a member, that it is for the purpose of defending myself and my colleagues against the assaults——

SIR ROBERT BOND—Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order and to point out to you as a new official in this House that any man who is interested in any way in a measure before the chair cannot address the House. I refer you to May's Parliamentary Practice.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member does not come under that law at all. May's Parliamentary Practice cannot support any such position. The Act of Parliament is so framed as to except him from that position in the same way as the Attorney General or any other departmental officer. The hon. member is perfectly right in speaking and does not in any way touch the principle referred to. If a man has an interest in the vote he cannot speak, but that does not concern us at all. The hon. member can debate this question as well as any other member of the Committee.

SIR ROBT. BOND—Mr. Chairman, I say that it is illegal and he cannot debate the question or vote upon it. The law is perfectly clear upon the subject. May's Parliamentary Practice leaves not the slightest doubt whatever. Even if it does, I would further draw your attention to the 117th rule of this House. Is not the hon. member interested in this measure. I say he is. He is interested in the Bill before the Chair because it contains the money out of which his salary is paid. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask for your ruling in this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN—My ruling is that the hon. member may proceed.

SIR ROBT. BOND—Well, sir, if he speaks he lays himself open to the penalty.

MR. DEVEREAUX—This, sir, is being done in order to try and deceive the public outside. For the last five or six hours he has been attempting various tricks before this House, but the most contemptible trick of all is this last one, contrary to all the instincts of British fair play. To try and prevent a member of this House speaking on any measure is contrary to every idea of British justice and fair play. Perhaps the clumsiest trick that one can conceive is that of telling us that a Bill that went through this Legislature and has been on the Statute Book for one year went through without their knowing what was the meaning of its provisions. That, sir, is the personification of stupidity. But, sir, they are so disappointed that they have been elected to this House, but not elected by a majority of the people, that they have no public interest left, no wish to do anything for the public interest. It is a clumsy trick, and I am surprised that those men over there, men convicted to-night as recreant to their duty and the personification of stupidity, do not see that he is trying to stultify and nullify everything British and everything connected with fair play. He took two and one half hours of the time of

this House playing to the galleries and the reporter's box, and for what purpose? Trying to take away from the magnificent work that has been done all over the country. The whole country, sir, not one settlement or city or town, but the whole country. This he has attempted to do the whole evening. And he has failed. While this Legislature upholds the ideas which appertain to British fair play it is impossible for any man, no matter whether he be titled or not, it is impossible to convert this House to anything un-British or unfair. A few evenings ago he quoted from Carlyle "Unless one has something important to say, one should be eternally silent." Now, sir, I will also quote a sentence from Carlyle. Everyone knows that he was a dyspeptic, and dyspeptic people have not the best of tempers. Yet he was a great philosopher, but he said many things when suffering from this disease which he did not believe himself two or three hours after being uttered. He said, "England has thirty-three millions of people, mostly fools." Three or four great measures have been brought before the chair during the present session relating to the fishermen and laborers of the Colony, every one of which have been opposed by the present Leader of the Opposition. Now, Newfoundland has some 230,000 people, mostly fishermen, does he think these men are also "mostly fools" because he happens to be placed in the cold shades of Opposition by them? He told us, also, that we ought to protect the independence of the members of Parliament. Is not that being done? Does he not know, sir, that whatever strength I may possess as a representative is derived from the people who placed me where I am, and as long as I represent their choice, no executive favors will put me in any other place than I wish? My strength is not derived from the paltry salary given me by the Government, but from the district which placed me here in this seat. The idea of that man telling us that it is a disgrace to be placed in a position that enables us to help the people that we love and that it is a shame to be able to assist those with whom I have always been associated, namely, the people of the outports! Further, that it is necessary to make me an expert farmer as my hon. friend, Mr. Dwyer, before it is possible for me to go to the outports and show them elementary agriculture. We only profess to show the very rudiments, but it does not satisfy the right hon. member for us to be natives. We must come from some other part of the world to go to the outports and show them how to sow a potato.

The ex-Minister of Agriculture and Mines has been very gentle all through the discussion and so I take it he is satisfied with this Bill. He brought in a Bill in 1908 for the founding of a model farm which showed what the Bond Government knew about agriculture. He confessed that he knew nothing about it. He did not know the salary to be paid to teachers even. Now that Bill asked for $20,000. We ask for a certain sum of money and have told the House what we intended to do with it and what we have already done with the money already granted. It has been a sat-

isfaction to the people outside, not only to the people that placed the Government members on this side, but it is a galling fact that it has become agreeable to the men who placed those men on the other side of the House. That is one of the principles which instigated the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and made him make that attempt to nullify the grand and glorious policy inaugurated by the present Government. I would not dare to stand up here to-night if I had been a member of the Fisheries Board under the late Government and run the risk of being asked with regard to the vast amount of money paid for the Flett Herring Fake. Nor would I dare to stand up and defend myself for granting a salary to a Mr. Mair employed by the Bond Government to stick on lobster labels at a salary of $2,000 a year. Does the right hon. member imagine that we are fools ? Does he imagine that this House and this Committee are to be faked, as he has faked, in relation to other matters. This man tells us that the Agricultural Board as at present constituted is unable to convey any idea of information to the country in regard to elementary agriculture. This is the very man that went to Washington some years ago to get through the Bond-Blaine Treaty and came back and did not know the difference until he did come back between green and dry cod. His gross lack of knowledge on that question put us into such disrepute with the Americans that we have never since had the remotest probability of carrying reciprocity. Owing to the great lack of knowledge of that man what might have been a great boon for the last fifteen years to the Colony has been denied us. And this man talks and tells us that it is impossible to build up a farming industry among the fishermen and sneers and slurs at the men who placed him in a position to take from the coffers of the Colony more than $100,000.

We contemplate these things, sir, while the only farmer in the House—and I am very glad he is in the Opposition—instead of giving expression to-night to his opinion in regard to what has been done by the agricultural societies, practically sits tight in his chair without giving any practical information whatever. I gave him more credit than that. In his position, as an agricultural expert, he is able, and ought to have given us some practical points on this policy. But, sir, what can we expect ? This is a man who when a servant of the Board came to his farm in the suburb of St. John's and showed him a cankerous potato, came to him as one of the principal farmers in St. John's—surely he knows the look of a cankerous potato—he allowed this man to go to the different farms in the country, and, in order to give vent to party spleen, said not a word to point out to him the danger of such a terrible disease. Is this the kind of farmer we are trying to help ? Why, sir, if I knew there were ten farmers of this description in the country, I would resign from the Board immediately. Again, sir, I have been informed that this man did not bring this cankerized potato on the farm of Mr. Dwyer, and, therefore an apology is due, not only to this Board, but to the

man. Again, sir, Mr. Dwyer has spent half a century in farming in this country, and certainly one would think that it would be the proper thing to consult him as to his course. But what does the hon. gentleman do ? He ties up this little bit of knowledge to deliver it here, instead of doing, as he should have done, warning the man, and pointing out the dangers. He uses it as a pretext to criticize the Government and foment opposition against it.

MR. DWYER—I had no opportunity to tell the man. You are talking through your collar.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Now, sir, you can see that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition has infused into his followers the contempt that he has shown himself towards the fishermen of the country. Has it come to this, then, that a man with fishermen's blood in his veins is to be debarred from taking his place under the British flag until he expiates his calling ? The right hon. the Leader of the Opposition granted money two years for a Model Farm. Let me read you a very high authority, the late Bishop of Harbor Grace, Dr MacDonald,, and hear what he says. He, with others, was appointed by the Government in 1899 to enquire into agricultural industries, and this is what he has to say :

"The head of the Ministry or Bureau should be a member of the Executive Government and responsible to Parliament. Besides the Minister, or chief of the Department, there should be five or more members chosen for their acquaintance with the needs of agriculture in the Colony. These with their chief would constitute the Central Bureau of Agriculture. The money appropriations voted from time to time by the Legislature should be under the control of the Central Bureau."

We have followed that recommendation exactly. Again, "the agricultural areas of the Colony should be divided into agricultural districts. Each of the said district should have its local board, consisting of nine or more members. The Central Bureau should delegate to the district boards a large share of the administrative work of agriculture." That is just what we have been doing. There are 75 agricultural societies now in the Island, each with its own local board, each doing its own local work. Again, as to Agricultural education : "Agriculture in Newfoundland is not, as yet, sufficiently advanced to warrant the Government in establishing special institutions of agricultural education, such as the Agricultural Colleges, Farming Schools, Model Farms, Experimental Stations of other countries. The probable results from like educational institutions in our Colony would not, in the opinion of your Commissioners, be at all commensurate with the expenditure of money which the establishment of them would necessitate. We recommend instead, that a medicum of agricultural instruction be imparted in our present schools and under our present educational system. This may be done at a small cost to the country." Well, that is what we have done, we have put back into the hands of the fishermen $7,000 of their own money. We have divided the country up into agricultural districts, and we have given the different societies supreme control

of any animals, or implements of agriculture that may be given them. We have given them No. 1 seed and No. 1 stock, and because we have done all this, we have been condemned. It is unfortunately too true, as said by a late member of this House, that if we do not come from the wigwam slopes of Nova Scotia, we are considered no good. Everything is condemned if it comes from ourselves. The Vice-President of the Exhibition said a few months ago that we are too prone to condemn what is produced in our own country, and to praise anything that comes in from another country under a large name. I hope that that idea will get out of the minds of the Opposition. What we want is an opportunity to educate the minds of the rising generation, and we are trying to do that. We are placing in the schools a primer, which will contain all that is necessary for the present, all information on how to grow cabbage, potatoes, etc., and also how to rear sheep, cattle, etc. Those will be placed in the schools, and will be prepared by some of our own people, with probable advice from abroad. We are not going to condemn our children to perpetual ignorance. Our policy is bound to educate and uplift them. I shall not detain this Committee any longer. I should like to go further in relation to the vote of $20,000 voted by the last Government for agriculture. I would like to know how far beyond that sum they went in contingencies. There were 36 students at a cost of $300 each. That would amount to $10,800. Then the farm itself cost $7,000, that was $17,000. Well there is not much left to pay imported teachers to come here and teach our young men. And for what ? To enable them to go to North-west of Canada.

MR. DWYER—My hon. friend has missed his vocation. He should have been a lawyer. He has an excellent voice. Now, with regard to that man. He did not come on my farm, and he was holding that cankerized potato very loosely. Then, my friend tells me, I ought to have explained the difference to him, and told him not to bring it about. I did not tell him. I mind my own business. The Minister said he did not know anything about it. Well, he knows just as much about this man as my hon. friend knows about agriculture, and that is very little. My hon. friend said I was against the fisherman farmer. I have many good friends among them.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I think it is the duty of every member of this House to express an opinion of the measure before the chair. It is one of the principal subjects that has come before this House this session, and one fraught with great benefits to this Colony. It is true that the Government may not have done all that was expected of them, but a good start has been made—a foretaste of what the Government intend to do. We have heard a good deal this evening about the fisherman-farmer. Now, sir, I can tell you what these men are able to do. I know of a settlement along the Southern Shore where twenty-five years ago there was but one horse and cart. To-day, sir, circumstances are very different there. In this same settlement there are to-day 90 horses and

carts. That means that during this time ninety families have turned their attention to the soil, and, through their farms, and by their industry, they have considerably increased their income and their comfort. Half their living to-day comes from their farms. And these are only fishermen-farmers! Now, we have been told here to-night that the Government's agricultural policy is all wrong, that we have not been going the right way about it. We have been told that we should have scientific men come here, start colleges, and teach our young men scientific farming. Well, if we adopted that policy, what guarantee have we that, after we have taught our young men, they will remain in the country. None, sir, none whatever. In my opinion, this is the one course we should not adopt. I believe that the new policy inaugurated by this Government is the right one—namely, to send competent men around the Island and instruct the fisherman-farmer how to plant his seeds and cultivate his crops; give him the best seeds and show him the most profitable way of growing them. That, in my opinion, is the way to go about it. What would be the good of the Model Farm to a man in Burgeo? What would he learn from it? Why, nothing at all. But by sending men to these places they would come in direct touch with the people, and are able to give them all the instruction necessary. Their work is not alone practical, but it is beneficial to the country. I believe that the work already done in this way will be returned a hundredfold to the country. I believe it, because I know it. I live among the people, and I know they appreciate the action of the Government in this direction. Our people are quick to grasp things, and they have the instructions given them, and already good results are apparent. From one barrel of seed potatoes, we have been told here to-day, the people used to get seven; now they get fourteen. If that is true, and I believe it is, what does it mean to the people? Does it not mean an increase in their income of 100 per cent., for what is true of potatoes is sure to be true of every other product of the soil. But it is the old story, when anyone tries to do anything for the people of this country, there is sure to be ridicule by the Opposition. Again, we are told that an agricu'tural foundation was laid by the late Government, and that we destroyed it. How was it laid? These are the facts. The late Government was in power for ten years, and the Model Farm was not thought of till 1908, a few months before they left office. That was the foundation. The Bill was brought before this House, and put into force to throw dust in the eyes of the people. It was done on the eve of an election. The farm cost $7,500, given as a sop to one of his followers. Then buildings were put up, which cost more money, and which were totally unfit for the work proposed to be done. Then a man was imported, and he was not a month in the Colony when it was found that he knew nothing about this work, and he was sent back to go to college again. That was the foundation that was laid. Then look at the money that was wasted on stock. Why, sir, it

was a perfect scandal. Take the case of the stallion Griffon. He was imported at a cost of $2,600. A few weeks later he was sold down at Pitts' for $75. And everything else was done in the same manner. And yet we are told that we have tumbled down their foundation of the agricultural policy. Why, during the term they were in power they never brought any measure before this House which was for the benefit of the people. They simply collected the revenue and spent it. The right hon. gentleman ran away before I could tell what I thought of him, but I say it now, that he is the greatest political hypocrite that ever had a seat in this House, and the greatest bloodsucker. I wish the gentlemen on the other side to take that home to him. And I am prepared to prove what I say. He tried a shabby trick here tonight. He tried to make the hon. member for Placentia sit down. For what ? He tried to make him sit down because he was paid for his services. What man in this House has been paid more than the right hon. member ? He has taken $100,000 out of the chests of the Colony, and then because a member is paid for work he has done, he has no right to speak here. What bunkum ! What bosh ! Why, sir, what did he do for the fishermen ? He talked about scientists ! What became of the scientist that he imported into the Colony to improve the fishery ? There is no man who knows better than the men on the other side of the House what fakes have taken place. They imported here two Scotchmen and eight old Scotch women to show them how to put up herring, and for that paid them fabulous sums and paid their passage out. Another man was employed to sit down all day and stick on lobster labels. That was his business, and for that the Colony paid his expenses, and on the eve of the election we settled the bill and sent him out of the Narrows. These, of course, were all right, but it is all wrong to employ Messrs. Downey, Devereux and Seymour to go around the country and instruct the fishermen in farming so that they can increase their stocks. We are told all this by the Leader of the Opposition, who did not turn up in the House for the last two years except to draw his salary. He stated during the election that if the people did not return him to power he would retire from public life. This is the man who takes up the time of theHouse in the hope of misinterpreting the actions of the Government. The agricultural policy of the past, indeed ! The agricultural policy of the last Government consisted in getting agricultural supplies for the members of the Government benches and distributing them amongst their constituents. That is how it was done. That is not the policy of the present Government. We are doing what we can for every man in the Island. We are trying to do something for the fishermen all over the Island, which ought to have been done years ago. I believe that the policy of the present Government, if properly carried out, as it is being carried out to-day, will reap untold wealth to the Colony—wealth, the amount of which no one can say at the present moment. If the fishermen are able to raise

their own vegetables, a great thing will be accomplished. And they are able to do that. They can raise all the vegetables for their own consumption. We were told by experts who were here last year that our soil for that purpose was as good as any in Canada. These experts who came here are known all over the world. If that be correct there is no reason why the fisherman-farmer cannot improve his position. Those fishermen-farmers will never be farmers like my friend, Mr. Dwyer, opposite. But the object of the Government is to encourage them to keep and work small farms, and with that intention the Government is distributing good seed, so that they can get twenty barrels to the barrel, instead of five or seven, as heretofore. That is the intention of the Government, and they are determined that it will succeed.

MR. ROBERTS—Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention at this late hour to occupy many minutes of the time of this Committee. I see nothing new in the agricultural policy of the Government that we have heard so much about. It reminds me of a story of Johnny and his stepmother. A man had occasion to marry again who brought home his wife to introduce her to his six-year-old boy. He introduced her as his new wife and his new mother. Johnny looked her up and down, and then turned to his father and said: "She's not new, she's about fifty years old, they have been swindling you." I regard in the same way the so-called new agricultural policy of the Government. Now, this policy is to give out seeds, etc., to the fishermen, so that instead of getting seven barrels to the barrel, something like fifteen or twenty may be got. I can go back twenty years ago and tell you of one barrel of potatoes getting forty-two barrels. And if the same thing could be done then it can be done to-day, having regard to certain conditions and circumstances in respect of seed and the way it is set and attended to. No one has said what kind of seed this is going to be, whether it is going to be round or cut, whether a barrel of seed is to make two or four barrels per barrel, but just a barrel of seed, without any qualification whatever. In respect to the giving away of seed, stock, potatoes, etc., there is nothing new in that. That has been done before, for years. What is the difference? Before, these things were sent direct to the various districts. Now men are paid and an agricultural board is appointed to go to the districts and see to the distribution. It is the same thing that has been done before, only in a different way. Now, in respect to the fisherman-farmer; the fisherman may be able to supply himself with vegetables, but it is impossible to carry on the fishery and farm at the same time. I think that this money might be spent in another way that, to my mind, would give far better results than those expected from the proposition of the Government. I went through the country the other day with a stranger to this country, and his impressions were that it would mean a great deal more if Newfoundlanders could be induced to open up the interior for farming. We are too much on the sea, and we want to open up more inland and farm there. Why, what is

the cause of the success of Canada ? Farming ! At present the fishermen cannot do more than till the little land they have, and if the Government created an interest from the shore more farming would be done. In respect to the three gentlemen to whom reference has been made during the evening, I object to their appointment on this ground: Of what I say I am positively sure, because it has come under my notice. These men are paid to instruct the fishermen around the country. The people do not believe in them, because they look upon them as paid for the job. They say : "These men are paid to take an interest in farms." And they consequently look upon them with suspicion. Now, that is so, because I have seen it. I do not intend to speak at any great length on this subject. It would not be healthy for myself at this late hour, and it would not be healthy for the Committee. For these reasons and on these grounds I would like the Government to show us some more practical scheme likely to mature in a few years. As far as this one is concerned, I feel sure that, if continued, in years to come, we shall be no more advanced than we are to-day.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman, from the Committee, reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and passed the Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a bill to give effect thereto.

On the motion for the adoption of the said report, the Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond moved, seconded by Mr. Kent, that the report of the Committee be amended, by the insertion in the proposed bill of the following, to stand as section 2 :

2. "Section 3 of an Act for the "encouragement of agriculture, "1910, of 10 Edward VII,Cap. 18, "is hereby repealed, and hence-"forth Cap. 4 of Consolidated "Statutes (second series), shall "apply to any persons who may "be appointed members of the "said Boards, including persons "heretofore appointed, or who "now are members of the said "Board."

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared for the amendment : Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond, Messrs. Clift, Clapp, Gear, Dwyer, Earle, Kent and Roberts (8), and against it : Hons. Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, Hon. Mr. Crosbie, Minister Public Works, Minister Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Devereux , Goodison, Kennedy, Moore, Murphy, Parsons, Seymour, Whiteway, and Winsor (16). So it passed in the negative.

The original motion for the adoption of the report of the Committee was then put, when there appeared for it : Hons. Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, Hon. Mr. Crosbie, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Devereux, Goodison, Kennedy, Moore, Murphy, Parsons, Seymour, Whiteway, and Winsor (16), and against it : Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond, Messrs. Clift, Clapp, Gear, Dwyer, Earle, Kent, and Roberts (8).

So it passed in the affirmative ; and ordered accordingly.

Whereupon the bill entitled, "An Act to amend the Act for the Encouragement of Agriculture" was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Resolution already adopted by the Commitee of the Whole on Supply, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, leave was granted for the introduction of a bill entitled "An Act respecting certain Retiring Allowances," and it was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

Mr. Clapp gave notice of question.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice of motion.

It was moved and seconded that when this House rise it adjourn until to-day, Thursday, March 9th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, March 9.

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

MR. GOODISON—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Victoria, asking for a sum of money to construct a Post Office in that town. The petitioners state that the office at present is not large enough for the requirements of the place, and request a sum of money to construct a suitable building there. I ask that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates. I have another petition from Victoria, asking for $150 for a road to an agricultural settlement opened up there. The petitioners claim that it is a very valuable piece of land, but at present to get to it the people have to pass through a large bog, and they ask for this sum to open up a road. I have much pleasure in supporting both of these petitions.

MR . CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from W. J. Scott and others of Twillingate, asking that $100 be expended on the road leading from Lobster Harbor and Boys' Cove. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. MURPHY—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Richard Conway and others of Colliers, asking for the sum of $200 to erect a public wharf at James' Cove, South of Colliers. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Channel, on the subject of trawls. The petitioners ask that they may be permitted to use trawls on that part of the coast, and I trust that the Government will be able to grant the prayer of the petition, which I have much pleasure in supporting.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Southern Bay, asking for the sum of $40 to construct a road to the school house there ; also a petition from the people of Bonavista, asking for the sum of $200 for a road to a piece of agricultural land. I have much plea-

sure in giving them both my hearty support.

MR. EARLE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Southern Bight asking for a sum of money for a road between Bonavista Bay and Seldom Come By. Also a petition from Joe Batt's Arm, asking for a sum of money—$400—to construct a road to a well. You may remember that a few years ago the attention of this House was drawn to this matter, and that the people there were drinking impure water. They could not get the good article without going a considerable distance, and they now want to make a road to this well. I also beg leave to present a petition from the people of Fogo, asking for a small sum of money to repair a road. I have much pleasure in supporting these petitions.

Ordered : that these petitions be received and referred to the departments to which they relate.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into Committe of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act Further to Amend 'The Crown Lands Act, 1903.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

SIR R. BOND—Mr. Chairman, I was not present on Monday last, or rather Tuesday, when this Bill was under discussion, and I am, therefore, entirely uninformed as to the lines upon which the debate proceeded. I do not know what objections were raised to the Bill by my colleagues, and what defence, if any, was put forward by the Government. So that it is just possible that in the course of dealing with the bill I may traverse the ground already covered by my political colleagues. This is a most important Bill, in some respects the most important that has ever come before the Legislature, as I shall presently demonstrate ; but I must record my objection to it, first, because it places too much power in the hands of the Executive Government, and, second, because it facilitates the acquisition and holding of our forest areas by speculators and monopolistic combinations.

Section 2 of this Bill amends section 25 of the Crown Lands Act, 1903, by doing away with the distinction between timber and pulp licenses ; by reducing the expenditure of the licensee upon the area leased ; and by giving absolute power to the Executive Government to determine how long a licensee may hold a lease without erecting a mill or pulp factory thereon. I do not see any great objection to doing away with the distinction between timber and pulp licenses, but I entertain a strong objection to reducing the expenditure of the lessee upon the areas leased. Under the 25th section of the Crown Land's Act, 1903, which is repealed by the section under review, the lessee had "to erect a mill or mills in connection with such license with a capacity to cut at the rate of a thousand feet board measure in 24 hours for every five square miles of limits comprised in the license." Under the law now proposed, he will only have to carry out the obligation as to mill and cut in respect to double the former area. To put it another way. Under the

law as it now stands the holder of a license to cut over 500 square miles of territory would have to erect a mill or mills capable of turning out one hundred thousand feet of lumber in 24 hours, while under the proposed amendment he would only have to erect a mill or mills capable of cutting one half that quantity. What necessity is there for the proposed change? By making it you reduce the expenditure of the lessee on account of plant, and you reduce labor to the people of this country. You facilitate the acquisition of large areas and at the same time reduce the revenue to be obtained from such areas. The greater the cut, the more labor; and the greater the labor and cut, the more revenue. Are we in a position at this time to cut off any source of revenue or of labor? I think not. Again, this clause facilitates the acquisition of large holdings without any condition attaching as to the erection of mills or cut of lumber. For instance ,a man by himself or the agency of others may obtain any number of areas of nine miles in extent, and under this new clause or amendment he could hold them without erecting a mill or sawing a stick. True, under the old law there was a defect in this respect, but you are now doubling the evil by enlarging the prescribed area from five to ten square miles. The defect should be remedied, not increased. The most serious objection to this amending clause, however, is that it does away with the time limit for erecting mills or pulp factories, and places an uncontrolled power in the Executive Government to say whether they shall be erected within two years or ten years. We can imagine without any great flight of thought or stretch of imagination a corrupt ministry in power, a ministry the majority of whom are interested in the acquisition and holding of large forest areas for speculative purposes. Such a ministry under this amendment might hold, for purposes of speculation, vast timber areas for an indefinite period without erecting a saw mill or a pulp factory upon such areas. On the other hand, if they did not acquire the land themselves, they could extend the favors to their friends and supporters. It will be perceived then what wrong, what injustice, what fraud may spring up under this proposed amendment. We are supposed to be to safeguard public interests, and not to remove safeguards that exist. The law as it stands is a safeguard against the fraud to which I have alluded; this amendment is a removal of that safeguard, and should not be approved by this House. Again, section 3 of this Bill repeals section 31 of the Crown Lands' Act of 1903, and therefore still further facilitates the holding of timber areas by speculators. The Act of 1903 provided that an applicant for a timber license "shall at his own expense cause the limit mentioned in his application to be surveyed by a surveyor and the boundary lines of said limit to be cut a width of three feet." The object of this provision was to prevent the overlapping of areas, to guard against the robbing of the public domain by the lessee or his employees and to test the bona fides of the applicant, for no man would go to the enormous expense of cutting a line three

feet wide around hundreds of miles, it may be, of forest area unless he meant to establish a business on that area. A mere land speculator would not do so, and to this extent it was a safeguard to public interests. The proposed amendment does away with the cutting of boundary lines, and substitutes the blazing or chipping with an axe, of the trees in a given direction. This, of course, reduces the survey to a farce, for any man with an atom of sense must know that it is absolutely impossible to survey through a dense forest without cutting a chain line. It does away with the large expenditure that the cutting of a chain line three feet wide would entail. It thereby enormously facilitates the speculators in acquiring and holding timber areas, while, on the other hand it necessarily must lead to the overlapping of claims and the involving of the Crown Lands' Department in possible litigation and certain confusion. Again, the 3rd section still further facilitates speculators in holding large timber areas. Under the Act of 1903, the Governor in Council, for good and sufficient reason, might extend the time for making the survey for "one year but no longer," on payment of the rent for one year then past, and an extra bonus and renta' of two dollars per square mile. This, then, permitted an applicant to hold a timber area for two years and no longer by a payment of six dollars per square mile to the Crown. This Bill before us proposes that an applicant may hold a timber area without a survey being made for three years by a payment of four dollars per square mile. This is clearly in the interest of the speculator and at a loss to the revenue. And, again, the Bill before us provides in section 4 that parties who obtained licenses for timber areas under the Act of 1903, may exchange them for licenses under the Bill before us and thus get rid of the obligations imposed by the Act under which they obtained their first title. The object of this measure is so apparent that I am amazed that it was ever brought forward. It is an Act purely and simply in the interest of speculators and timber grabbers who hold in their possession to-day the whole of the timber areas of Newfoundland, and of the Labrador as well. Through the web and woof of our legislation let us run the golden thread of justice. I can perceive nothing but injustice and iniquity running through this Bill. If it becomes law it will work an injustice upon the people of this country, by locking up public lands in the hands of speculators ; by depriving this country of the revenue that should flow from those lands ; by fostering and aiding monopolistic combination which have proved the curse of every land where they have held sway. If it becomes law it will be iniquitous because it will have become such by the vote of those members of this House who have a personal interest in the timber areas held under license, and therefore, a personal interest in this legislation. Since the present Government came into power they have approved applications for immense areas of public, so called, timber lands. Since January 1st, 1910, they have approved applications for fifty million acres, or

seventy-eight thousand one hundred and twenty-five square miles of timber areas. The fees that were payable upon that vast area under the Act of 1903 amounted to three hundred and twelve thousand five hundred dollars, but, I observe from the statements tabled by the Department of Agriculture, that only fifty nine thousand two hundred and sixty-four dollars have been paid by the applicants, leaving a balance due to the Crown of two hundred and sixty-three thousand two hundred and thirty-six dollars. Unless this Bill becomes law, fifty million acres of land now held by speculators and land grabbers must revert to the Crown, because of non-compliance with the law under which the applications were approved. Let this Bill become law and those fifty million acres may remain locked up in the hands of the speculators and land grabbers for the next three years. There cannot be a shadow of a doubt in the mind of any observant man but that those applications were made looking to free export of pulpwood to the United States. In the year 1908 the "American Newspaper Publishers' Associations" made an appeal to the United States Government for reciprocity with Canada, based upon free export of pulp wood from Canada to the United States. Here is an extract from the "brief" that was presented :

"A reciprocal arrangement with Canada for free paper and free 'pulp' is advisable to insure the continuance of the present supply of free logs from Canada. The threatened retaliatory export duty upon logs to be imposed by Canada would ultimately fall upon the newspaper consumer. The present consumption of pulp wood by the United States, including manilla, book, and writing is stated upon authority of the Paper Maker, a trade journal, of 2,000,000 cords per annum, which consumption requires the entire stripping of pulp timber on 625 square miles per annum. Our spruce wood supply is limited. We therefore urge that the commission should take advantage of the present opportunity and immediately secure a sufficient supply of spruce freed from tariff complications. The trust . . . . has increased its timber holdings . . . . and that ownership is more than sufficient to give it a wood supply for a long period of years on the trust which can be utilized to operate large plants in competition with the trusts, so that all that might be done in the United States towards the enlistment of capital, the development of new enterprises, or the conversion of manilla mills to news production would be inconsiderable in comparison with the wiping out of the duty on paper and the opening of Canada to our relief."

The publicity given to this demand and the favorable manner in which it was received, opened the eyes of speculators and land grabbers to the resources of Newfoundland and Labrador, and during the past two years we have witnessed a mad rush to the Crown Lands' Department for timber areas. Men who did not wish their names to appear, put forward their applications thro others, and in the Royal Gazette we have seen postal clerks, office keepers, and other public officials ; impecunious loafers and keen witted lawyers vieing with

one another in the scramble for timber areas. The appeal of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association to the Government of the United States was successful and reciprocity with Canada, based upon a free export of pulp wood, is an accomplished fact. So far it has not matured as regards this country, but the public have been told that the question is still open ; in the meantime these speculators and land grabbers want to hold on to their areas at the least possible expense. This Bill, if it becomes law, will make them do so. There is a moral as well as a financial consideration attached to this matter. The holders of these so-called timber areas we know, for the greater number have no knowledge of the character of the land they hold. It is almost certain that a vast quantity of the area is as barren as the summit of Mount Blanc. Yet the fact that it is leased by the Government as timber land gives it a certain value on the market and helps the speculator in preying upon the credulity of others. Has not the Government a duty to perform in the premises ? I certainly think so. Quite recently an almost similar condition of things was proceeding in connection with public lands in Australia, and the Prime Minister of New South Wales conceived it to be his duty to warn the British public through the press. Now, what do we find as respects this Colony and the English press ? Let me read you a few extracts from the Standard of Empire to show you how the British public are being fooled in the matter of these lands. The Standard of Empire is very properly subsidized by the Colony in order to advertise its public lands and other natural resources, and people naturally turn to it for reliable information. This paper has been availed of to circulate the most misleading and false statements respecting timber areas and their transfer. During the past two years a persistent attempt has been made to direct attention to these lands that are held by speculators Week after week cable despatches have been transmitted, such as the following, to the Standard of Empire, London :

December 1st, 1909.

Only last week news came about the completion of the great pulp deal on Gander River North. On Saturday a still larger deal was completed, and the purchase money paid to the original grantees by Mr. W. S. Kimber and associates of New York. The property consists of 305 square miles of good timber country along Fishel's, Crabbe's and Robinson's Rivers on the West Coast. The motive power will be obtained from Robinson's River. The company has a capital of $4,500,000. Sir Edward Morris's Government has been very liberal to the company.

January 5, 1910.

Nearly every available timber tract here has now been taken up by the great pulp and paper making concerns in addition to an area of 25,000 square miles in Labrador.

The great Hearst deal is now practiclly settled. It covers an immense extent of fine woodland and has the advantage over all the northern pulp and paper factories of an ice-free port whence the paper can be shipped every

day all the year round to New York. It was found by experience that our spruce wood makes excellent tough paper. There are several more pulp and paper deals now in course of negotiation, mostly with United States' capitalists.

January 19, 1910.

The amount of fees received by this branch of the Government for licenses to search for minerals and grants for timber areas for the manufacture of pulp and paper is by far the largest ever received. For the full year from July 1, 1908, to June 30, 1909, the amount received for licenses, etc., was $53,000. In the last six months, from July 1 to December 31, 1909, $87,000 has been already taken.

2,000 Miles of Pulp Areas.

In this department there has been an immense increase of business. The permanent head of the department informed me that there was a dozen grants of pulp areas at Labrador, and they averaged each about two thousand square miles. There was not in Newfoundland, he declared, more than one or two hundred square miles of woodland not taken up for areas.

March 16, 1910.

Another important pulp deal has been negotiated this week, a pulp timber area covering upwards of one thousand square miles having been sold to a United States Syndicate.

The situation is in Bay d'Espoir district, and the transfer includes a splendid ice-free shipping port.

The same syndicate is negotiating an extensive timber deal in the Straits of Belle Isle, Labrador. Sir Ed. Morris's Government would gladly have sold these and other valuable pulp areas to British syndicates, but while British syndicates are hesitating, the business men of the United States are seizing all the best sites and paying promptly for them.

April 27, 1910.

The Government has concluded a very important pulp deal, by which an area of 8,260,000 acres of timber in the Hamilton Inlet district of Labrador will be leased to a company possessing a capital of $25,000,000 (£5,136,986), at a rental of $50,000 (£10,273) per annum.

Another pulp deal of an extensive character is now engaging the attention of the Government, and is likely to be put through in the course of a few days. The area concerned is about 7,000 square miles, and the rental offered is in the neighborhood of $30,000 (£6,164). Other enquiries are also under consideration, two of them being English capitalists.

May 11, 1910.

Another pulp and paper company in the United States, with a capital of $25,000,000, has been formed to work an extensive timber area.

The opportunities thus snapped up by United States financiers were offered first to British capitalists.

May 12, 1910.

With regard to the big pulp deal at Labrador, the company is registered as the Anglo-American Development Company. Its capital is $25,000,000, and it is composed of a group of financiers and paper manufacturers. The whole area taken is twelve thousand five hundred square miles ; explorers declare that it is one of

the finest timber limits in these latitudes, and the work will be started at the opening of navigation next month.

Nothing shows more clearly and distinctly the recent progress of Newfoundland than the contrast between the revenue of the Department of Agriculture and Mines for 1908-9 and the present year's collection. In 1908-9 the whole revenue for mineral and timber grants was $54,000. The present year it will be $250,000. The Anglo-American Company paid nearly as much in one cheque as the whole amount received in 1908-9. There is still an immense area of undeveloped timber lands on Labrador and Newfoundland. The largest owners of all are the Reids.

February 22, 1910.

The figures for the fiscal year in our Colony show great and steady prosperity and advancement. The following are the figures given me to-day by the Minister of Finance and Customs: Estimated Customs revenue for fiscal year, $330,000 over 1909. Crown Lands revenue, $200,000 over 1909. Every other source of revenue shows an increase also. Revenue estimates of probable surplus indicate this is certain to reach $450,000, possibly half a million.

The greatest increase of all is in the Lands Department. Last year it was $54,000. This year it has come up to $251,000, and I am informed by the head of this department that there are over one hundred applicants for pulp areas in Newfoundland and Labrador, covering 30,000 square miles.

May 20, 1910.

The great Labrador pulp deal will involve the erection of three mills. A sum of $54,600 will be paid to the Government as rent for the first two years, and subsequently $27,300. There are quite a number of other deals being negotiated, which will give immense employment. Labrador is a very large country, and the supply of timber is like the iron ore at Bell Island—simply inexhaustible. In the near future the Government will have a revenue from pulp and the iron mines of $200,000 a year.

June 13, 1910.

There is continued activity in the mineral areas, and several large pulp deals are in progress of negotiation.

June 24, 1910.

In consequence of this regulation, United States pulp and paper companies are now erecting great pulp and paper works, both in Newfoundland and Labrador, as well as in Canada.

One of these, at Hamilton Inlet, Labrador, and two other localities, has a paid up capital of $25,000,000. They have already commenced operations. Their grant covers 13,000 square miles of splendid forests. The several other new pulp projects within our Colony are controlled by English and United States capitalists.

The head of the department, Mr. Taylor, tells me that there are over one hundred applicants for pulp areas besides those I have mentioned. There is a large grant at Sandwich Bay, Labrador, to an English capitalist, Mr. Phillips.

November 9, 1910.

Another large pulp factory is being erected at St. George's Bay for United States capitalists. It will begin operations with an output of 200 tons per day, which will gradually be materially increased.

January 18, 1910.

An important pulp deal is announced. A tract of timber land at Hamilton Inlet, on the Labrador Coast, nearly 10,000 square miles in extent, has been sold to an English capitalist.

February 3, 1911.

It is reported that a very big pulp and timber deal has been concluded with British capita'ists. It embraces 3,700 square miles of fine timber country on Hamilton Inlet, Labrador. The lessees paid a Government rental of $38,-400, and have now sold it to an English syndicate at a big profit. It is gratifying to see that English capitalists are waking up to the importance of Newfoundland and Labrador as a field for enterprise in this direction.

June 29, 1911.

Owing to the progressive policy of Sir E. P. Morris' administration with regard to pulp and mineral ares, the revenue from Crown Lands alone for the year ending to-morrow is five times greater than it was in 1909, the revised figures showing a total of upwards of $250,000 (£51,368).

(Standard of Empire Correspondent).

One of the causes which have contributed to the present attitude of the United States in seeking a reciprocal treaty with Canada and Newfoundland is the great demand for pulp wood in the States. Several great paper makers have purchased extensive wood areas, and are building mills in Canada. One of the very largest concerns has just sent down its steamer from here to Hamilton Inlet, Labrador. It is understood that they will build three mills on their big grant of thirteen thousand eight hundred square miles of densely wooded timber areas.

Then I would direct your attention to the following extract from a specially prepared article, evidently written on behalf of land speculators in this city. It was published in the Standard of Empire under date of January 3, 1910, by "A special correspondent."

This is the extract I refer to—

"In order to offer every possible encouragement to the outside capitalist, the Government of the country offers most generous terms for the leasing of their timber lands. The price, as compared with the timber areas of Canada and the United States on the one hand, or Scandinavia on the other, is ridiculously low.

"All persons desirous of acquiring from the Crown timber areas in the country must approach in the first place the office of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I visited this department, where I was shown a map of the country, from which it appears that every available square inch of timber land in the country has been disposed of by the Government to different individuals. It would seem from this, therefore, in so far as timber for either the lumber or pulp industry is concerned, there is no opening to the British capitalist, at least it would appear there is no opening for the British capitalist if he wants to get it on the "ground floor"

terms, and become one of the pioneers of this country's future development.

But this is not so, for the reason that though every square inch of the available timber lands of the country has been disposed of by the Government, the bulk of it has been granted to those shrewd inhabitants of the Colony who, foreseeing the inevitable boom in the timber lands of the country, have acquired the areas from a speculative point of view, and hundreds of square miles can be acquired from the natives at a very small margin of profit over and above the nominal sums which they paid to the Government in recognition of the concessions issued to them.

Many of these properties, of course, have already been disposed of, and others are now under option or negotiation.

United States capitalists are unfortunately the largest buyers of timber lands, and already control extensive areas of the finest timber in the Colony ; but from enquiries which I have made it appears there are at present about 600 square miles of timber land now open for sale by private owners. Practically the whole of this is well watered and admirably situated for the establishment of lumber and pulp mills. The majority of it has been granted (and so can be purchase) in blocks of from 200 to 600 square miles. The price at which these areas can be acquired to-day varies, according to location, from anything between one dollar and five dollars per acre. The majority of these forest lands are estimated to yield between ten and twenty cords of pulp wood to the acre. A cord and a half of wood will make a ton of paper, so that on the basis of twenty cords we have a yield of fifteen tons to the acre, or, in other words, at a dollar per acre, it will work out about 3d. per ton of paper.

At a conference early this spring at St. John's the Prime Minister said that assuming the value of the timber land of the Colony to be $45,000 per square mile the valuation of this wooded territory would be in potential labor alone $630,000,000.

The man who can go there now and put down his gold can acquire timber areas which within the next few years will yield to him many hundred per cent. profit, whilst in the meantime his investment costs nothing to keep and is as safe and sure as the finest of city freeholds."

In these extracts we have a persistent effort to inveigle the British public into this timber lands scheme. Is this a scheme to which the Government and the Legislature of this Colony should lend themselves. If we adopt this Bill we most certainly do lend ourselves to it. There will be a rude awakening for this country if British investors discover that they have been cruelly deceived and deliberately defrauded. The fair name of the Colony is at stake. The future credit of the Colony is endangered by this land scheme, and we as public trustees should look to it. I lay it down as a sound principle that before the Government seeks to make any alteration in the Crown Lands Act, 1903, they should by the enforcement of that Act get back these fifty million acres of land with which I have been dealing into

the public domain. If the Bill does not become law these fifty million acres must revert to the Crown because of non-compliance with the law under which the applications were approved. But, sir, let this Bill become law and that vast area may remain locked up in the hands of speculators and land grabbers for the next three years. When those lands have reverted to the Crown, steps should immediately be taken to have them examined, reported upon, and such as may properly be described as forest areas plotted and laid off on a plan. If the Government then determined to sell or lease, the purchaser or lessee would know what he was paying for. This is precisely what all other Governments have done. Then again every civilized country in the world, with the exception of China and Turkey, is conserving its forest areas, recognizing that, at the present rate of consumption, in thirty years from now, there must ensue a timber famine, unless reforestation and conservation takes place. We are giving out our forest lands to anyone who applies for them for the sake of a few immediate dollars return in rental and bonus, and we are permitting indiscriminate cutting, without any return, in all directions. Perhaps I shall be asked, are we to obtain no revenue from these lands? Perhaps it may be contended that, owing to national obstacles, pulp mills cannot be advantageously operated on the Labrador. My answer is that the Government should hold the balance of our timber areas here and on the Labrador as feeders for pulp mills erected and to be erected in Newfoundland. If the climate of the Labrador is adverse to the successful operation of mills down there, then the pulp wood may as easily be transferred to this country for the building up of a great pulp and paper industry, as it can be to any other country, and from this extern supply the Colony can swell its revenue, and enormously increase the demand for labor. Nothing would compensate us for the loss the Colony would sustain by the export of its pulp wood to foreign countries. Entertaining the views I have expressed in relation to this matter, I cannot do other than vote against this bill.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I am certainly not in accord with what has fallen from the lips of the Leader of the Opposition. The changes that we have proposed are absolutely necessary, and if I am not mistaken some time since, when the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition was occupying the Premiership, he contemplated bringing in some of the amendments that we have now brought in.

SIR R. BOND—I never heard of such a thing. They were never contemplated by my Government, and, if contemplated, it must have been by some individual member. If such a proposal were brought in, it would get the hoist in a very few moments.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Well, Mr. Chairman, in looking through the records I think you will find that in 1903 an extension of time for survey of lands was granted to Messrs. Duder and Tait, and in referring to it, the Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond stated that although the

extension was illegally granted, he was contemplating an amendment so that the Governor in Council would have the power to grant such an extension. When we assumed power, it was difficult for anyone to obtain timber or pulp lands in Newfoundland, because they were nearly all given away,and the only place where applications might be made was on the Labrador ; and when licenses were granted for areas on Labrador, it was seen that, on account of the short season, the surveys could not be made within the time permitted by law. The first section to which the right hon. gentleman referred was section 2, which does away with the distinction between pulp licenses and timber licenses. Pulp licenses for as high as 150 square miles were granted by the previous administration, but I do not know of a license being granted for a single pulp area since we came in. The Government has been very watchful and mindful of the sections of the Act, and I cannot at present think of one instance where the Act has not been rigorously enforced. It has been stated outside the House that the present administration were showing partizanship in the granting of lands. That is absolutely false and incorrect. I make the assertion in justice to the office of which I have the honor to be the head. Other false reports have been circulated, but the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, from the facts and figures he has in his possession, knows that my statement is critically correct. When an application came before the Governor in Council, it was either approved or disapproved, and it was then sent to my department. If approved, thirty days were given for the payment of fees, and if these fees were not paid within the time, the license was immediately cancelled, and the notice of cancellation was sent to the party. This has been the means of doubling and trebling the revenue of the department. Further, I want to state that the Department of Agriculture knows no such thing as party. It is not a question of granting areas to political supporters, as has been done by past Governments, but it is a question of a straight deal and giving everyone the benefits of the Act. The hon. gentleman says that we are making this law because we are personally interested. I do not know whether my interpretation is correct or not. It was at least an insinuation that some members of this House are personally interested.

SIR R. BOND—Not an insinuation, a broad statement.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I can assure him and the public that I know nothing of any member being in any way interested in any part of the Crown Lands Department. There is no one can say that I am interested, either myself individually, or through any other agency. The Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, from the position he occupies, should be very careful in the statements he makes. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has referred to the amount of leases granted by the present Government. It is not unlikely that even in his time the same leases changed hands a dozen times over. The only difference was that then the rents

were never paid. They never collected them. We have done so. So far as the British capitalist is concerned, I do not see what difference it makes to this Colony. If any British capitalist comes here the law leaves it open to him as to any other man who is in a position to make an ordinary application. Then it is up to him to look over his lands and see that his title is good. If he does that, he will know whether there is timber on the land or not. The duty of the department is to see that the rents are paid, and not to make surveys for investors. They must do it themselves. If any man chooses to invest his money in properties that he has not seen and that have not been cruised, that is his own lookout, and it is not the department's business to interfere. Now, Mr. Chairman, in connection with another point raised by Sir R. Bond, viz., where the law asks for a survey line to be made round the property three feet wide. He may be right that this should be done, but from what I can find out from those who have been in the Department for a number of years, this way of marking out in practice is impossible. It cannot be usually done in the time, and it is very expensive. And experienced surveyors state that the blazed line is just as good as the three foot cleared line.

SIR R. BOND—How can a man see through a forest ? It is absurd and impossible.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—The right hon. member knows that in Canada and United States they use the blazed line and find it satisfactory. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendments we are bringing in will have a beneficial effect, and will be of great assistance to the Department. I think that if we continue to act as we have acted in the past, and give each party the whole right that the law gives without drawing any distinction, then we shall be doing the right thing by the people. There is no object in holding up any license. The sooner the application goes forward and is approved and returned the better. We are carrying out the provisions of the Act, and acting under its authority.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the able speech of the Leader of the Opposition, and I do not intend now to follow up his general observations as regards the policy of the Government and the effect which he expects this Act to have on the future of this Government or any Government which may succeed it. I simply intend to go over the Act, and explain to the Committee as clearly and concisely as I can the changes in the law which are proposed to be made. The observations made by the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition deal with three sections of the Act. He has not touched the rest of the Act, and from this I presume that the other sections are satisfactory. I think the best course to take will be to explain these other sections first, and then go back to the three sections to which he has taken exception. I hope to be able to show him and the Committee that the amendments suggested here do not increase the power which under the Crown Lands Act, 1903, was vest-

ed in the Governor in Council, and do not in any way increase the opportunities of monopolistic speculators to acquire timber property in this country. If the members of the Commitee will turn to section 1 of the Bill they will see that it deals with licenses of occupation. For a number of years past it has been the law in this country that any person desiring to get a grant of a considerable area of land for agricultural purposes could do so by application to the Crown Lands Department. A lease would be issued to him of the areas desired, subject to certain restrictions set forth in the Crown Lands Act. It has been found in the working of the Department that of recent years applications have come in for licenses of occupation on areas which contain good timber, and so far as the Department could learn, the applicants were taking up the property rather with a view to stripping the timber than to carrying out the conditions put in the lease by the Crown Lands Act. The law was such that the applicant could go to the Department, put in his application for a large area of land, perhaps a hundred acres, or half a mile square. He got his lease and started in and practically stripped that land of its timber, and then handed it back to the Crown denuded of all its valuable growth. The Government concluded that it was proper to safeguard the pub'ic by compelling the applicant for an area of that kind for agricultural purposes to hold the land bona fide for that purpose. It is proposed to put in every license of occupation issued after the passing of this Bill, in addition to the conditions of the Crown Lands Act, a condition that it shall be unlawful for the licensee to cut and take away, or sell from the property any timber except in the course of clearing the land for cultivation or for his own actual use. Of such timber as is cut bona fide he may sell what he likes. But he must not strip the land and then let it go back to the Crown denuded of its most valuable asset. Sub-section (b) of section 2 simply provides for putting a condition on all licenses that the licensee shall preserve a growth of young timber. That will go to the same end, and there can be no objection to such a condition being put in the lease. The next subsection amends the law relating to the making of returns. Under the present law returns are supposed to be made quarterly. But it is found that they are not sent in ; and there is no penalty provided for this at present. This Bill proposes to amend that by providing a penalty of $50 if the returns are not sent in within 30 days after they are due.

Sub-section 5 deals with the question of the payment of rents, bonuses and royalties. Under the law as it now stands the applicant for a timber area as soon as the application is approved is liable to pay $2 bonus and $2 for the first year's rent within thirty days of the application. No change in that is intended. The new provision is with reference to the second year. It is to provide that if a man has his survey made within the year, and it is found when the area is surveyed that the amount actually granted is less than that for which he made his original application there sha'l be no doubt as to his

exact liability for rents. The doubt is resolved by making his rent payable on the amount actually shown by the survey. So, if you apply for a 100 miles and it turns out on survey to be 95 or 105 you have to pay the rents for the future on the actual area. There can be no objection to that. Section 5 of this Bill provides that all timber cut upon property held under license shall be scaled by an authorized scaler. The cut of the mills now required to pay stumpage to the Crown is scaled under the existing law by their own scalers. All we have to depend upon is the return made by the parties own scalers. But our position is that every scaler should be properly licensed and authorized, so that he may be an official to some extent under the control of the Department and may be responsible to someone for a correct account of the quantity of timber cut by the holder of the license. Section 6 provides that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines may authorize the scaler in the same way practically as surveyors of lumber are now appointed. Section 7 makes an amendment which I think will not occasion any objection. Under the Crown Lands Act, 1903, any person who made a discovery of minerals had a right to stake his discovery and without any further staking apply for as many more mineral locations round it as he pleased. The Department considered that that privilege was rather too large. They were desirous of protecting the rights of the bona fide discoverer but it was considered that to allow him to make up 10 locations would amply do this. Section 9 has been dropped out of the Act because it has been found that such a section is already in force at the present time. This section was originally passed in 1898, and was carried forward to the Crown Lands Act of 1903 (as Sec. 62). The Solicitor to the House was under the impression that the 1898 Act had been repealed by implication by the 1903 Crown Lands Act, and overlooked the fact that Section 62 of that Act was the section of 1898 carried forward. He proposed to put that section in here in order to resolve any doubt. Section 11 deals with the important subject of the acquiring of areas. This will occur more particularly in relation to the iron mines at Bell Island ; of course it also may arise in connection with other parts of the Island. At the present time the position is that the submarine areas around Bel. Island are held by owners different from those on the island and from each other. Unless persons owning leases under the sea are able to pass through other areas not owned by themselves, it is impossible for them to work their own. The principle has always been recognized that the owner of mineral property could expropriate any land necessary for workings or access in connection with the development of his property. This merely extends that principle to submarine areas. It has, however, been found necessary to put in some conditions here. There are provisions here that the parties claiming the arbitration against holders of other areas for the right to pass thro them shall be held as a security against any damage that may be done in carrying out the work permitted or authorized. We have

endeavored to provide for every point which might come up in such an arbitration. Section 15 simply deals with surveys and makes a small alteration in the practice, and requires that applicants for agricultural lands sha'l have them surveyed and a diagram fyled within six months from the date of notice from the Minister. In the past the practice has been for a man to make an application and have the land surveyed when he pleased. It is the desire of the Department to put this matter on a systematic basis, and they propose to do so by compelling the applicant to send in his survey six months after his application. Then there is a small amendment in the latter part of the section in relation to surveys of mining locations. It says, "In all such surveys of mining locations the bearings of the boundaries shall be from the true meridian." That has not always been the case. As far as possible the bearings have been from the true Meridian, but this is to compel the practice to be uniform. Section 16 deals with bog lands and gives power to the Governor in Council to make regulations as to the manner in which such lands leased under the Crown Lands Act, 1903, shall be worked, and to specify as to what depth the bog shall be taken. That I think is a simple and proper restriction. Going back to the sections which were referred to by the leader of the Opposition, I would call his attention to section 2 which was criticized by him at some length. The law as it stood before is found in section 25 of the Crown Lands Act, 1903, and , shortly, it was this, that a license to cut timber shall contain among others this condition, that a licensee shall erect a mill there of a capacity to cut at a rate of a thousand feet, board measure, in 24 hours for every five square mi'es. Now, in addition to that the Act contained, under sections 33, 34 and 35, the right to a person to obtain a lease of timber lands for the purpose of manufacturing pulp. In the case of the ordinary timber lands no limit was made as to the number of miles which might be granted. In the case of a pulp license it was provided that the area should not be less than five nor more than one hundred and fifty square miles. That Act was passed when it was supposed that a limit this size would be suffi cient, but as time went on this was found to be impracticable, and in 1906 an amendment was made partly to deal with this difficulty, and that was that a person holding a timber license under the Act of 1906, and one of the conditions would be that if a pulp factory costing $20,000 was erected within five years from the date of the license, then that would be satisfactory in lieu of the conditions with regard to the erection of a sawmill. A man held a timber license and he was compelled by law to put up a saw mill of a capacity of a thousand feet board measure per day, but the law gave him the privilege of changing that for another lease under which if he puts up a pulp mill within five years it would be a complete performance of his obligations under the law. Now it was found that the conditions of this section were absolutely impracticable and it was simply a dead letter upon the Statute Book. The section required that

the licensee should commence the erection of his mill within six months and should complete it within eighteen months of the approval of his application. When you take into consideration that 12 months is allowed for a survey, you can easily see that the time limit was not sufficient if the mill was to be of any size. A man could hardly make arrangements to come here and get everything ready and have his mill complete within 18 months, and the result was that the section became a dead letter upon the Statute Book, and if that condition had been enforced during the past 25 years it would have meant the forfeiture of nineteen-twentieths of the timber licenses issued in Newfoundland . Now the change which is proposed to be made is this, simply that instead of requiring a holder of a license to put up a mill with a capacity of 1000 feet board measure for every five square miles, he will be required to put up a mill of the same capacity for every ten square miles. Members of the Committee will notice that there is nothing in the Crown Lands Act compelling any man who puts up a mill to cut any quantity of timber. There may be years when it would not suit a man to operate at all. If we had a condition of that kind we might compel a man to run a mill for a whole year at a time when it would be absolutely unprofitable to take a stick. The purpose and intention of the Act is to compel a man to erect a mill, and then we may assume that having done so he would go on with the work to the best of his advantage. That change, Mr. Chairman, commends itself to the Department of Agriculture and Mines after their experience of the past 25 years. Now the other change with regard to the erection of a pulp mill is that it shall be left to the Governor in Council to prescribe the sum that shall be expended on the erection and equipment of these pulp factories and the period within which they shall be erected. That seems to me a very reasonable provision. If a man comes in and wishes to put up a factory which would manufacture forty tons of pulp per day, he should not require as long a time to erect his mill as a man putting up a factory which would manufacture 150 tons per day, and vice versa. Of course it is open to the observation of the right hon. gentleman that we may have a corrupt Council, and may have a man in it who will use the law to his own advantage, but that is one of the risks that the people of this country have to run. If they send honest men here they will do business honestly and vice versa, and it ought not to weigh with this Assembly in dealing with a question like this. I do not take it that the right hon. gentleman made any such imputation on the present Government. His point is that this section gives too much power to any Government. My answer to that is that it is a reasonable and proper power and one which will operate for the benefit of the public. Now the next section that the right hon. gentleman took exception to was section 3 which deals with surveys of timber properties, and on that point we have simply taken the opinion of expert officials of the Department and their experience of the

past twenty years in carrying out the Crown Lands Act. The law now requires that when a man makes a survey of a timber limit he shall cut a line three feet wide all round the timber limit. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition says that this is the only way to get a correct survey. And if you simply blaze the line right round you cannot get a correct survey. We have the opinion of the hon. gentleman on one side and that of expert officials on the other, and we have our own common sense to use as between the two opinions. The practice in Canada, where they have a well fitted Department of Agriculture and Mines, is simply to blaze the trees. That is, the surveyor starts from a corner post and as he goes along he blazes the trees on the side of the line which is most convenient, and when he gets a little further he blazes a tree on the other side, so that when a man wants to find out the position of his land he follows the blazed line till he comes to a corner post which is marked with the name or description of the particular section. We have been advised by the expert officials who have been carrying out the Act that the cutting of a three foot boundary is in the first place wasteful, in the second place is dangerous in that it is liable to fire, thirdly it is unnecessary and expensive, and fourthly, no matter if you send out a most careful surveyor the three foot line is not cut. The Government came to the conclusion that it would be well to amend the Act and instead of compelling an applicant to cut a three foot line, he simply has to blaze it in that way that I have described. The hon. gentleman made another objection in connection with the time to be allowed, and it seems to me he or he would not have come to or he could not have come to this conclusion. As I understand him he said that under the law as it stands at present, the Government collects $6 per mile from the applicant during the first two years, but under this law only $4 will be collected. I think he will see that this is not correct. The law at the present time is that a man makes an application ; it is approved and within thirty days he has to pay a bonus of $2 and the first year's rent of $2 ; that is $4, and at the end of 12 months he has to pay another $2, making $6. Exactly the same thing happens under the proposed amendment. It only deals with the question of extending the time for survey. Under the proposed law when an application is approved the applicant pays $4.00 and twelve months from that date he pays $2 more ; $6 per mile the Government gets under the Act of 1903 and under this Act. The difference is in the survey. Under the present law the applicant commences his lease thirty days after the approval, pays $4 bonus and rent and within one year he is required to survey it, but if the applicant can explain to the Governor in Council why he has not been able to make his survey, on the payment by him of another $2 per mile the Governor in Council may extend the time for a term not exceeding one year. Possibly this is the $2 the hon. gentleman was thinking about. The change proposed to be made is that if, for any substantial reason, the appli-

cant cannot make his survey during the first year he can come to the Government and get the time extended for the survey for any time not exceeding two years. The reason for putting that section there is for licenses on Labrador. Suppose an applicant comes in under the new law and gets his application approved on the first of May ; on the first of June he pays $4. Twelve months after he has to pay another $2, and if he has not surveyed by that time and comes and satisfies the Government that he has a good reason to ask for an extension he has to pay another $2, and the only difference is that when he comes and asks for that extension the Government can give two years instead of one years extension. It makes no difference in the amount payable to the Government. This suggested amendment came up on account of the difficulty of making surveys on Labrador. Applicants have been granted approvals for large areas of land on Labrador, and it has been impossible to get them surveyed. Even if we had the surveyors we know the difficulty of making the surveys in the summer on account of the flies. The only time in which surveys can be made is in September, for during the winter months it is very much more difficult to survey on Labrador than in Newfoundland, and for that reason it was considered fair that if the applicant could show good reason the Government should have the power of extending the time for surveys for two years. The only other objection was in relation to section 4, and that surely is clear enough. It simply follows the similar section in the Crown Lands Act, which says that any man who has had his title approved under the old law, his rights will continue. We give him the liberty of exchanging his license for one under the new law, if he sees fit, but if not he can go on and be subject to the conditions of the old law. That is fair and proper, and has never been departed from in this House. I therefore think, Mr. Chairman, that a good many of the observations of the Rt. hon. gentleman were very far afield, and went very far from the most important amendments in the bill under consideration.

Committee rose for recess.

Committee resumed at 8 p.m.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, before recess the Hon. Minister of Justice explained the object of the Bill which is now before the Committee. On a previous occasion I dealt to some extent with the subject matter of this Bill and I pointed out some of the provisions contained in it which I thought open to objection. I heard nothing from either the Minister in charge or from the Minister of Justice which removed these objections or which in any way justify the alterations contemplated in the Bill now before us. The Minister of Justice did not regard these alterations in the law that are contemplated by this Bill as being of a serious character. He has led the Committee to believe that the amendments under discussion were for the more easy administration of the Department of the Government that has charge of the granting of Crown lands. I cannot at all agree with the minister in this view. Of course there are sections in the measure before

the Committee which are very meritorious. The first section of the Bill I think a very desirable amendment to the law. It restricts the holders of licenses from cutting away all the old and valuable timber on these limits, and returning them to the Government practically denuded of their value. That I think a very good amendment to the law. But the part that is open to objection from my point of view is contained in sections 2 and 3 of the sections dealing with the matter of timber areas.

Section two in the first place is an amalgamation of the clause dealing with timber under the old Act with those dealing with pulp and paper. This amalgamation will under certain circumstances be an improvement, and may be very desirable, but personally I say that it is impossible to work the two together under conditions which will safeguard the rights and interests of the people of the country. Now, section 2 repeals sub-section (1) of section 25 of the Crown Lands Act 1903, that is a section dealing with the conditions under which licenses are to be issued. In this section, as it stands at present, the intention of the Government might be put more clearly, and the effect of it can be summed up in one sentence, as follows : The Ministry of the day, that is the Governor in Council, may grant timber limits on such terms and conditions as they may see fit. That is the practical effect of this section. The involved verbiage, when analyzed and its meaning made clear, is that the Governor in Council is given an absolute discretion as to the granting and the conditions upon which the right to cut timber on areas shall be issued. The section reads as follows : "The licensee is to erect a saw mill or mills, or a factory or factories, for the manufacture of paper or pulp upon or in connection with the limit described in such license, and subject to any special conditions which may be agreed upon and stated in the license, such saw mill or mills to be of the capacity to cut at the rate of 1,000 feet, board measure, in 24 hours, for every ten square miles comprised in the license, or to establish such other manufactory of wood goods as may be agreed upon as the equivalent of such mill or mills." Thus it is entirely a matter of argument what manufactory is to be substituted for these mills, or what is the equivalent to be agreed upon by the applicant and the Governor in Council. Thus in the first part of this section there is an absolute discretion given to the Governor in Council to say what is to be put up on these areas. The other is an absolute discretion as to time within which such mill or factory is to be erected. This is an entire departure from the former rule, under which the mill to be erected and the time given for its erection were specified, and had to be performed under a penalty of forfeiture. The present proposal is that the licensee is to commence and complete the erection of the saw mill or mills or manufactory of wood goods within such period as shall be determined by the Governor in Council to set forth in the license or to expend in the erection and equipment of a factory or factories for the manufacture of paper or paper pulp such sum as shall be presribed

and within such period as shall be limited and stated in such license. Here everything is left to the absolute discretion of the Governor in Council, the nature of the factory, the sum to be paid, to be expended, and the period within which these things are to be done. Now, sir, I think that if any person will analyze that clause, he must inevitably come to the conclusion that whatever the Governor in Council agrees to with the applicant, that is to be the law and the measure of the licensee's obligation. In other words, this legislature is abdicating its right to regulate the administration of those lands, and so far as the granting of leases or licenses and conditions upon which such leases and licenses are granted is handing over an un limited and uncontrolled authority to the Government. I do not think it right or good policy on the part of this Legislature to say to the people who may want to apply for Crown Lands for timber purposes or for pulp or paper, to practically say to them that they must go to the Government of the day to make a bargain with them. It is entirely wrong in principle. I think that if a person wishes to obtain the right to cut timber on the public lands he should know from the public statutes upon what conditions he can get them, and upon complying with these conditions to get them, and not to be subject to the whim or favor of the Government. This is the case in most countries. If you apply for timber areas in Canada you will know what terms and conditions you will be called upon to perform to secure the right, and you get it, if you pay the price. There and the applicant. This should not be. The applicant before he applies should know all the terms and conditions necessary and requsite for the obtaining and holding of a license. This, sir, to my mind goes far beyond the reasonable precautions necessary for the administration of the public lands. It is a power which may lead to gross abuses and corruption. The Legislature should hold firmly its control over these Crown Lands, and not permit them to be wasted and distributed improperly, or for inadequate returns to the Colony.

Again, sir, if we refer to the pulp clauses of this Act, and compare them with the former, we find that in this Act there is a difference in the amount of the bonus. Under the former, the licensee the first year has to make a payment of five dollars per square mile, and every subsequent year three dollars per year. Under the present proposal this is reduced to two dollars. Section 10 of the Act of 1906, under certain conditions, enables a person to come in under Section 25, but the conditions that he has to perform, one of which is that he must spend $2,000 towards the erection of a mill, go to prove his bona fides, and that he is not a mere speculator. Section 3 of this Bill deals with surveys. As to the question of the possibility of making a survey under the terms of this section, I am not going to express an opinion. The Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, this afternoon, gave his opinion on this. But the other part of the section again gives the Governor in Council the power to extend the time for mak ing the surveys to two years.

is no room there for political favor whatever. Here there is such a discretion given to the Government as may lead to unjust appropriation on favorable terms of our public timber lands for the purpose of satisfying the demands of political supporters and favorites. This is entirely wrong in principle.. Every license, every grant, every allocation, is made the subject of a dicker between the Government Now, in order to understand that, it is necessary to state that applicants for timber areas are bound within one year after date of approval of their application to file a survey of the area applied for, in the office of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, under penalty of the rights under his approved application being forfeited. Under this Act, therefore, the limit of one year may be extended, on good cause being shown, for a year longer, on payment of the rent for the year then passed, and an extra bonus of two dollars per square mile. Under the present Bill the period of extension is enlarged. Instead of one year as before, the Governor in Council is given the power to extend the time for a period of two years on the payment of a fixed bonus of two dollars per square mile within thirty days of the granting of such extension. Now, sir, that means that the time of extension is being doubled within which surveys are to be made, and the payments cut in two. Under the old section, the extension was granted for one year, by the payment of an extra rent and bonus, that is four dollars—that is a man would have to pay his ordinary rent, and also pay an extra bonus and rent, that would be six dollars. Under the present amendment the provision that he is to pay rent for the year past is dropped, as is also the provision to pay an extra rental for the period which the extension covers. So that for an extension of time within which to make the survey of two years you will henceforth have to pay a bonus of two dollars, where heretofore you had to pay in rents and bonus six dollars for an extension of one year. Why is this change made just now ? Large tracts of timber lands are now held by speculators under approvals for which no survey has been made. Is it that the amendment is made to enable those speculators to hold on to their areas at the expense of the Colony for a further period ? You relieve them of rent and bonus during the extended term. I think that that is clear. These amendments all tend to diminish the revenues from the Crown Lands. In other words that this legitimate source of revenue is curtailed and the revenue required for the public service has to be raised from other sources in the Colony, and from the people themselves who are sorely taxed enough at the present time. These sections deal with the timber areas the remaining sections deal with mineral matters. Section 11 deals with submarine areas. Its object is to enable the holder of a submarine area situate outside another submarine area to tunnel through the intervening area in order to connect his outside property with his works on the land—a most desirable object in the interest of development of our mines. There are one or two matters arising

out of these sections as at present framed to which I wish to draw the attention of the Minister, not in any captious spirit, but for the purpose of bringing these matters under his notice. The proposal is that the party interested must first get the permission of the Government and satisfy it on innumerable points. We have there first an abjudication by the Governor in Council as to whether a permit will be granted to acquire such surface lands or right to tunnel in order to make connection between the outlying areas and the works on the land. With all due respect this is unnecessary and embarrassing. One enquiry and abjudication should be enough and that should be held and made by the arbitrators appointed for that purpose. The Government is not constituted to deal with these matters. One of the questions to be determined in each case is whether it is reasonable to expect the right to make those tunnels through another's property. If the arbitrators pass upon this question, when dealing with the other matters of value and compensation, we have a sufficent guarantee that the power given by the Act will not be used unreasonably and particularly as it very properly provides that a deposit must be put up as a guarantee of the bona fides of the applicant. I notice this clause is entirely inoperative if the parties concerned can agree, if not the clause may be brought into operation. Another matter in this clause the effect of which in reference to the tunnelling is unnecessarily burdensome, is the restriction p'aced on the arbitrators in dealing with the tunnels. I note under a subsequent section certain conditions binding the arbitrators in making their awards, are stated. I notice that anyone owning an outlying submarine area who wishes to connect his land works with his outlying area, and for that purpose has to pass through other areas, must under this Bill, if the parties do not agree, submit the matter to arbitrators. It is made one of the conditions imposed that the arbitrators in every award, shall provide that the mineral seams on the intervening area shall not be entered or tunnelled, but that a vertical shaft is to be sunk, and the tunnels go through the intervening strata of the inside to the outside one which it is intended to operate. It is well known that in the matter of working submarine areas that a tunnel sloping as on an inclined plane, which can be operated by cars, would cost less to build and operate than a vertical shaft with a horizontal tunnel going through the intervening strata. I would suggest to the Minister the desirability of not closing out the arbitrators from making this arrangement in the award which would enable those operating mines to say whether they would sooner have an inclined plane instead of a vertical shaft, which, with all the accessories necessary, would cost far more than the former. I have no real reasons against it. It is on'y a matter of compensation in every case. There are cases where a mine owner may be put to the choice of changing his whole system of operation or buying out the holders of intervening areas at their own figure —a most objectionable position to put any mine owner in. I point these things out, sir, for the

consideration of the Minister. I hope he will take these remarks in the same spirit as they are given. These are the sections dealing with minerals. I think that the Crown Lands Act requires to be revised, codified, and consolidated At the present time you have to chase all thro the acts for the last eight or nine years, if you want to know the rights of applicants. Every year brings some new amendment, often bringing in conflicting rights, which wou'd be avoided by a proper consolidation. Section 4 deals with pulp licenses, now outstanding. Many have been forfeited for non-performance of conditions. If these holders apply for a license under this Act it is the intention to give it to them notwithstanding the forfeiture. The Government may do so. This is improper. The section should be restricted to those licenses which have not incurred or become liable to forfeiture. In fact the entire Bill looks like an effort to bolster up forfeited or expiring licenses.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—I appreciate very much the remarks of my learned friend, the member for St. John's East, and I agree with his observation that the whole of the laws dealing with Crown Lands ought to be consolidated for the benefit of the people here and those outside who are interested in the matter. Unfortunately, so many things have been claiming our attention that it has been impossible to get the necessary time to consolidate and codify the Acts, but we hope to accomplish this in the near future. Not only is it necessary in the case of the Crown Lands Act, but the whole body of our legislation needs to be consolidated for there has been no consolidation since 1892, and it will soon be time to consider the matter. A word or two in reply to the other objections made by the learned gentleman. I think he misapprehends the effect of sub-section 1 of section 2 in relation to the establishment of a mill for the manufacture of wood articles, for this law is the same as it has been in the past. It is now open for a man who has a license to say : "I shall not erect a saw mill, but some other manufactory of wooden goods," and some arrangement is made. With regard to pulp licenses. At the present time a man can obtain a timber license of unlimited size, the only condition being that within the first five years he shall expend the sum of $20,000 on the erection of a pulp factory. This is absurd for the time allowed is too long and the amount to be expended is too small. Under this Act the amount and the time will be determined upon, and this will prove more satisfactory, for the applicant will know what he has to do, for it will be stated in his license. I am confident, too, that this will be more satisfactory from the public's standpoint for there will be no loose approval as there is under the present Act, but the terms and conditions will be stipulated thereon. My learned friend also pointed out that under the Act now in force there was a rental of $5, while under the proposed law the rental was only $2.

MR. KENT—I was speaking of the first year only.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—It is $3 a year after the first year. However, my answer to him is

that the collecting of the rental under the present law is abolished by the Act of 1906, which allows a man to take his timber license and to exchange it for a pulp license, subject to the condition of expending $20,000 in the erection of a pulp factory, which condition is one which cannot be fulfilled. There is another answer and a more practical one, and that is that no one has taken out a pulp or paper license, partly because the rent is $5 for the first year and after that $3, and more particularly because the limit is 150 miles and no rent is collected from pulp licenses at the present time. There is another serious objection to the present law, as to pulp licenses, and that is that when a man makes an application for a pulp license, he has twelve months from the date of his approval within which to pay the rentals thereon, and he is not called upon to pay the bonus for thirty days after the expiration of that time. As I have said, no licenses have been taken out under the section in question, and no moneys collected thereunder, but, even if the application were made, nothing would be paid till twelve months after the date of the approval.

SIR R. BOND—I think the applicant ought to be made pay in advance.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—I agree with the Rt. hon. gentleman, and I think that possibly it might be worth considering whether he should not be compelled to pay some part in advance, to make a deposit of some amount to be held subject to the approval. This will put an end to applications being made for speculative purposes by those who are not in a position to pay for them. The next observation of my learned friend was that it is not clear that rent is payable during the time that extension is given for the survey of the property, and he contended that during the two years that are allowed for extension of survey, the Crown is not in a position to collect rent. However, sub-section 5 provides that a bonus of $2 per square mile shall be paid within thirty days of the date of the approval on the total area applied for and approved, and that in subsequent years it shall be paid on the area surveyed and described in the license, on the 30th November. The rent goes right on whether the property is surveyed or not, and it is payable. Consequently, there is no loss to the Colony if the Crown Lands Department does its duty and collects the rents, and I take it that the law will be carried out. As to the sections dealing with submarine mines and the acquiring of certain rights by the holder of a lease of such mining location over land adjacent to such mining location, I may say that the rights given are entirely different to those given to a railway contractor. In building a railway, the land is wanted immediately, nor can it be said just what land is wanted. The contrator cannot wait for an arbitration to be held on it. Here the case is a different one. Two parties own land near each other, and one wants rights over the land of the other. It is already provided by section 55 of the Act of 1903 that the party seeking to obtain a right, however small, over the land of another must come to the Crown for permission, if he is unable to

come to terms with the owner. When he comes to the Crown he must satisfy the Crown that he has a bona fide reason for asking the right, and if the Governor in Council is satisfied, after being furnished with full particulars from both parties concerned, that the right should be granted, he may grant the same ; and he names a time within which the arbitration to determine any matters of difference between the parties shall hold its first meeting. My learned friend referred to the section in the Bill that deals with the sinking of shafts through the ore seams. As he said the section has special reference to the Bell Island properties, for they are the only ores in Newfoundland, probably, to which the section would apply. I may say that the section has been put in the Bill only after very careful consultation with the Government Engineer, and also with the parties interested in the Bell Island properties. The whole body of ore is flat in Bell Island ; the deposit is horizontal, and it would be a great hardship and would lead to complications if we allowed a man to go over the ore body of the first company and run out through it and get to the ore body outside. Therefore the Act provides that the arbitrators have got to locate the position where the incline may be, and the intention is that, if possible, an incline will be run out in same way as done now. That may be impossible, and, if so, the right may be granted to sink a shaft until it reaches the strata to be traversed. The intention is that if they can work with an incline it must be done, but, if not, they must sink a vertical shaft. It seems to me that this is the most practical way to deal with Bell Island, and if questions arise they will be dealt with on their merits by the arbitrators.

MR. KENT—I appreciate the explanation which the Hon. Minister of Justice has just given, but I think it would be better if, in an Act of this kind in the matter of submarine areas, which may or may not be of great importance, the arbitrators were allowed to exercise their own discretion more as to the award to be allowed and were not bound down as they are by this Act. You can imagine the position under this section where, for instance, a person owning an intervening area near large mining areas could force the company to buy out his claims, so that he may not exercise the powers that are proposed to be given him under this Act. It is well in framing an Act of this kind not to keep in mind an individual case, for much confusion has been caused in the past by legislation of this kind. It is best to have the application of the Act very general. The matters dealt with by the section should be left to the arbitrators, and they should make their awards on the merits of the parties before them, and not be hedged in by the conditions set forth in the Bill. There is another section which I did not refer to, and that is section 10, which relates to the forfeiture of mining areas. This section, Mr. Chairman, gives the Governor in Council control over these areas entirely different from that which they hold over general mineral areas in the country. For instance, under the general law, if

a mineral area is applied for, the applicant is entitled, as a matter of right, to have his application acceded to. Applying for the area and having it granted is a mere matter of formality, but under the section the Governor in Council is given the power to deal with mineral lands which have been forfeited. In other words, instead of an applicant having a right to have a mining location that has been declared forfeited granted to him, it is a matter of discretion with the Governor in Council whether they will do so or not. This may or may not be a defect in the wording of the section. I think that once an area becomes forfeited it ought to be put on the same footing as the other mineral lands of the country. The Minister of Justice, in his remarks, suggested another matter in relation to sub-section 1, which, to my mind, brings out the objectionable feature of that section, and that is that any agreement arrived at between the Governor in Council and the applicant for these areas need never be known to the public. There is nothing in the Crown Lands Act which gives a person the right to go in and examine the registration record of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, the same as can be done in relation to the Registry of Deeds in reference to other property. I think that that at least ought to be inserted, and that if the Governor in Council is authorized, as they are here, to grant these lands with a free hand, that the terms and conditions upon which they are granted ought to be registered in such a way that the public, or any person who may be desirous of doing so, could go to the public registry or file and ascertain the conditions upon which licenses or leases have been granted.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE— My learned friend suggested that the arbitrators should not be restricted in dealing with any application for rights over private property under this Act. I would point out that they are only restricted in one instance, and that is that the ore bodies and mineral seams may not be entered. That is all. That matter was carefully discussed, and it was considered wise to lay it down as a principle that if parties owned properties adjoining, and one wished to get a right to work through the other man's property, that he should not be allowed, simply because it might be more convenient for him to work in the middle of the body or seam, but that he should go on the unproductive portion or strata, either above or below the mineral body. That is the only restriction upon the arbitrators ; and the provision is absolutely general. We have been discussing this matter in the light of Bell Island, simply because Bell Island is the only place at the present time in Newfoundland where work of that class is probably in sight, but it may turn out in years to come that the same kind of work will have to be done in connection with other submarine areas and if it does, the legislation proposed here is wide enough to deal with any case that may come up. Now with regard to forfeiture. If the hon. gentleman will look at section 53 of the Crown Lands Act of 1903, he will see that there is under that section an automatic forfeiture, but it is provided at

the end of that section that notice of this forfeiture should be published by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines in the Royal Gazette and one other newspaper. The hon. gentleman probably knows that that has never been done, although this Act has been in force since 1903. I am not sure whether it was done before that.

SIR R. BOND—It has been done.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—I mean, it has not been done generally. This is a recommendation from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, who informs me that the publication of the notice of forfeiture under this section has always been completely neglected. The only effect of the change in the Act is this, that when a man has secured a mining lease and fails to pay his rent within thirty days after it is due, under the law as it stands to-day he automatically forfeits any rights that he may have under that lease ; but the law requires that notice of such forfeiture shall be published in the Royal Gazette. The publication was really of no force or effect—I suppose it was put there so that something should be done to show that the Department had taken notice of the forfeiture. The rights had been forfeited, under the law, before the publication of the notice in the Royal Gazette. The effect of the forfeiture was that the particular piece of property fell back again into the possession of the Crown, and might be leased to the next man who applied for it ; but there seemed to be a sort of doubt as to what would be the position on account of that notice of forfeiture not having been published in the Gazette, and in order to clear away that doubt it was considered advisable to repeal that section and simply make the law so that if a man has a 99-year lease of a mineral area and fails to pay his rent, according to law, within thirty days after the same is due, then his rights under that lease are automatically forfeited. That is the amendment that is proposed here. My learned friend refers to the desirability of giving the general public the right to search in the Crown Lands Department, similar to the right which they have in relation to the Registry of Deeds. The two things are entirely different. The Department of Agriculture and Mines is a Government Department, the same as the Department of Justice, the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or the Department of Finance and Customs ; and I think it would be very inadvisable to give any person that chooses, even on the payment of a 25c. stamp, the right to go in and search the records of the Crown Lands Office, or any other Department. The position as regards the Registry of Deeds is different entirely. In that case a person wants to see about the title to some particular piece of land. The law requires that if an assignment or transfer, or mortgage of a piece of land is not registered in the Registry of Deeds, it is void as against any subsequent purchaser or mortgagee, and consequently if a man is interested in a particular piece of land, he makes a search at the Registry of Deeds in order to satisfy himself as to the title. At the present time the public have the right to get any information they may desire with res-

pect to any particular piece of land, whether it is timber land, agricultural land or mineral land. Any person has the right to go in and ascertain whether a particular piece of land belongs to the Crown or not ; and if it is open he has the right to make application for it, in accordance with the provisions of the Crown Lands Act. I can hardly see, Mr. Chairman, that the two cases are parallel, or that it would be of any benefit to the public to give them the right to search the records of any Department in the same way as they have the right to do in connection with the Registry of Deeds.

MR. KENT—There are three matters, Mr. Chairman, to which I would like to refer briefly. First, as regards the position of parties dealing with submarine areas. Of course, as far as the person through whose land the shaft would go was concerned, as to whether the shaft went through the intervening strata or through the ore deposit, would be entirely a matter of compensation. The next matter is this : The Minister did not at all touch on the difficulty which I referred to in connection with section 10. I did not refer to the fact that a notice was required in the case of forfeiture of mineral areas ; the difficulty that I find is in the latter part of the section. Under the present law, the mineral areas of the country are open to any applicant, and when a man puts in his application he can, as a matter of right, demand the issue of his license. Under this section the lands which are declared forfeited, are put in a very different position. The applicant does not acquire the right to have them issued to him, but the Governor in Council is given the power to issue them, which is a very different thing. Probably the intention of the Minister was to put these lands in exactly the same position as the rest of the mineral lands of the country, but I don't think he has done so. Instead of giving the applicant the right he has conferred a power on the Goovernment. Now the third matter to which I wish to refer is in relation to the right of the public, or of any person interested, on the payment of a fee, to have access to the records granting the public demesne. Now is the time, Mr. Chairman—if it is not already too late—when some compulsory registration of these titles should be made. The registry may be kept in the Department of Agriculture and Mines, and any person who is desirous of knowing whether a certain timber limit is taken up, and whether the license under which it is held is a legal one, and whether it is in existence at the present time or not, or whether it has been cancelled, and the terms and conditions under which it has been issued, should have the right to go to the public registry where these titles are deposited and to examine them. I don't see, Mr. Chairman, that that can be open to any objection. Surely, if the Governor in Council take the very large powers and discretions which they are taking in connection with Crown Lands under this Bill, there can be no objection to a registry of the titles, and of the conditions under which they are granted, which would be open and accessible to those who may desire to get information regarding any particular area.

SIR R. BOND—On payment of a small fee.

M R. KENT—Certainly, the same as is done in connection with the registry of deeds. I cannot conceive from any point of view that such a procedure would be objectionable. Certainly, I don't think the holder of a license would raise any objection, and it cannot in the least interfere with the administration of the office. The public would have access to no other records except those that are necessary for the examination of the conditions under which licenses and leases are held.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, at the present time the Governor in Council has the right to grant a lease of a mining property. It is true that, under the Act, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines accepts the application and the fees and issues a license ; but it is all done subject to the Governor in Council. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines has no power on his own responsibility.

MR. KENT—I didn't say he had. I only said the applicant has the right .

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—Yes, you mean that when a person puts his discovery stake down and puts in his application, that gives him a different right from the person who comes in and makes an application for a piece of timber land or an agricultural area.

MR. KENT—In this respect it is entirely in the discretion of the Governor in Council to grant or not.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—That is not the intention. The intention is that when once a lease is forfeited the land should simply become Crown Land again and be open to any applicant, just as if it never had been leased before.

MR. KENT—I don't think that is the effect of that section.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—With regard to this suggestion, we will allow that section to stand until I look into the point that my learned friend has raised, and make quite certain that the wording of the section will carry out what is intended.

MR. CLIFT—I would like to call the attention of the Minister to another section, which probably may not be capable of carrying out just what is intended. Section 7 says : "Section 44 of the Crown Lands Act, 1903, is hereby amended by adding after the word 'locations' in the 4th line of said section the following words, namely, 'not exceeding ten.'" I take it, sir, that the intention of that section is that when a person stakes a particular area he must comply with all the requirements of the Act, and make an application for that area, when it would be laid down on a location plan ; but he is restricted under this from taking more than ten sections. That, I take it, is the idea. Well, he may get over that by taking ten sections in somebody else's name, and another ten sections in still another persons name ; and in that way this section may not carry out the object which it seems to have in view. And not only that but the staker comes in and he takes up ten sections ; another party who is not a staker may come in and take a hundred sections on that location plan ; so that the second party would be in a better

position, really, than the staker. Of course the staker would have the choice place, at the same time the section seems to be open to that objection. With regard to section 4—that section imposes a fine of $50 for not filling returns in accordance with this section. This is a case of a $50 fine and that is the end of it. When the fine has been paid the Act has been complied with, and still the returns may not be filled. I think that in order to make that section more effective, it would be advisable to add that he should be liable to a continuous fine of say $5 a day, or something of that sort, so that he would be compelled to eventually fill his returns. I think it is a pity when this Act was being brought down that something was not done in the way of consolidation. However, I can quite appreciate the amount of labor it would take to put this Act in more workable form. When it is reconsidered again I hope something will be done for the purpose of making it impossible for persons to hold up large areas of timber lands for indefinite periods. Under the present law anybody had the right to come in and make an application for a large area of timber land, in Newfoundland or Labrador, and, under that application hold up that area for quite a long time. For instance, he may give notice, in accordance with the Act, in the Royal Gazette, and that secures him, to some extent, in his right to apply for that particular area ; he may not file his application immemediately at the end of thirty days, but he may hold it over for some convenient occasion, or until he sees somebody else applying for the same area ; eventually it may be granted to him, and he has it then for thirty days after his application has been approved ; he may fail to pay the rent or the bonus that becomes payable at the end of the thirty days, and the license would thereupon become forfeited ; he would get a notice in the regular way that the license was forfeited, and there is nothing to prevent him from immediately putting in another application for the same area, and so on, hanging it up for quite a long while ; or he may by paying the rent and bonus and getting an extension of time for the survey keep it going much longer than he really ought. I think that at the time this Act was introduced the idea of the Legislature was that only bona fide operators would come in and make application for these areas, and that they would immediately proceed with the erection of mills or factories upon the areas granted, and in that way the timber resources of the country would become developed. but although we see large timber areas granted from time to time, still we see very little development ; and although we hear constantly of big deals going through, very little in the way of actual development is being done. I would prefer seeing some change in the whole form with regard to the method of applying for these areas. I think that if something were done on the lines of our mineral areas it might possibly be more beneficial, looking at it from the Colony's standpoint. What I mean to suggest is this : That in order to acquire a timber area it should be necessary to proceed something upon the lines laid

down in connection with a mineral area. A notice should be published and make it compulsory to file an application immediately on the expiration of the notice ; then on filing the application a certain fee, say, for the sake of argument, $1 a square mile, should be payable on the area applied for, and if the applicant, after getting his license and cruising his area, is satisfied that it contains a sufficent quantity of timber to pay for developing, he could come in and apply for a 'ease, just as he does now for a mineral lease, after the expiry of his license. If he has the limit cruised the applicant should be compelled to fi'e the report of the cruiser ; thus the Department would be able to acquire some information as to whether or not there was timber on the land and the extent of it. That is the important matter for the Governor in Council to know when dealing with the applicant ; for this reason, that the application comes before the Governor in Council for consideration. The Governor in Council, under the provisions of the present Act, approves the application ; and there is issued in due course a license to cut timber over that land. Upon the face of it, it would appear to anyone on the other side inclined to invest in timber properties, that the Governor in Council, by issuing that license, gives a sort of implied undertaking that there is timber upon that area ; when there is possibly not a stick upon it. What I would advise in this matter would be the prevention of persons going about and placing upon the market in England and the United States, licenses to cut timber over lands where no timber exists. These people represent that they have paid $4 an acre to get these lands ; complied with the law in all respects ; will be able to get certain concessions in the way of water power, etc., free admission of machinery and materials ; and altogether they make up an attractive proposition for investors ; and it is all done under a license to cut timber issued by the Governor in Council. We know that that has been done and we know the effect that it will and must have upon the reputation of the Colony. We heard to-day read in this House extracts from a paper published in London, to which some persons in this Colony have been sending messages about the great timber propositions available here—messages which, if believed, would make investors flock over to this country. I think that these misrepresentations, if they are so, and we have no knowledge before us as to whether these areas are timbered or not, will be very detrimental to the interests of the country. Great care should be taken in granting these licenses, and particularly when we see such very large areas applied for, not only in Newfoundland, but in Labrador. Now, it was suggested here to-night by the Minister that it would not matter whether there was timber on the land or not, so long as the Government got their rents, etc. I think the country would be better off with a reasonable amount of timber. It is bound to come back on us some day ; and, instead of attracting to our shores, it will have the contrary effect. It was also suggested, with regard to the holding of lands, the payment of rents and the compliance with

the conditions of leases, that, during the late Government, the rents were not collected as they should have been. I want to state that during the period when I had the honor of presiding over that department, in every case where an approval has been issued and the rent has not been paid within thirty days after it was due, so far as I know, a notice of forfeiture was issued. I knew of no case where it was not. The regular routine of the office required that the notice should go out, and it went out in every case. With regard to the rentals that were payable on the leases, or licenses, there were at some periods large sums in arrears. But it must not be supposed for one moment that under these circumstances it became the duty of the department to go out and collect these moneys. I always took the position that if the person holding the license to cut timber failed to pay his rents, he was taking his own chances of his license being forfeited, because, under the law, it became liable to forfeiture, and while he was taking these chances, interest at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum began to accrue on that rent from the day it became due. Thus, as far as the department was concerned, it was losing nothing. I found, however, that, for reasons best known to themselves, many did not pay, and eventually a large number had to be placed in the hands of a solicitor for collection. I think he collected nearly all the amounts that were due, with the interest. So that, on the whole, I do not think it was altogether fair for the Minister to infer that there was any laxity in the collection of rents. It has always been so. As far back as I remember, there were always some arrears. Persons holding licenses and not paying rent become liable to pay interest, and ran the chance of having their license forfeited. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps next year when this Bill comes down again it will be in the shape of a consolidated Act, so that one could readily find out the terms and conditions upon which licenses to cut timber for paper or pulp or other purposes may be obtained, and so that it will be readily seen how strangers and others who may be interested in our timber areas, what the conditions are and what they have to pay, the areas that may be granted to them and, generally, all the conditions and circumstances.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I share the regret of my hon. friend that we have not been able to have the Acts consolidated this session. Two or three years ago my learned friend would have been in an excellent position to have consolidated these Acts himself when he had at the same time the lega¹ learning and the leadership of the Department concerned. He would have saved me lots of trouble, both this session and the next. But I hope next year we may see something done in that direction. Now, with regard to the point about an applicant being limited to ten locations, I would point out that this has, to some extent, been supervised by the Department. When a man makes his discovery location, it is the practice of the Department to lay out a plan of the place, showing as many locations round the discovery as they may consider ne-

cessary. It is their duty to lay these out reasonably, and I do not see how better we can deal with the matter. If we allow the land to remain as it is at present, the first applicant can take up the whole section. My hon. friend thinks it an objection that if the first applicant can only take up ten in his own name, he can take up the rest in the name of somebody else. It makes no difference whether the first applicant takes ten and the next more, or the other way about, so far as the public are concerned. But we thought it fair to limit him to ten. With regard to the penalty of $50 for not furnishing a return, we thought it better to put some small penalty there to ensure the attention of the person holding the license. We discussed the idea of putting a penalty of so much per day, but the difficulty arises when it is let run for a long time. And you have always the right to sue a party under the law and compel him to make the return. We thought $50 would be ample. I quite agree with my learned friend about the effect that may be produced outside by the issuing of timber licenses over country where there is really no timber. But that is a difficulty that I cannot see how we can avoid at the present moment. Our difficulty now, and for some time past, is that we have never had our timber areas thoroughly cruised or surveyed. If you go into the Crown Lands Department in Canada you will see the whole Crown Lands blocked off into sections, and they will tell you what you are likely to find in each section, whether pine or spruce, or birch, or what. That is simply because they have a fine survey outfit, and have got the lands marked off and full information. Unfortunately, we are not in that position ; and when an applicant comes in we cannot size him up and ask him whether he is a bona fide applicant or a mere speculator. Under our law every man has a right to make his application, which must be dealt with upon its merits. This, although the Council may be perfectly convinced that the man is merely a speculator without a $5 bill, and that thirty days after the application the man will have to drop the land and it will be thrown back into the public domain. That is the explanation to a large extent of the tremendous number of miles referred to by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. If the records of the late Government were examined I think it would be found that the late Governor MacGregor, who had a tremendous faculty for statistics, once worked out the number of square miles he had signed grants for. I think it came to more than the whole area of land in Newfoundland. Some of these app'ications were very large, perhaps 500 or 600 miles; and frequently the same man would be making application for these a number of times. The same location has often been approved a number of times in the course of a year; and thus 500 square miles may grow to 5,000. The same difficulty as to what people abroad may think applies to our mineral licenses. We issue a license to a man who makes his application and pays his ten dollars. Naturally the business man in England will have to apply the same business precautions as he would in any other pur-

chase. If he take up timber properties, as some did, on the mere ipse dixit of the man who wants to sell them to him, and finds there is no timber upon them, he must suffer the same results as any other man who does business on bad business principle. .

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered : That this report be received and that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act to further Amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1903."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the Bill with some amendments.

Ordered : That this report be received and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend the law relating to the encouragement of Agriculture," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting certain Retiring Allowances" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from Mr .William Wyatt asking for a subsidy from this Legislature in relation to the manufacture of a combination plow he has manufactured. Mr. Wyatt is well known to the members of this House and has always taken a deep interest in agriculture. This plow is his own invention and he is now about to manufacture it and put it upon the market, and he hopes this Legislature will interest themselves and give him a small grant. I have much pleasure in presenting the petition and ask that it be sent to the Department of Agriculture and Mines.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

Mr. Clift gave notice of question.

Mr. Shea gave notice of question.

Mr. Earle gave notice of question.

Mr. Roberts gave notice of question.

Hon. Prime Minister gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow Friday, March 10th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, March 10.

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

THE PREMIER—Since this branch of the Legislature last met, the Reaper, whose name is Death, has taken from amongst us one of our members, who for a number of years has been a respected and valued representative in the Legislature. I refer to our late brother, Edward Davey. "Pale Death impartially knocks at the palace of the king and the habitation of the poor." Rarely, however, does he come so suddenly and so unexpectedly as in the present instance. It was only a few days since when, as the representative of the district of Burin, our deceased friend was present with us in this chamber, and took part in the deliberations of the Legislature, and no one could then have contemplated that the messenger of Death was so soon to convey to him the summons which one day will be served on us all. It is appointed unto all men once to die. Death is the on'y event in our lives that may be said to be certain and inevitable, and yet we are in the habit of regarding everyone as mortal except ourselves. Truly, "what shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue." The vacant chair in this chamber today more eloquently proclaims than anything that I can say, the personal and public loss that we have all sustained. "The good die first, and those whose hearts are dry as summer dust burn to the socket." In a small community like ours, we can ill afford to lose one of such sterling character as the deceased. He was not alone prominent in all the work of the denomination of which, for many years, he was the respected Church Warden, but in the councils of the Synod, in the Vesteries, and on the school boards, in works of philanthropy, charity, social reform, and remedial legislation, he was an earnest, faithful, and zealous worker. It will not be easy to fill the void which has been made in the community by his death. In his own private business, in which he was the senior partner, he was remarkable for his character for thoroughness, always faithfully carrying out his obligations even when it had to be done at a loss to himself. The Legislature will lose his wise counsel and mature unbiased judgment. The district which he represented will find it hard to replace him, and whilst his party may be able to do so, they will not easily find one upon whose loyalty to party they can so surely and safely rely. It has been my privilege to have known him from boyhood ; and during the ten years he has occupied a seat in the Legislature, I have been closely associated with him as a member of the same party, and can speak with intimate knowledge of the many splendid traits of character which he possessed. He was a man of strong convictions and indomitable will, and having made up his mind as to the proper course to pursue, wild horses would not swerve him from his purpose. He will be a severe loss to his particular church, and it will not be easy to replace him. After the great fire, in which the Cathedral of Saint John the Baptist was destroyed, he, with others, shouldered the weight and responsibility of restoring it. The loss to him was a

personal one, and the present splendid edifice stands as a monument to him in the good work. For years he was a member of that valuable institution, the Masonic body, which in this country has done so much for education and for the widow and orphan, regardless of creed or nationality. The same was true of his connection with the Society of United Fishermen, and the Sons of England. Though a native of this country, he was a thorough believer in British rule and the British constitution. Everywhere he was popular. A strong adherent to party, he was a fair fighter, and even in the height of the political batt'e one almost forgot he was on the other side. So absolutely fair and just and open were his methods that they in no way affected friendships or created those severances which unfortunately too often exist. The last years of his life were saddened by domestic bereavements that did not pass lightly over him, but broke his big generous heart. The last of a long series of trials and troubles culminated a few months ago in the death of his wife. But now they are united where "the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest." We do not know, it is difficult to understand, why it is that some are born to trouble and sorrow, whilst others pass through life with nothing in their path but sunshine and pleasure. If we were not sustained in the belief that one day in the Great Hereafter it will be made manifest to all why the Providence of God, which often in this world permits the good to suffer and the wicked to prosper, shall appear just before all men—the ills of life would indeed be hard to bear.

"'Tis well for us all some deep
hope lies,
Deeply buried from human eyes ;
And in the Hereafter Angels may
Roll the stone from its grave
away."

As a tribute of respect to our brother and to a worthy citizen, I move that this House shall now adjourn until Monday next, coupling with the motion the following Resolutions :

RESOLVED : That this House desires to place upon record an expression of regret at the death of Mr. Edward Davey, a member for the district of Burin, by which the House has lost a valuable member and the community a greatly esteemed and useful citizen.

RESOLVED : That the sympathy of the Members of the House be conveyed to the relatives of the deceased in their bereavement.

SIR ROBERT BOND—It is with feelings of the deepest sorrow that I rise to second the motion which has been so touchingly proposed by my honorable friend the Prime Minister,—that the House desires to place on record its regret at the demise of our fellow co-worker in the public interests of the Colony, the late Mr. Davey, member elected for the district of Burin. His demise has come to me as a great shock, although when I left his home last night I was prepared by the sad tidings I then received, that the life of my good friend was fast passing away. By his death I have lost a sincere friend and devoted and unswerving supporter, a man I highly esteemed ; this

House has lost an honest, manly and public-spirited member and the community has lost a patriotic and enterprising citizen, whose place it will be extremely difficult to fill. Only a few days ago, as my hon. friend had said, the deceased gentleman sat here in this House, but some of us could not fail to notice that he was bowed and still bending beneath the weight of great domestic affliction. The aching heart has ceased to pulsate, for death has visited our friend, not in the ghastly garb of ancient mythology, but as a beautiful and bright angel, who, with the greatest gentleness, has closed the weeping eyes and stilled the throbbing heart, and our friend is at peace. We utter our sad farewell, that is only illumined, only brightened by the knowledge that He who shall pass judgment upon the record of our lives is the same who framed us in our frailty.

The said Resolutions having been unanimously adopted, it was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, March 13th, at three of the clock in the afternoon

The House adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 13.

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

MR. SEYMOUR—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Spaniard's Bay asking for an amendment of the law as to the fencing of the railway. They set forth that many of their cattle and horses have been killed during recent years by thetrain and they wish to have the law amended in such a way that it will be necessary for the Reid Company to fence the railway outside the various settlements along the line for a greater distance than the present law calls for. The petition has my support and I ask that it be referred to the Department of the Minister of Justice.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I have much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by my co'league. Last year two valuable horses were killed at Harbor Grace, and I understand that the owners have written to the Government and the Reid Company, but they have received no recompense so far. The Reid Company should pay for all cattle killed by their trains or else fence the track. This may appear to be hard on the Company, who often have to suffer for the acts of the officials on the trains, but the people cannot afford to have their horses and cattle destroyed. It gives me much pleasure to support the petition and I recommend the Government to take it into their consideration.

MR. PARSONS—I beg to support the prayer of the petition which has just been presented by my hon. colleague, Mr. Seymour.

MR. F. J MORRIS—I have been asked by the hon. member for Port de Grave to present a petition on the same matter as that contained in the petition just presented by the hon. member for Harbor Grace. The petition is signed by over a hundred residents of Cupids and emanates from the Agricultural Society of Brigus, which embraces Cupids and other places in the district. Of course as the law at present stands under the 1901 contract

the company is bound either to fence the track or to pay compensation for animals killed within one mile from the settlement. The grievance of the petitioners in the present case is that cattle have been killed at a further distance than that prescribed by the Act. I had a large number of cases while I had the honor to represent the district of Harbor Main, and if I could not obtain a settlement I brought the matter into court. However, in nine cases out of ten I obtained a settlement by making application to the Company and setting forth the facts of the case to them. The difficulty comes in when the cow or horse is killed more than a mile from the settlement, for then the Company is not responsible. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. EARLE—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Fogo and Joe Batt's Arm, asking for the allocation of the sum of $100 to complete the building of the road between these two places. The petitioners state that they first asked for $150 and only $50 having been sent them they now ask for the balance, $100, to complete it. I can only add that the prayer of the petition has my hearty support.

I also beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Musgrave Harbor asking for an elective road board and for the sum of $150 to support it.

I have also a petition from Simeon Guy and others of Musgravetown asking for the appoint ment of a local council.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—I have a petition from certain merchants of the city on the subject of granting a charter to a Marine Insurance Club, and with your permission, sir, I will read it.

This petition is signed by twenty or more of the leading merchants of the country. It is signed by Edgar R. Bowring, Charles P. Ayre, John Harvey, John Browning, F. H. Steer, W. Ashbourne, J. Henderson, R. F. Goodridge, R. K. Bishop, A. E. Hickman, Colin Campbell, M. G. Winter, Geo. J. Carter, W. A. Munn, F. McNamara, W. Duff, Carbonear, A. H. Murray, W. S. Monroe and Hugh Baird. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that this will be the first Marine Insurance Company ever started in the country, and I am instructed to say that the business will be conducted merely in connection with cargo and freight imported into the country or otherwise handled here. It is not the intention to in any way interfere with the business now being done by the Mutual Clubs already doing business in Newfoundland. It is claimed that in America and England the large steamers have nearly destroyed the freight business in sailing vessels and that it is almost impossible to get insurance on this class of risk. This matter was discussed by the Board of Trade recently and this petition is the outcome of that discussion, and although it has not emanated from the Board the signers are practically all members of the Board. It is proposed to make the capital stock of the company $150,000, with a provision in the charter enabling them to increase the capital if necessary. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the petition be received and sent to a select committee, and in doing so I would ask for a sus-

pension of rule 314 in connection with the month's notice. The matter is of very great importance. It was only finalized within the last week and if the usual month's notice in the Gazette were given it would not expire until after the prorogation of the House. In view of the importance of the petition I would ask, sir, that it be received under suspended rules and sent to a select committee for report.

MR. SHEA—I have much pleasure in supporting the petition just presented by Mr. Morris, as I feel that the establishment of such a company will be filling a long felt want in the commercial community. As he has stated, its establishment will in no way interfere with the local clubs, it is intended for insuring cargoes of fish from here. For many years it has been becoming more difficult to get insurance on such cargoes, and the rates have materially increased year after year. It is difficult to get foreign underwriters to take this insurance, as they are not acquainted with local conditions, and the risks they are taking. Now, if a local company takes these risks it will be a kind of guarantee to these foreign underwriters and they will be able to reduce the rates and take larger lines. For these reasons it has become necessary to take these steps for the establishment of this local company. I therefore have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

The petition was received and referred to the following select committee : Hon. Colonial Secretary, Messrs. Morris, Goodison, Shea and Earle.

HON. MR. EMERSON—I beg to present a petition from Pool's Cove, Fortune Bay, on the subject of a wharf, to which I give my hearty support.

HON. S. D. BLANDFORD—I beg to present a petition from Brookfield, Bonavista Bay, on the subject of a ferry. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to present a petition for a wharf at Ship Cove, Harbor Main. The petitioners ask for the sum of $600 for the construction of this wharf. I give the petition my hearty support.

MR. CLIFT—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary if Mr. Abram Batten, of Bareneed, in the electoral district of Port de Grave, is at present in the employ of any department of the Government ; if so, in what capacity and at what salary.

HON. COL. SECRETARY—Mr. Batten is not in the employ of my Department. I am making enquiries of the other Departments and will have the information to-morrow.

MR. ROBERTS—To ask the Hon. Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to give Twillingate district a semi-weekly overland winter mail service next year ; if not, why not.

HON. THE PREMIER—I may say, Mr. Speaker, that that matter has been under the consideration of the Government and tenders were called for, but the matter was not finalized, but it is proposed to take it up again and we hope to arrange for the service.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled, "An Act Respecting Pilots and Pilotage for

the port of St. John's," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of the Hon. Prime Minister the order for the third reading of the Bill entitled, "An Act further to amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1908," was discharged and it was ordered that it be referred again to Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

HON. THE PREMIER—I should like with the permission of the House to have this Bill again sent into Committee, as I want to make a few amendments. The last clause gives a right of appeal to any person who may feel agrieved by the appraisers. It will be noted that under the present law the appraisement only takes place every three years, in other words, it is triennia', and if any houses go up in the interim the Council loses any amounts that might be appraised on them. Now it is proposed that the Municipal Council have the right themselves to appraise these houses and that appears to be a very reasonable amendment.

MR. BENNETT—I should have risen to say something the other night had I been in the House, but I did not know the Bill would be up for discussion at that time, otherwise I wou'd have made it a point of being here when this Bill was considered. I think that matters relating to St. John's should at all times receive the utmost consideration from the members of this House. I can appreciate the fact that the majority of those here are not very much interested in those matters, but on an occasion of this kind the representatives of St. John's have an opportunity to give their ideas regarding the affairs of the city of Saint John's. I would like to see introduced this year, or some year soon, broader legislation on municipal affairs. The time is ripe for the same and the citizens of St. John's should take a deeper interest in its Government. Whilst the Council are probably doing their utmost with the means at their disposal, the affairs of the town are not to the satisfaction of the people. It is not the fault of the Council, but rather of the system. I have had four years' experience as a Municipial Councillor and have had the opportunity of noting many of the problems which confront the City Council. I do not pretend to give an expert opinion on these, but I can speak with some experience on many things deserving of thoughtful consideration. As the Premier has just said, the regular appraisement takes place every three years. In the interim there is what is known as the special appraisement between each triennial. That in the past required the expensive machinery of a triennial appraisement, viz., Court of Revision, etc. The object of this new clause is to avoid the expense and trouble of having a court of revision held. I think this is a very sensible and desirable provision; the Council have shown that it is in the interest of economy. But I think that the citizen is entitled to protection at all times. It is possible that an appraiser would appraise a building and put an excessive valuation on it. In the old Bill there was an appeal from this decision, but in this new

clause there is none. This is not fair to the citizen, whether the amount is small or large ; and there ought to be some right of appeal. The Premier was good enough to admit this principle and to make the desired alteration which I think will be more satisfactory to the public. In any case, I think that it will be required in but few cases, but still the right is there.

Another question I have to refer to is the licensing of cabs. This is a question which has occupied the attention of the Council ever since it was constituted ; but there were always difficulties in the way. I do not know how the present Council intend to get over these. I think that whilst making any rules for the regulation of cabs some place ought to be set apart in the central part of the town for a cab stand. It must be appreciated that it is a very serious hindrance to several business people on Water Street to have a row of cabs blocking their doors. It interferes with their business and keeps away a good many customers from them. The only places used that are acceptable are the Post Office and the Court House. The Council should provide some other place or places where these cabs will not interfere with private rights. Then they should have some sort of a house or shelter in each, connected with the telephone system, where people would be able to ring up for a cab from any part of the city. One of these might be in the cove opposite the Court House, which is known as Baird's Cove. It is a good open place, convenient to Water Street, and I think it would give satisfaction. The same thing would apply to the eastern stand. Once that was done it would remove a great grievance from the business people of Water Street. And if the cab fares are regulated, I think that the Council should see that they (the cabs) are kept in a proper way ; they should be inspected, and their drivers should be qualified men. We should not allow young, irresponsible boys in charge of cabs, who might not have good judgment, especially in cases of emergency. The Council should see that this work is done only by proper and competent drivers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to delay the House, but I want to make a few observations on other sections of this Bill, and I must ask the indulgence of the Committee for a short time I intended to refer the other night to the franchise asked by the cable companies who have come here lately. Those of us who have any experience in municipal affairs will endorse what I say that in the past the Council have been heavily handicapped by the privileges and franchises held by different companies in the city. Take, for instance, the Gas Company. They have the right to dig up any of the streets of the city in order to lay their pipes or mains. They are under no restriction as to when or how they may do it. All they are bound to do is to replace the streets as they found them. The experience of the Council in the past continually has been that after spending perhaps $1,000 on a street, macadamizing it and so on, the next week perhaps the Gas Company would acquaint the Council of their intention to lay a main in that street, and dig it all up again.

That condition of things should not be allowed to occur again. Although I must say that the Gas Company in recent years have acceded to the wishes of the Council, and have always given six months' notice of these intended works, but this done only through courtesy. Cable companies or any others who are given the right to use the streets should be hedged round with such restrictions as will conserve the best interests of the city. I am very glad that the Committee have seen fit to leave the question of the charge for laying cables in the hands of the Council. I think they are the best judges of what would be a fair charge, and as to how far any company should have the right to open up the street, and so on.

I think there is a good deal of improvement to be desired about our municipal affairs. I do not think it is the fault of the Council; it is, rather, the fault of the system. Originally, I was a believer in the present system of election of the Municipal Council. To-day I am a convert to the system of election by wards. There is an old saying, that everybody's business is nobody's business. That is the position in theCouncil. These gentlemen are elected by the whole city, and equally by all parts of the city. It is nobody's business to look after any particular part of the town. I think that has much to do with the lack of interest shown in Municipal affairs. If you had the ward system, it would be much easier in the first place for a candidate to run an election. He would only have to go to the peop'e in his own particular section, and would be primarily responsible to them for his work. But to-day the Council are elected by the whole city. If any particular Councillor attends to demands made on him, as soon as it becomes known that this particular Councillor is the man to go to, the result is that the man gets all the work of the Council, and the others are not bothered. It is merely putting the work on one or two shoulders, whilst others may be indifferent. This is not right, and some improvement is necessary. I hope that before the next election of Municipal Councillors we will have the ward system again in vogue. Then there will be some man responsible to the people of each section of the city. If we revert to that system, I be'ieve we will have our city better attended to, and more satisfactory all round. I think it very unfortunate that so little interest is taken in Municipal affairs, especially by the large land-owners. It is the business and the duty of every citizen to look after the interests of his city, as he would his own house or his own business. In improving the city, he is improving his own property; he is making his home more attractive. Take, for instance, some of our principal streets. Duckworth and New Gower Streets should, I think, be paved from one end to the other, and the property owners on these streets should pay the greater part of the cost. It is right for them to do so; for it would be improving their property 25 or 30 per cent. Why should the citizens, generally, pay the total cost to pave the streets to increase the value of people's property on these particular streets? Again, until these two streets are paved, we will

never get a clean Water Street. The water and drainage running down from above washes down the mud that is made on these upper streets on to Water Street, making it as bad as the others. The first long step in the improvement of St. John's will be the paving of Duckworth Street and New Gower Street. A few years ago when I was in New York I visited the works of a large asphalt paving company. I went to see their pavings in the different parts of the city, and I was particularly struck with the efficient and splendid value they gave, and the condition of their work ; not only under light traffic, but under the heavy traffic of lower New York it had lasted in some cases for 14 or 15 years without repairs, and then the cost of repairs was light. A pavement like that on Duckworth Street and New Gower Street, from the east to the west end fire hall, would cost $100,000, or, say, $4,000 a year for interest. It is well worth the Councillors' while to take this up ; I am quite sure that the money would be forthcoming. It is necessary, before we can do much for Municipal improvement, to get our main streets clean and decent. The foregoing may also appiy to the paving of Water Street West. We are advertising the country, and not advertising ourselves or our city. If we could only instill into the Council some of the progressive ideas which the Premier has instilled into the Government, we would soon see a vast change for the better. As regards the expenditure of the Council, of course it is generally understood that that is increasing every year. Whilst the revenue is increasing, the. expenses are increasing faster. But I do not know whether it is very well spent. That is the question which strikes every citizen. Are we getting a good return for our money ? I have no doubt the Council are doing their best, but are they working right, and are the different departments being properly administered ? Are all the offiicals of the Council doing what they are paid for ? That has long been the question in my mind ; and there is only one way we can decide it. Many of the officials are good men, but perhaps they are not acquainted with the latest and most modern methods of doing things. Are they running in old grooves, and not getting the best results from modern methods ? I think it would be in the interest of the city to get an expert here from the United States or from Canada, to give a general report as to our whole machinery; then we would get an idea whether we were geting good value for every dollar. But if we ever reach that state, I hope the city will be more fortunate than the Council I was a member of, when building the new water works. I refer to the engagement of Mr. Gault, the engineer in charge of that work. I have nothing to say against Mr. Galt, personally ; but it is the first time that I have had an opportunity to express my opinion as to how that work was carried on. I think, when he came here first, he made an estimate of $80,000 to $100,000 for the new water works. The Council took the matter up and provided the money ; the Government of the day undertook to advance the money, viz., $100,000. I might tell you, Mr. Chairman, that,

whilst negotiations were going on for Mr. Galt's services, certain rumors as to his capabilities came to the ears of the Council. Enquiries were made, and they were not satisfactory. I went to Halifax shortly after this and met Mayor Shea there, and, in company with him, interviewed the Mayor and the City Engineer of Halifax as to Mr. Galt. They said they had heard that he had made some blunders in some of his work. They made enquiries for us in Wolfville, N. S., and were told that Galt's work there was not satisfactory. The engineer of Sydney told me he did not know anything about Galt, but he had heard the waterworks he built at Springhill were a failure. At the suggestion of the City Engineer of Halifax, I went to Toronto, and interviewed Mr. Willias Chipman, of that city. Mr. Chipman is one of the most expert civil engineers in Canada, at the head of his profession ; and he was willing to come to Newfound land on terms similar to those asked by Mr. Galt. When I returned I found that though the Council had asked me to do this work, which I had done gratuitously, as thoroughly as I could, I found Galt had been engaged in my absence to carry on the contract. Nothing was said to me on my return, and I was never asked for a report, although I wired what I had heard. I contend that engaging him cost the city $50,000 more than was estimated. His estimate was $80,000 to $100,000, and the cost was $150,000. And the reason was that he did not seem to appreciate the nature of what was required. He said the rock cut near the lake would not require to be covered in. That idea was ridiculed by Councillors Ellis and Kennedy, both practical contractors. He said the compensating basin would not require to be covered, but he found that he had made another error. He placed all the old pipes in the valley which is crossed just before the line comes into town. To take old pipes from a place where they were under no pressure, and place them where the greatest pressure was, is ridiculous. Of course, they burst all over the place. Our own City Engineer was in no way responsible for these errors, as he was directly under the supervision of Mr. Galt. If the Council, therefore, get a Municipal expert, they should take good care that they get a good and reliable one. I express my ideas as a representative of St. John's, not only of the external parts of the district, but also of the city ; and I think that when anything occurs to me that is in the interest of the city, it is my duty to express it. We have had too much indifference and too much laxity, although the city is growing in importance and increasing every day, yet public opinion seems to lay dormant. Let us put our shoulders to the wheel, and do all we can to improve the centre and capital of the Island. I am sure that every member of this House, whether he be a city or an outport member, will always be ready and anxious to help us in this. I do not suppose that there is one representative in this House but takes an interest in St. John's. It is the capital of the Island, and I am sure that every district in the Island would be glad to see anything done to improve the city. I am very much obliged to the Hon.

Prime Minister for giving me the opportunity of uttering these few remarks concerning the affairs of the city, which I have the honor to represent in this House.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Bill with some amendment.

Ordered : That this report be received and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into Commitee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act further to amend 'The Crown Lands Act, 1903.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, when we were in Committee before on this Bill the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Clift, drew the attention of the Committee to section 10. I promised him that I would consider it and rectify it, and it is now simply proposed to strike out the words "Governor in Council."

MR. KENT—I think that will leave you in exactly the same position as before. If the Minister were simply to apply the provisions of the Crown Lands Act of 1903, it would accomplish the purpose, and you would not have a different state of law applying to forfeited lands and to lands which have not been granted. That is the difficulty I pointed out last evening.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—That is exactly what the section amended does. The effect of this section is simply to leave this land exactly the same as other Crown Lands.

MR. KENT—There is only one objection. Under the present law a man who discovers can go down and demand a license as a matter of right. You are now giving the power to withhold such a license. That is the distinction I pointed out during the last sitting of the Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and passed the Bill with some amendment.

On the motion for the adoption of this report, the House divided, when there appeared in favor of it : Hons. Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Hon. Mr. Emerson, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Bennett, Devereux, Howley, Goodison, Kennedy, F. Morris, Murphy, Parsons and Seymour (16) ; and against it : Messrs. Kent, Clapp, Gear, Roberts and Shea (5).

So it passed in the affirmative, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 'The Motor Vehicle Act, 1906.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

HON. PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, since we last met I have had this Bill reprinted with a view of meeting the suggestions of the Committee. It will be remember-

ed that Mr. Bennett pointed out section 1 shou'd be confined to motor cars, the owners of which reside or operate such cars within the town of St. John's, and that was agreed to by Mr. Kent. That amendment has been made ; and also after the word " cars " in the third line the words " Motor Cycles " have been added. All the other sections are the same down to section 8. That has been amended merely on account of the amendment in section 1. Then section 9 has been amended as regards the distribution of fines. It was pointed out by several members that it would only be fair that a certain portion of the amount collected should be spent in repairs to bridges, etc., in the district where these cars go. Now it is proposed to amend the schedule by inserting the words " provided that only one half of the above fee shall—"

I think the Committee will see that it is hardly fair to heavily tax cab men for driving motor cars. I understand there are three or four this year and I think it is only reasonable to give them an abatement as regards the fee to be paid. That, of course, is a matter for the Committee to decide, as to whether they think one-half is sufficient or whether a little more or less should be paid.

MR. SHEA—I am sorry the Premier thought it necessary to amend clause 9, because if you divide up this tax in any way the money that will be distributed in the several districts will be so infinitesimal that lt will amount to nothing. I understand that this tax has merely been imposed for revenue purposes, and not in the sense of a tax for the use of the roads. What the hon. member for Trinity has said is perfectly true. Certainly the owner of these cars use the outport roads, and if they do any damage they should be made pay for it. But as far as the Council is concerned they tax motor car owners the same way as they tax steamship owners. Motor car owners can afford this tax, and I think it is a fair way of raising money, but don't put it in the sense of a return for using the roads. I was under the impression that this section was going to stay as it was. If these people use the roads it a question for this House to take up and ask themselves if these people will pay for it. They ought to be made pay for any damage they do, but I don't think it should be taken out of the Council's taxes.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —I agree with the hon. member for St. John's East in his remarks as regards the damage done by these cars in travelling over the outport roads. Our small bridges are not built to conted with the heavy pressure that is brought to bear upon them by these cars, and we are not in a position to build bridges that will stand the pressure. But the point to which I wish to refer is the speed at which these cars travel. I am not altogether conversant with the limit of speed, whether it be 12 or 15 or 20 miles an hour, but I am sure that those in charge of these cars when outside the city limits have no regard whatever for the damage they do or the rate of speed they run, or for those who may be on the roads. When those chaffeurs meet our people from Kelligrews with loads of hay or wool, they have no regard whatever for them. I think a penalty should be imposed on the chaf-

feurs or owners of cars when they exceed the speed limit as in other countries, where they are made liable for the damage they do if they run a mile beyond the speed limit on the suburban roads. The same thing should apply here, whether the owners are driving for hire or for family purposes, for outings, etc. We are trying to keep up those roads in the best way we can with the limited means at our disposal, and the Government will have to wake up to the fact that the grants will have to be increased, or the owners of these cars brought to account. The tax may be considered severe, but I say double the amount or you will have to increase the amount of the grants for roads in the districts round the city.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I agree with what has been said by my friend and colleague of St. John's East, Mr. Shea. I pointed out on the last evening when we were considering this Bill that when fixing this tax the City Council only had regard to its own requirements and to the attainment of its own object, and were not considering the matter outside the city limits. If it is desirable to imposed a charge upon the owners of motor cars in connection with damage to bridges and roads outside the city, then the Government should do it. It is entirely different from this one and should be kept distinct. The Council in making their estimates had before them their own necessities, and now we in this Committee propose to divide it and take half of that estimate. It may be desirable to tax those motors for damage outside the city, but when the Council were considering this estimate they were not thinking of dividing it. There is no question about it that in some instances damage has been done to roads and bridges, and many people have suffered considerably by reason of the abuse of the road by these motor cars. I have known instances, both in St. John's East and West, where people have suffered loss by injury to their horses and carts and even to themselves. There is a generality of risks on the road, and people are prepared to take the ordinary risks. But people ought to be guarded in some way from these cars, which I look upon as an extraordinary risk. I must say I agree with my friend, Mr. Shea, in his remarks about dividing the money.

HON. MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, before the Act goes through I would like to place myself on record as being in accord with it. I consider in the first place that the time has arrived, in fact it arrived some years ago, when something should be done in some way to lessen the dust from these motor cars. Now, the law as it stands at present is that these cars must not run at a speed over 12 miles an hour within the town limits. The law is not being carried out. Everyone sees daily that that law is absolutely disregarded, and the lives of our citizens, and especially of our children, are being jeopardized. I am glad to see, sir, some attempt made to derive some revenue from these people. It is only right that they should be made to recognize that there are others with equal rights of road, and they should be made to treat pedestrians and horses with equal rights as they themselves exercise

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, just one word in refe-rence to this section. When it was proposed to the Committee that a division should take place between the city and the districts into which these cars run, I did not object to the principle, but I pointed out that the amount that would be divided between the dis-tricts would be so small, so in-finitesimal if allocated in the usual way per capita, that it would be hardly worth while dividing it. But now the amendment that is proposed gives to the Governor in Council power to expend the money on any special damage that may occur. In other words, if damage takes place, say, in Pla-centia Bay or Conception Bay, or on any other of the roads, any special damage, then part of this fund may be fairly allocated. I do not altogether agree with the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Shea, in his remarks that there is no distinction between this tax and the steamship tax. There is quite a distinction. In the first place, a steamship tax is a port tax, and practically is in no way a municipal tax, but here un-der arrangement with the Gov-ernment it has been made a muni-cipal tax, while in other countries it goes with the general revenue. The general principle that this should go to the city is that the ship comes in here, takes water, has the advantage of all our city arrangements, their crews and passengers share in the advan-tages of our municipality, our parks, roads, etc., This tax on motors will probably grow as such a tax is bound to grow. In some countries it is more a tax for revenue purposes. In Eng-land they are paying £60, or nearly $300 for their cars, and that goes into the general reve-nue. Here, the Municipal Coun-cil want to tax the cars operating within the city limits. Half of this we want to keep. Now these cars only use one or two of the principal streets. They do not use the smaller streets at all, and the only time they use the strets is to go out into the coun-try. Outside the city they do a lot of damage. But at present there is a law. The 1906 Act is a very stringent one, and if these chaffeurs and drivers over-run the speed limit they should be pro-secuted. The Municipal Council have large powers under the Mu-nicipal Act, powers named in the Act, and powers to make regula-tions. In addition to this, there is the ordinary common law of right. This has not been taken away by this statute, and every-one has the right to be protected against abuses of the law, at Com-mon Law, and under the Motor Car Act and other Acts dealing with the matter,—Nuisance Act, Municipal Regulations, and other Acts,—and if these are properly enforced the public ought to be fairly protected. The districts of St. John's East and West, Har-bor Main, Conception Bay, Pla-centia Bay and Trinity Bay all the districts will share alike in this money, and later when we open up the road form St. John's to Burin, Fortune Bay and Bona-vista Bay, the other districts will share in the advantage of this tax ; and by taking some of it to the general revenue, all will participate in the advantages. I have not had the opportunity of a conference with the Mayor, but I do not think he will consi-der himself unfairly treated in

what we are asking for. My former objection was the difficulty of allocating, but now, where any damage takes place, the Governor in Council can fairly allocate a certain sum.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and passed the Bill with some amendment.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture & Mines, the House resolved itself into Committee ofthe Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend the law relating to the Encouragement of Agriculture."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and passed the Bill without amendment.

Ordered : that this report be received and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting certain Retiring Allowances."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Bill without amendment.

Ordered : that this report be received and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up, entitled "An Act respecting the sale of seeds," without amendment.

Mr. Speaker also informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled, "An Act respecting the Esquimaux and Indians resident in Labrador," with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of the Hon. Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Clapp gave notice of question.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice of motion.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 14th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 14.

The House met at three p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

MR. GOODISON—I beg leave to present a petition from the Carbonear Agricultural Society on the subject of killing of cattle on the railway line. This petition is numerously signed by the

electors of my district and I am thoroughly in accord with its request and strongly support its prayer. Similar petitions were presented yesterday in this House from the districts of Harbor Grace and Port de Grave and the remarks made then by the hon. members presenting those petitions apply equally to the one I now have the honor to present. The mode of getting payment for cattle killed or maimed on the track is, at it stands at present, most unsatisfactory. Cattle are killed or injured and it is almost impossible to get a settlement without taking legal proceedings and our law abiding people are decidedly adverse to such action, sir. I trust the Attorney General to whose Department I ask that this petition be referred, will give the matter his serions attention and that some amendment to the present law will be made at no distant date, which will ensure to my constituents a prompt settlement for any damage done them.

MR. DOWNEY—I have been asked by the hon. member for Port de Grave to present a petition similar to the one just presented by Mr. Goodison. I would ask that this petition be referred for consideration to the Department to which it relates. I am also entrusted with a petition from Lark Harbor and Bay of Islands asking that gasolene engines and lubricants in connection with them be placed on the free list. I have no doubt that the granting of this request by the Government will give an impetus to the use of gasolene power in connection with the fishery, not alone in the district of Bay St. George but in all the other districts of the country. I have also a petition from the people of St. George's, very largely and influentially signed, asking for a small sum of money to provide a water power to operate a stave sawing machine which the people there propose using in common, and which would be of great advantage to them in the prosecution of the herring fishery I have also a petition from Great Codroy similar to the one which I presented a few days ago asking that provision be made to construct a bridge across the river.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Mockbeggar asking for the sum of $150 for the construction of a road. This new road is necessary to connect Mockbeggar with the railway, and I would ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Public Works for consideration.

Ordered, that these petitions be received and referred to the Departments to which they relate.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting Old Age Pensions.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, in submitting these Resolutions for your consideration I feel that I am doing so to a sympathetic audience. I do not feel that it will be necessary to adduce any argument to this Committee in favor of Old Age Pensions, and that really the only questions

that we shall have to seriously consider are, (1) Where the money is to come from ; and (2) The selection of the parties to whom the Pension is to be paid.

Modern conditions of industry do not favor the aged. Work is driven faster, and needs more nerve ; and changing conditions continually displace the old. The community gains, but the old men suffer, and hence their claim to special consideration. The case of old women is often as strong, for they may spend lives of utmost utility, without hardly any opportunity of putting by a dollar for themselves. There are thousands of old people in Newfoundland to-day who are in want, through no fault of their own, but by reason of the fact that owing to our industrial system, the amount of uncertainty in connection with our great fishing industry, from time to time, they were never in a position to put by anything for their old age, and they counted themselves fortunate when they were able to pay their way and make both ends meet. In the great majority of cases it is not idleness which has brought them to their present condition, as many can be seen working daily who, if not driven to it by grim necessity, should have given up toil years ago, and be in the enjoyment of a comfortable old age after having borne the heat and burden of the day for so long.

In dealing with this question of Old Age Pensions one cannot but be confronted with the fact that the riches of the world are not equally divided ; that the profits of industrial enterprises, the profits from the partnership of capital and labor, are not evenly distributed. It is quite true that capital in the development of our industrial resources often takes great risks, so also does the laboring man ; and if thousands have been lost in the fisheries of Newfoundland as a result of the supplying system, so too has many a hungry home been created, and many a cheerless old age been left unprovided for. Thousands of our people go to the fishery, year after year, and work harder in their search for fish than their more fortunate brothers who obtain a good catch. The tragedy of want and age is one of the saddest problems that those responsible for the public administration of the Colony have to deal with. The tendency of modern times is to grapple with this problem and lessen its effects as much as possible.

"Rattle his bones over the stones,
He's only a pauper that nobody owns,"

is a sentiment that no longer exists. In Newfoundland in the past the deserving aged have been, to a certain extent, relieved under the head of what is known as pauper relief, but this relef has been, of necessity, partial in character, as first, the revenues of the Colony do not permit our being able to pay anything that would be appreciable ; and secondly, thousands of our people would rather die than have their names inscribed on the poor relief roll, and become what is termed "paupers." There must be in Newfoundland a very large proportion of aged persons who, notwithstanding what is being done in this direction, are in a condition bordering upon want, if not actual want.

As I have already stated, we are shortening the industrial life at both ends. This is quite right and commendable, so far as the child-labor part of the problem goes, but it militates at the other end against the men, who, while they might hardly be termed "old" have come to an age when their nerves will no longer respond to the strain of modern industrial methods. Consequently they are thrown out of employment, and their condition is then pitiful indeed. With no means to fall back upon, without even the mere animal or physical comforts, bereft of shelter, warmth and food, they have to fall back upon their neighbors for support, after expending the best of their energy and manhood upon the fluctuating fortunes of the fisheries. Very many, too, have added to their miserable condition the ravages of disease, which they will carry to their grave, while others may have suffered similarly for a life time, and together with the destitution of their old age, are permanently invalided and incapacitated from work even if it were offering.

This Old Age Pension scheme must not be regarded in any sense as a tax upon our people. The Government should be regarded merely as the machinery for collecting the contributions of the public towards a fund for the aged and worn-out laborers, mechanics and fishermen of the Colony. It is one of our obligations as citizens, and is merely a contribution towards the general welfare of the people, as we contribute for any other national need, and we should regard it as a sort of filial duty devolving upon us to keep in comfort those who have worn themselves out in the service of the country. Why do we tax ourselves for education, for lighthouses, for mail services, and other public utilities? I feel that I echo the sentiments of every man in the community capable of contributing towards this fund when I say that we will no longer see the old people in want but will do everything possible to alleviate and relieve their present destitute condition, so that they may not be deprived of the ordinary comforts of life in their declining years.

Several schemes have been discussed and thought out the past century: in fact, there are hundreds of different schemes and proposals regarding Old Age Pensions What is known as the Universal scheme is the one that at one time found most favor in England. The object was to afford Old Age Pensions from the State to all who attained a certain age. All who are old enough share alike, the only necessary qualification demanded being the attainment by the applicant of an age generally put at 65 years. It is the most costly of all the schemes, and therefore is not considered feasible. It confers pensions on people who do not need them, which is bad in policy and wasteful in practice. It is simply distributing the moneys ofthe State indiscriminately on no principle of justice. To become qualified for the receipt of a pension the person has to do nothing but grow old. It is calculated that if such a system were put in force in England it would cost somewhere in the neighborhood of £30,000,000 annually. Another scheme is that known as the Chaplin Committee scheme,

whereby all old people who, by general agreement, are regarded as most deserving of State assistance, shall receive a pension. In other words, the deserving poor, who are in want, are relieved by this means. From these and other similar schemes a system has been recently evolved embodying the principle that all persons having an income of more than ten shillings per week should be excluded from the benefits of pensions. In other words, pensions were given the poor to the exclusion of those more comfortably situated. Running through the system is the desire to grant the pensions to the necessitous aged only, and to provide them with the minimum sum required to maintain their existence. It is on this principle that the French pension system of 1905, and the Victoria, Australia, systems are based.

Some advocates of pension schemes go further, and say that pensions should be a reward for those who have borne the burdens of the State in their earlier years, and that pensions should not be restricted to those really necessitous. They have grown old in bearing the burdens of the State, and accordingly the State should bear some of their burdens when they become old and feeble. In the preamble to the New Zealand Pensions Act of 1898 it is laid down that "It is equitable "that deserving persons who, "during the prime of life have "helped to bear the public bur-"dens of the Colony, by the pay-"ment of taxes and the opening "up of resources by their labor "and skill, should receive from "the Colony a pension in their old "age."

In New Zealand, New South Wales and Denmark the pension schemes are conducted according to this principle, to reward the deserving poor, but none of the nations have yet proceeded so far as to adopt the Universal system. In New Zealand, for instance, the applicant for a pension must have reached the age of 65 years; he must be poor; his income must not reach $200 a year; he must be sober and reputable; he must never have deserted his wife and children; he must never have been imprisoned; and, while in receipt of his pension, he still retains all his rights of citizenship. In New South Wales and Denmark the systems are practically the same. It is not easy to lay down a definite principle to guide one in the establishment of Old Age Pensions. Should a system confine itself to those who are in want? Or should it go further and reward the aged, deserving poor? Or go still further and reward the whole of the aged population, leaving out only those who are wealthy, but including those who, though not in want, have hardly all that is necessary for their old age?

It is essentially a work in which we should proceed cautiously, and step by step. The most urgent cases should be first relieved. Then again one is confronted with a difficulty as to the organization and administration of the pensions. Considerable pains have to be taken to keep old age pensions as far removed as possible from the administration of the relief of the poor. In many countries they are kept rigidly apart. It is of the utmost importance that no taint of pau-

perism should be attached to old age pensions, and that the receipt of a pension should not be regarded as relief, but merely as a reward of toil and effort, carrying with it no disability. It should be regarded as a sort of annuity or allowance earned by a lifetime of toil, and entitling the receiver to all rights of citizenship. On the other hand the taxpayer has to be protected. The claim of every applicant for a pension must be thoroughly investigated, as well as the manner in which they are to be paid, so that advantage will not be taken of these people by those who would impose upon them by anticipating their pensions and giving them credit. In other countries this is accomplished by local committees : by the utilization of post offices and telegraph offices, in order that the system may be perfected as much as possible. As I say, it is difficult, in a country like this, without any machinery and in which there are districts containing as many as 160 settlements, to devise a scheme that could be as perfect as one could wish. What then would be a practicab'e scheme for Newfound land ? The Resolutions which I shall propose to the Committee outline a plan which would, I think, work satisfactory in this Colony.

Of course it will take time to evolve anything like a perfect scheme but that will only be repeating the history of all our public utilities and institutions. An illustration of this will be afforded by a comparison of our splendid educational system of today with the system which prevailed forty years ago both as to cost and efficiency. The same is also true of our telegraph, postal, lighthouse and railway systems. Human effort cannot progress as rapidly as human aspiration. Rome was not built in a day. But by gradual improvement and continual effort we may hope to perfect the Old Age Pension system. We are all anxious, we are all desirous, to do what is right by the people, and it is only a question of being able to carry out their views, and meet their wishes.

It may be of interest to the Committee to have a brief statement of the various systems at present in operation in other countries.

In 1908 the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain passed their Old Age Pension Act. On September 30th, 1909, 682,768 Old Age Pensions had been granted at a cost of £6,063,658, thus :

	Paid in Pensions.	No. Pensioners Sept. 30, 1909.
England and Wales.....	£3,672,747	431,432
Scotland	667,007	75,134
Ireland	1,723,904	186,202
	£6,063,658	682,768

The Act confers a right to an Old Age Penson on every man or woman, whether married or single, who satisfies the pension authorities that he fulfils the statutory conditions for the receipt of a pension, and is not subject to any of the disqualifications im-

posed by the Act. The statutory conditions which have to be fulfilled to entitle a person to a pension are :

(1) He must have attained the age of 70.

(2) He must satisfy the pension authorities tha for at least twenty years up to the date of the receipt of any sum on account of a pension he has been a British subject, and has had his residence, as defined by the regulations, in the United Kingdom.

(3) He must satisfy the pension authorities that his yearly means, as calculated under the Act, do not exceed £31 10s.

The Act provides that in calculating the means of a person for the purpose of the Act, account must be taken of :

1. The income which the person may reasonably expect to receive in cash during the succeeding year, that income, in the absence of other means for ascertaining it, being taken to be the income actually received during the preceding year.

2. The yearly value of any advantage accruing from the use or enjoyment of property and the yearly value of any benefit or privilege enjoyed.

3. The yearly income which might be expected to be derived from property which is capable of investment or profitable use, but is not invested or properly used.

The procedure to be followed by a claimant for an Old Age Pension, and the method of dealing with a claim, is this : A form of claim may be obtained at any post office, and in it the claimant is required to state his full name and postal address, occupation, sex, whether married, or single, widower or widow, age, date of birth, and place where born, whether the claimant is a British subject and has lived for the last twenty years in the United Kingdom, and certain particulars as to his means.

The claimant must sign the form, or, if he cannot write, make his mark, and his signature or mark must be witnessed by some other person. A postmaster is required to give any necessary information and assistance to a person desiring to make a claim. The claims may be handed in at the post office at which the claimant wishes the pension to be paid, for transmission to the pension officer, or be sent to the pension officer by the claimant.

Scale of Pensions.

The amount of pension payable to a person is calculated on his means, and is on the following scale :

5s. a week where his means do not exceed £21 per annum.

4s. a week where his means exceed £21 but do not exceed £23.12.6.

3s. a week where his means exceed £23.12.6 but not exceed £26.5.

2s. a week where his means exceed £26.5 but not exceed £28.17.6.

1s. a week where his means exceed £28.17.6 but not exceed £31.10.

Old Age Pensions in other Countries.

There are at present State pensions in force in Denmark, Belgium, France, Germany, New Zealand and Australia, and in Canada an annuitant or Old Age Pension system. The German

scheme in contributory, and the Belgian one is partly so ; in the other countries the schemes are non-contributory.

DENMARK.

Persons of 60 who are unable to maintain themselves, are entitled to a pension, which is really an old age relief. This relief entails no loss of civil rights. It is settled and distributed by the poor relief authorities and about one half of the cost is repaid by the State. The number of pensioners increased from 43,826 on January 1st, 1893, to 66,878 on January 1st, 1905, while the annual cost rose from £135,891 in 1892 to £376,814 in 1905. The relief is given in cash, or in kind, or by free board-residence.

FRANCE.

A scheme adopted in 1905 provides for the assistance of the aged, infirm, and incurable who are without resources. Relief is given either at the person's home or institutions. The cash allowance varies from 5 francs to 20 francs per month. The cost is met by the Communes and Department, with a subvention from the State. The number assisted in 1907 was 340,610, and the estimated number for 1909 is 495,000. The cost for 1907 was £1,961,980 and for 1909 it is estimated at £3,760,000.

BELGIUM.

Two systems of pensions are in force. One is a contributory system under which the working classes are encouraged to pay money into a fund which, assisted by State contributions, provides an annuity at the age of 65. The maximum annuity is 1,200 francs ($48), but the amount depends upon the sums paid into the fund by the contributor.

A person invalided earlier than 65 may draw his annuity at a reduced rate ; but persons who are permanently incapacitated by injury arising out of their employment may draw the full annuity. Friendly societies are affiliated to the fund. The other scheme provides a free pension of 65 francs (£2.12) per annum, for indigent workers on reaching the age of 65.

GERMANY.

In Germany there are three methods of State assurance, viz.: Accident Insurance, State Insurance, and Invalidity and Old Age Assurance.

(1) Accident Insurance—This system provides compensation in case of workmen, for injury or death resulting from their employment. In case of death, burial expenses and allowances to dependent relatives are paid. The contributions are assessed on the employers.

(2) Sick Insurance for workworkmen and employees with salaries up to £100. The funds are derived, two-thirds from employees and one-third from employers. Under this system medical treatment, sick pay, and burial are provided for.

(3) Invalidity and Old Age Insurance—This is compulsory on all wage-earners with salaries under £100. Employers and employees each contribute one-half of the funds, and the State contributes 50 marks (£2.10) for each annuity. To receive an Old Age Pension a person must be 70 years old. The amount paid to the insured under the Accident Insurance has increased from

£1,015,766 in 1890 to £7,221,843 in 1906 ; and the amount paid under the other two forms of insurance has increased from £2,994,691 in 1897 to £8,301,957 in 1906. Of this last sum £5,864,076 was contributed by insurers and employers, and £2,437,889 by the State. The total sum paid in 1907 as compensation and pensions was thus £15,523,800.

NEW ZEALAND.

Old Age Pensions of £18 per annum were provided by the Act of 1896, the amount being increased to £26 per annum in 1905. To be qualified for a pension a person must be 65, and have resided continuously in the Colony for 25 years ; he must not have been imprisoned, or have deserted his wife, and must have lived a sober life for the last five years. A deduction of £1 from the full £25 is made :

1. For every £1 of income over £34 ; and

2. For every £10 of accumulated property.

In 1906 there were 13,582 pensioners, of whom 11,915 were Europeans, and 667 Maoris. The cost of the pensions is defrayed by the Government.

AUSTRALIA.

Old Age Pensions are provided by the States of New South Wales and Victoria. In the former State the system is similar to that in force in New Zealand, the main difference being that persons under 65 but over 60 are entitled to a pension if incapacitated by sickness or injury from earning their live'ihood. In Victoria the pension is 8 shillings a week only, and a person of 65 may receive a lower pension, or be refused a pension altogether if he appears capable of partially or wholly earning his living. In 1905 there were 11,055 pensioners in Victoria ; as against 20,737 in New South Wales.

CANADA.

What is being done in Canada in relation to Old Age Pensions ? In Canada they have an Act dealing with Old Age Pensions. It enables every industrious man in the country to provide, at an easy rate, and at small cost to the State, a reasonable annuity for his support at an advanced state of life. There they merely help. In other words, it is a contributory system. When a man comes of age, he can put aside, if he so choose, the earnings of one or one and one-half hours per week, or one and one-half days per month and the State will guarantee him, on his attaining the age of 60 years, an annuity of $120 a year ; or at 65 of $200. This scheme is bound to appeal to the thrifty and industrious.

The first outstanding feature about the scheme is the fact that nobody is debarred from its benefits who is willing to make the small sacrifice necessary to pay the required contributions. The returns that come to the people from this scheme are not called old age pensions, but Government annuities. In order to secure the benefit of an annuity, a person must pay in a certain amount, and this may be done in instalments, or in a lump sum, and it may be done at any age. Whether a person be five years of age or fifty whether he pays a lump sum or instalments, the total amount he has to pay in is the same. There is no charge of any kind.

On the contrary, compound interest at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum is paid on money received.

Then ,again, a person cannot be deprived of the annuity in any manner, by any person, or by any process of law. A man may provide for annuities for himself, his wife or his children ; he may provide for a joint annuity for himself and wife. An immediate annuity may be purchased, and the first instalment received three months after purchase. In case of death before the annuity becomes payable all payments made, with interest, will be returned to the heirs. Except for invalidity or disablement, no annuity is payable before the age of 55 years. Here are some figures showing at a glance the benefits of the scheme:

PRESENT AGE 20—ANNUITY AT 60.

$100 is the income from $2,000 invested at 5 p.c.; $100 annuity will cost 3 cents a day, $10.01 a year, a total of $400.40.

$200 is the income from $4,000 invested at 5 p.c.; $200 annuity will cost5½ cents a day, $20.02 a year, or a total of $800.80.

$300 is the income from $6,000 invested at 5 p.c.; $300 annuity will cost 8¼ cents a day, 30.03 a year, a total of $1,201.20.

$400 is the income from $8,000 invested at 5 p.c.; $400 annuity will cost 11 cents a day, $40.04 a year, a total of $1,601.60.

$500 is the income from $10,000 invested at 5 p.c.; $500 annuity will cost 13 2-3 cents a day, $50.05 a year, a total of $2,002.00.

$600 is the income from $12,000 invested at 5 p.c.; $600 annuity will cost 16½ cents a day, $60.06 a year, a total of $2,402.40.

LOOK AT IT ANOTHER WAY.

$400.40 gives you an annuity of	$100.00
$400.00 invested at 5 p.c. gives an income of	20.00
$800.80 gives you an annuity of	200.00
$800.00 invested at 5 p.c. gives an income of	40.00
$1,201.20 gives you an annuity of	300.00
$1,200 invested at 5 p.c. gives you an income of	60.00
$1,601.60 gives you an annuity of	400.00
$1,600.00 invested at 5 p.c. gives you an income of	80.00
$2,002.00 gives you an annuity of	500.00
$2,000.00 invested at 5 p.c. gives an income of	100.00
$2,402.40 gives an annuity of	600.00
$2,400.00 invested at 5 p.c. gives an income of	120.00

Any person, of any age from 5 to 84 is eligible, the plan to enter being simply the obtaining of a card from a postmaster, and filling out the questions thereon. If the poorest wage earner in Canada starts his boy at 7 years of age and pays 25 cents a week until he is 17, and then asked him to pay it regularly until he was 65 years of age, he will then finish paying and receive an annuity of $600 for the rest of his life. If a father who has $500 to leave to his boy, 15 years of age, instead of giving it to him in one lump sum, at the age of 21 places it in some system like this, it will give him an annuity of $323 for his life after 65. The great attrac-

tion about the scheme is that there is no failure ; everything a man pays comes back to him in some form. If he dies before reaching the age at which he would receive his annuity, his heirs would get what he had paid in. In other words, it is what is termed an annuity, and is not a pension. An annuity is a purchase ; a pension is a gift. It is merely a plan of State Insurance, upon which the applicant pays his weekly or monthly or yearly premium. The only cost to the State is the cost of administration. Of course there are some who wou'd say that there was no demand for the article. That is true, because it is not on the market. Once on the market the demand wil' appear. This shows that the Canadians have not a system of Old Age Pensions in the sense in which that term is understood in other countries, but they have an admirable system of Old Age Annuities. It is true that these annuities come from the savings of the annuitant instead of from the State, but the system offers substantial advantages. The Dominion Government pays the entire cost of the management. There are no licenses or fees. Any applicant that ceases payment of his contribution for a time knows that what he pays in will be returned with 4 per cent. interest. He may resume payment when he pleases, or paying in a sum which his means and inclination will allow. Here is an example : If a man aged 20 will pay to the Government 50 cents per week, from 20 till the time he is 60, a total of $26.00 a year, or a grand total during the forty years of only $1,040, the Government wil' pay him for the remainder of his life $259.82, a return each year of one-quarter the entire amount paid and if he lives to be 80 he will have been paid $5,000, or five times more than he paid in, or the interest on $5,200 at 5 per cent. There is no reason in the world why this system of annuities should not go hand in hand with our Old Age Pension scheme as a complete and independent service, so that those desiring to avail of it may do so.

The Government are now making full enquiries into the system with a view of seeing if the principle cannot be adopted in this country.

History of Old Age Pensions in Newfoundland.

The earliest public mention of Old Age Pensions in Newfoundland, I think (I say this under correction) was during the election of 1897, when it was advocated during the elections in some of the districts, particularly by one of the leaders of the then Opposition, Mr. A. B. Morine. The Government that was elected to power in that year took no action in the matter, probably due to the finances of the Colony not warranting the necessary expenditure.

In March, 1906, however, nearly ten years later, Mr. Morine, then leader of the Opposition, brought it forward again. Thescheme that he advocated was much on the lines of the systems in vogue in Denmark, Germany, Australia and New Zealand. He proposed to give a pension to all the old men in the Colony from 65 years of age upwards. He went on the basis that there were in the Colony 1,897 males from 65

to 70 ; 1,257 from 70 to 75 ; 818 from 75 to 80, and above 80 years of age, 603. Altogether there was a total of 4,605 males or old men above the age of 65.

He proposed to allow them pensions on the following scale :

65 years to 70.....	$40
70 years to 75.....	50
Above age of 75.....	60

or an average pension of $50 each.

This would equal an expenditure of about $225,400 a year. From this amount, however, it was argued that $25,400 could be deducted as representing parties who would not accept pensions, being able to support themselves, or one tenth of the total number. Out of the sum of $158,000 then being expended for Poor Relief it it was argued that $40,000 went to old men, and as these old men on the pauper list were proposed to be transferred to the pension list, it would still further reduce the sum to $160,000. Further, that the Treasury would gain in duties paid on dutiable goods from this amount about one-third so that the balance, $110,000 would be required to be raised by the Colony. The principle of this proposal met with the approval of the House, and of the Government of the day, and on motion of Mr. Morine, seconded by Capt. C. Dawe, the following Resolution was passed unanimously by the whole House.

RESOLVED—That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that means should be adopted to improve the condition of the aged poor, and for providing for those who are helpless and infirm.

FURTHER RESOLVED—That in the opinion of this House such means should include a provision for a pension for aged persons. if it be found feasible :

AND FURTHER RESOLVED—That an Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor in Council, praying that he be pleased to appoint a Commission to inquire into the subject during the approaching recess, and to report thereon.

And on a later day on motion of Mr. Morine, seconded by the Right Honorable the Premier Sir Robert Bond, the following Address was unanimously adopted :

To His Excellency
Sir William MacGregor, etc.,

May it please Your Excellency, The House of Assembly having under consideration the question of adopting means for improving the condition of the aged poor and for providing for those who are helpless and infirm, by means of pensions for aged persons, respectfully request that Your Excellency may be pleased to appoint a Commission to enquire into the subject and to report thereon to the House of Assembly.

Ordered that this Address be presented to His Excellency by such members of the House as are of His Excellency's Council.

Following on this address the Government of the day took the matter up and a Commission issued from His Excellency Sir William MacGregor, as the following will show :

Col. Secretary's Office,
November 29, 1907.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor in Council has been pleased to associate with you the

following gentlemen on a commission to consider the question of provding means for improving the condition of the aged poor, and of those who are helpless and infirm, by means of pensions, viz.: R. H. O'Dwyer, Esq., Commissioner of Public Charities; Hon. James S. Pitts, C. M. G; Hon. John Harvey, Hon. Edgar Bowring, W. B. Grieve, Esq. The Commission will be forwarded to you in due course, and I have to request that you will convene a meeting and submit the same on its receipt by you, so that the Commissioners may arrange for a consideration of the matters referred to them.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) R. BOND,
Colonial Secretary.

Hon. E. M. Jackman,
Minister Finance and Customs.

Col. Secretary's Office,
December 5, 1907.

Sir,—Referring to my letter to you, of date the 29th ult., I now beg to enclose a commission, apponting you, Hon. J. S. Pitts, C.M.G., Hon. John Harvey, Hon. E. R. Bowring, R. H. O'Dwyer, Esq., Commissioner of Public Charities, and W. B. Grieve, Esq., to be a Commission to consider the question of providing means for improving the condition of the aged poor, and those who are helpless and infirm, by means of pensions.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) ARTHUR MEWS,
Deputy Colonial Secretary.

Hon. E. M. Jackman,
Minister Finance and Customs.

[Seal.]
Sgd., Wm. MacGregor.

To the Hon. E. M. Jackman, Minister of Finance and Customs; R. H. O'Dwyer, Esq., Commissioner of Public Charities; Hon. James S. Pitts, C.M.G.; Hon. John Harvey, Hon. Edgar Bowring, W. B. Grieve, Esq.

GREETING:

Whereas in an address unanimously adopted by the Honourable House of Assembly of this Colony, on the 27th day of April, 1906, it was requested that I, the Governor, should appoint a Commission to consider the question of improving the condition of the aged poor, and of those who are helpless and infirm, by means of Pensions;

And whereas my Ministers, after taking the same into consideration, have advised the appointment of such Commission,

I do, therefore, by these Presents, appoint you, the said Honourable E. M. Jackman, R. H. O'Dwyer, Esq., Honourable Jas. S. Pitts, C.M.G., Honourable John Harvey, Honourable Edgar R. Bowring, W. B. Grieve, Esq., to be Commissioners to enquire into the said subject of improving the condition of the aged poor and of those who are helpless and infirm, by means of Pensions, and to report thereon to the Honourable House of Assembly aforesaid.

Given under my hand and seal, at the Government House, St. John's, this 3rd day of December, A.D., 1907.

By His Excellency's Command,
(Sgd.) R. BOND,
Colonial Secretary.

I understand from Mr. O'Dwyer, who, in obtaining in-

formation in relation to this matter, I have found to be most painstaking in providing the necessary information, placing at my disposal the officials of his Department as well as the records, that practica'ly nothing was done by this Commission. One or two preliminary meetings of the Commissioners were held, but beyond issuing the following circular to the Relieving Officers of the Island, no further action was taken, and after November 1907 nothing further was accomplished. The following information, which was obtained by Mr. O'Dwyer from the circular to the Relieving Officers, of the number of males and females over 65 in the various districts, and the amounts paid will be of interest.

Instruction No. 1.

Sir,—You are hereby requested to fill in the subjoined form, to be taken from your Returns for quarter ending the 31st inst.

Sign same and return to this office as early as possible.

I am, Sir, Yours, etc.,

R. H. O'DWYER,
Commissioner Public Charities.

	No.	Total Amt. Paid.	
Number of Males aged 65 years and over.....	.....	$....	....
Number of Females aged 65 years and over.....	.....	.....	....
Total.....	.....	.....	....

....

Relieving Officer.

Information furnished by the Commissioner of Public Charities, at the request of the Old Age Pension Committee, as per instructions No. 1 enclosed :

Districts.	Males 65 and over	Tl. Amt. paid per year.	Females 55 and over	Total per per year.
Bay de Verde	62	$ 846.00	131	$ 1640.00
Bonavista	103	1668.00	202	3018.00
Burgeo & LaPoile	49	792 00	83	1190.00
Burin	41	534.00	114	1579.00
Carbonear	7	101.00	68	1116.16
Ferryland	47	638.00	69	1014.00
Fogo	48	916.00	100	1880.00
Fortune Bay	34	568.60	34	1118.00
Harbor Grace	57	911.40	157	2336.80
Harbor Main	27	450.00	102	1376.00
Placentia and St. Mary's	59	1208.00	142	2654.00
Port de Grave	34	539.00	86	1307.00
St. Barbe	22	436.00	55	1052.00
St. George	18	384.00	56	1088.00
St. John's, East	14	302.40	149	2562.00
St. John's, West	29	559.20	162	2814.00
Trinity	97	1369.60	206	2254.00
Twillingate	80	1762.00	155	3290.00
Labrador	16	257.00	26	497.00
	844	$14242.20	2147	$34385.96

Total number of Males, 65 years and over	844	$14242.20
Total number of Females, 65 years and over	2147	34385.96
	2991	$48,628.16

E. & O. E.

March 10th, 1908. R. H. O'DWYER, C.P.C.

Between 1907 and 1908 the question of Old Age Pensions seems to have been entirely forgotten, as there is no record of anything having been done. In March 1908, following on the resignation ofthe leadership of the Opposition by Capt. Chas. Dawe, I was asked to assume the leadership of His Majesty's Opposition, then in the Legislature, which request was afterwards confirmed by a large majority of the electorate of both sides of politics. In accepting the position of Leader of the Opposition, in reply to this request, I announced that Old Age Pensions would be one of the planks in my platform and one of the conditions upon which I would accept the leadership. In the autumn of 1908 the present Government went to the country and the principal plank in our platform was the providing of Old Age Pensions. Here is what is contained in my Manifesto of that year :

"The providing of Old Age
"Pensions for our people is a
"matter that demands immediate
"attention, and this it shall re-
"receive at our hands. Legisla-
"tion of this character is already
"in operation in Australia, New
"Zealand, Germany and Great
"Britain. With the example of
"these countries before us, a
"feasible scheme, applicable to
"our circumstances, and one with
"in the means of the Colony, and

"not requring additional taxation "can be devised."

In the following May, when we again went to the country, the same principle was enunciated in our Manifesto, so that to-day we are merely carrying out the mandate of the people.

During the two campaigns there would not appear to have been any question by the Opposition as to the desirability of the scheme, the only question being as to whether the Colony could afford it.

In a speech delivered in the T.A. Hall, and publshed in the Evening Telegram in October, during the Autumn campaign, the Hon. John Anderson, speaking on behalf of the Bond Government, in a very able address, aimed particularly at a criticism of our policy from a financial standpoint, spoke as follows :

"Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is true Old Age Pensions are in operation in the countries I have just mentioned. In Great Britain it is only in the experimental stage, and does not come into operation untill Jan. 1st, 1909. Germany is the model country for Old Age Pensions. I am not going to weary you with figures, or the general working of Old Age Pensions in the four countries I have mentioned, but I wish to inform you here to-night that the cost is many millions of pounds sterling. But my friend, Sir Edward, in his message to the people of Newfoundland, says he will give Old Age Pensions without increasing taxation. If he is able to do this, it is more than they have been able to do in the countries he has named. Sir Edward must have a wonderful way of doing things, in fact, he must be a living financial miracle.

"What would be the cost of Old Age Pensions to the people of this country ? If you take the population of 225,000 and give a pension to one out of every sixty-five, that would mean that 3,500 old people would require to be provided for at a cost of $150 per annum, and would amount to $525,000 per annum. I believe in Old Age Pensions for the weak and worn-out among our fishermen and working men, yes, and old women, old people who have no friends to help or give them assistance should be under the care of the State in order to make them a little independent. But whether it will be the Bond or Morris Government that will take the question up, great care must be taken as to the best way to accomplish this, to my mind, one of the greatest boons to the deserving old people of a country, and to do this will require very careful consideration as to where the necessary fund can be raised, because the amount, whatever that may be, will be an annual expenditure of the Colony for all time. My friend, Sir Edward, can see his way clear to devise a way to do all this without additional taxation."

Here it will be seen that Mr. Anderson gives a pension to one out of every 65. That would mean about 3,500 old people who would have to be provided for, but he forgot to point out that all the Old Age Pension schemes and proposals in this country so far, only contemplated the inclusion of old men, which would reduce the number to 1,750. He further puts down the amount at $150 per year, when he well

knew that $50 was the highest amount ever suggested or proposed. In fact the scheme unanimously approved by the Legislature in 1906 was as low as $40 and not above $60, making an average of $50, so that if we multiply 1,750 pensioners by 50 we have $87,500 of an annual charge without in any way allowing for those who are over the required age but who are not in need. This, then, knocks the bottom out of Mr. Anderson's argument, as to the scheme costing $525,000. But even according to Mr. Anderson's own estimate, $175,000 would give pensions of $50 each to 3,500 old people. Of this one-third would return to the revenue of the Colony, as this whole sum would be expended in the purchase of dutiable goods, paying at least thirty per cent., so that the Colony would get back one-third, which would reduce the total cost to $117,000 annually. From this sum may be deducted one-third as representing people who are over Mr. Anderson's age limit, 65, but who would not apply for pensions, their circumstances being such as to place them beyond want. The amount would then be $78,000. According to the scheme which I propose to the Committee we shall, in four years, be asking this Legislature to vote a larger sum than this, or about $80,000.

The following is a statement of the number of males in the Island in the various districts who, according to the last census, are over 75 years of age :

District.	75 to 80.	80 and over.	Total.
St. John's, East	80	54	134
St. John's, West	67	51	118
Harbor Main	26	31	57
Port de Grave	39	27	66
Harbor Grace	56	52	108
Carbonear	25	16	41
Bay de Verde	46	42	88
Trinity	75	57	132
Bonavista	88	48	136
Fogo	33	14	47
Twillingate	62	50	112
St. Barbe	21	13	34
St. George's	24	20	44
Burin	24	15	39
Fortune Bay	28	24	52
Burgeo and LaPoile	38	23	61
Placentia and St. Mary's	47	41	88
Ferryland	39	25	64
	818	603	1421

This shows 818 men over 75, and 603 over 80, or a total of 1,421. If from this is taken one-third, or 473, who would not be likely to apply for pensions, it will leave 948.

In Great Britain they have a population of 45,000,000.

Our population to-day is probably near 250,000. Ten years ago it was 230,000. In other words, the population of Great Britain is 180 times that of Newfoundland. The number of pensions granted to-day under the Old Age Pension law in England is 682,768, at a cost of £6,063,658. This includes women. On the same basis of population we would have 3,780 pensioners, or, if we excluded women, 1,890.

It has been said and will be said, that the amount we are asking the Legislature to vote this year is small ; that it is not enough, But the answer is that we are making a beginning. Had we come in and proposed to increase taxation $50,000 or $100,000, that would enable us to grant 2,000 pensions at $50 each ; we would then be told that it would mean bankruptcy and Confederation. We are cutting our garment according to our cloth. We are not going to increase taxation. On the contrary, before our term of office closes, we are going to substantially decrease taxation. Even for the two years we have been in office we have placed a considerable number of items on the free list, always in favor of the poorer classes, and have not increased taxation one cent. But before we can substantially decrease taxation, all our pledges to the country must be carried out.

This year we propose an expenditure of $20,000 for Old Age Pensions. We are taking $200,000 from the surplus revenue of 1910, and this wil' be invested in Colonial Debentures at four per cent. giving $8,000 a year, and the House has already voted in the Estimates $12,000—in all $20,000, or 400 pensions at $50 each. Next year we propose to add 400 more, and another 400 the year after.

This is no novel policy. We are simply honouring a cheque drawn years ago in favor of the aged poor which bore at its foot the signatures of all the leaders of all the political parties.

If they did not pay the cheque it may have been no fault of theirs, it was no fault of ours. We are now going to honor it.

If any class of people were ever deserving of pensions in their old age, it is the broken down fishermen, laborers, farmers and mechanics of this country.

The army and navy officers and officials of the civil service are retired on half pay, and in some cases as a rule, more than this

The fisherman prosecutes his calling at a great hazard to life and limb, and for entirely problematical returns. The vicissitudes and uncertainty of the calling are proverbial, and they prosecute a national industry, a business which brings plenty to the whole land. They win from the deep a precarious livelihood, with small chance of saving anything when their usefulness has departed. The same is also true of the laborer and mechanic, who are largely governed by good and bad times, and by supply and demand; and are sometimes for days, sometimes for weeks, and, unfortunately, not infrequently for months, forced to walk the streets owing to the scarcity of labor.

A pension to the old and worn-out of these classes, something to ensure them comfort and independence in their declining

years, would not alone be giving them what they are entitled to but would encourage those who are coming after them.

As to the age limit, the pensions should be paid only to those who have been unable, through force of circumstances, to lay up sufficient to maintain them in their old age. This is a class of humanity which will not long be ignored by any civilized country and Newfoundland should be one of the first to participate in a movement for the amelioration of their condition. It may be found necessary, hereafter, to lower the age limit, but that is a matter which we will be best be able to speak of after a year or two years' experience. Some contend that the physical condition of an applicant for an Old Age Pension should be as carefully considered as his age.

There are many men who, at fifty or sixty years of age, are older, from a physical standpoint, than others are at 70 or 80 years. They may be incapacitated by accident or decrepit from sickness or otherwise, and their condition and claims should not be ignored or overlooked on account of any difference in age. Nor should there be any discrimination as to a man's calling, whether he be a fisherman, farmer, laborer, or mechanic. The fact of his having paid taxes, and helped to build up the country in his prime, and his present destitute condition, should be sufficient to entitle him to the pension.

The advantages which will flow from this are many. It will not tend to discourage thrift in any way. The man who lives a life of useful industry will know that there is an Old Age Pension ahead of him. He will be relieved from the general fear of want that very often impels men to acts which lead them into trouble. Our vagrant laws make helpless poverty a crime, and the man who has not been successful in the world's game of grab sees before him the prospect of the stigma of charity, with the insults, abuse, hardships, and vicissitudes imposed on him. It removes the demoralizing and pauperizing tendencies of the general distribution of public funds. It relieves the old age pensioner from the disgrace that attaches to public charity. It is not a disgrace to live on the public, except when it is done on a small scale. It makes citizenship a matter of reward : gives it a standing, and recognizes the value of a long, industrious life above the claims of new arrivals or transient foreigners.

Summed up, then, the advantages claimed by the Government for this scheme are :

1. That it is reasonable.
2. It is according to precedent.
3. It is safe and practicable.
4. It removes the objection to pauper relief.
5. It is capable of gradual expansion.
6. It is economic.
7. It provides substantial benefit.
8. It benefits the right persons.
9. It is within our means.

Can the country afford Old Age Pensions ? I say it can. Look at what has been done in other services. Look how the revenue has doubled for the last ten years, and remember that any amount that we shall pay away, will not alone be distributed over the whole country, but will pass into the

hands of those who will purchase dutiable goods, and at least one-third of it will come back directly to the revenue. There are very many people in this country, well-to do, who have amassed large fortunes which can hardly be said to have been earned by them, in proportion to the amount of work expended by those who produced these fortunes for them. It would be impossible for a man to earn a million of money by ordinary physical labor if he lived to be as old as Methuselah. For tunes are accumulated because law and order and all the forces of civilization are at the disposal of the owners, and they have been provided from the taxes wrung from the very class of people who had built up their fortunes for them.

The financing of this will not cost nearly as much as people thought.

No matter what system we adopt, it will take several months to arrange for the first 400 cases. After a year's experience we can say if the age limit cannot be reasonably reduced. The question of when and how and what number of old ladies can be added to the list is also a matter which will be considered as we go on. Very special enquiries will be made into their number and their condition. In a great many cases in relieving the old men the old ladies will also be relieved. As regards the annual cost after four or five years we shall have provided a vote, and that within our means and without extra taxation, to cover the whole pension list, and all new pensions or additions will be merely filling the places of those who annually die out. It will not be like our other expenditures that have annually jumped within the last few years. Take for example the following :

Relief of the Poor.

1880 .... $138,000.00
1911 .... $292,642.00

Education.

1880 .... $ 88,000.00
1911 .... $318,023.66

Steam Subsidies.

1880 .... $136,000.00
1911 .... $291,314.00

Roads, Bridges & Marine Works.

1880 .... $103,000.00
1911 .... $295,000.00

For instance the increase in our Estimates from 1908-9 to 1910-11, that is, three years, amounted to $206,000 and yet this large sum is covered by the increase in the revenue, with not alone no increased taxation but a considerable reduction of taxation on some items. This increase of $206,000 is made up in this way.

Increases 1910-11 over 1908-9.		Principal Items of Increase.
Public Debt	$ 61.603	Interest on new Public Service Loans, and on new Branch Railway Bonds.
Civil Government	8,014	Repairs Public Buildings, $6,000 ; Salaries, new, $1,000 ; Small increases salaries $1,000.
Pensions	4,711	
Adm. of Justice	15,225	Magistracy, $3,000 ; Constabulary, $6,000 ; Penitentiary, $6000.
Education	55,600	Destitute Places, $6,000 ; Augmentation, $20,000 ; Interest on Loan s for School Buildings, $4,000 ; Extra Vote under Education Act 1910, $25,000.
Public Charities	11,510	New Fever Hospital, $6,000 ; Lazaretto, $1,800 ; General Hospital, $1,000 ; Lunatic Asylum, $2,000.
Lighthouses	5,563	Salaries, $4,600 ; Maintenance, $1,900.
Agriculture & Mines ...	15,000	Exploration Coal Areas, $15,000.
Marine & Fisheries		*DECREASE $8,950.00 ; caused by dropping of vote for Construction of Fog Alarms and Lighthouses.
Roads and Bridges	2,560	Ferries, $2,560.00.
Postal & Telegraphs ...	68,488	Salaries G. P. O. and Railway Clerks, $3,000 ; Outport Offices and Couriers, $6,500 ; Steam Subsidies, $38,000 ; Telegraph Maintenance, $20,400 ; Stamps, $2,000.
Additional Estimates ..	7,000	Survey Branch Railways, $3,000 ; Prevention Spread Tuberculosis, $4,000.
General Elections		*DECREASE, $40,000.00.
Increase	$255,274	
Decrease	$ 48,950	
Net Increase	$206,324	

No one will say that there is any item here that was not absolutely necessary.

I do not propose to delay the Committee any longer at the present stage, and I submit, with confidence, the present Old Age Pension proposals for your consideration. I trust the Committee will look at the measure from a national standpoint, entirely apart from any party feelings, without any reference to the past, wisely improving the present, and looking hopefully to the future. In a matter like this, little can be gained by criticism of the past. Ours is to improve the present, and go forward to the future with hope and confidence. I feel that there is not one in the Legislature who is not in sympathy with assisting the old, the decrepit and the infirm, both men and women. In the past they have worked hard to build up the Colony and to give us all that we have in population and in wealth, and we would be unworthy of that heritage, and recreant to our duty as trustees for them if we did not do something which posterity can justify. Nothing is so sad or so pathetic as to see an old man, bowed and decrepit alone in the world, with no one to assist him ; a representative of a bygone generation, with all those belonging to him and with whom he grew up long since laid to rest,—the last withered leaf on the tree.

I am delighted to have had the privilege of introducing these Resolutions. I am convinced the measure will be a success ; I feel that it will be acceptable to those immediately concerned ; and that time will show that we are justified in the belief that the measure is quite within the means of the Colony.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with the greatest attention and the greatest interest to the remarks that have fallen from the lips of the learned introducer of these resolutions. But I cannot make up my mind what attitude it was that my learned friend expected that the Oposition would take in regard to this measure. Are we to oppose it because we cannot afford it ? Are we to oppose it because the amount is not sufficient, or are we opposed to the giving of pensions to the aged and infirm ? I do not know why my friend had any doubt in his mind as to the attitude of the Opposition in regard to this matter, because, sir, I have already placed myself on record long since as to the position which I take in reference to Old Age Pensions.

The question of Old Age Pensions is, and so far as I am concerned, shall, remain a non-party question. A few days ago an attempt was made by a member of the Government to give it another complexion, by charging the late Government with inconsistency in respect to the matter, and this afternoon the Premier had followed in the same line of conduct by quoting from speeches delivered by the Hon. John Anderson, in which he had at a public meeting condemned an Old Age Pension Scheme. This speech the Premier had declared was delivered by Mr. Anderson on behalf of the late Government, and must be accepted as the views of the late Government. That was a most unwarranted statement on the part of the Premier, it was an unfounded and utterly

incorrect statement. Mr. Anderson was not a member of the late Government, I cannot be sure that he was even a supporter of that Government. I know that he had no authority to speak on behalf of the late Government, and he therefore must, and could only, have spoken as a citizen and taxpayer. Now no provocation will induce me to descend from the position that I took up in the year 1906 on the question of Old Age Pensions At that time, it will be observed on reference to the official report of debates, I said that in the principle of Old Age Pensions the House of Assembly might unanimously concur, for it was a question of workers and of those past the allotted span of work. I declared that it was the duty of the State to extend every possible consideration, sympathy and relief to the aged poor and infirm, for they had done something in the building up of the country for which they shoul be recompensed. On the 27th of April, 1906, an Address was unanimously adopted by the Legislature, praying His Excellency the Governor to appoint a Commission "to inquire into the subject of providing pensions for aged persons," and in pursuance thereof the then Minister of Finance, the Commissioner of Public Charities, the Hon. J. S. Pitts, Hon. Edgar Bowring, Hon. John Harvey, and W. B. Grieve, Esq., were appointed such Commissioners. The Chairman of the Commission was the Minister of Finance, and the Secretary was the Hon. John Harvey. The first meeting of the Commission was held on December 13, 1907, when it was decided "that regular meetings of the Commission shall be held on alternate Fridays hereafter." The Commission entered on its duties, as might be expected considering its personnel, in a thoroughly business like manner. Correspondence was exchanged with officials in Great Britain, Canada, and elsewhere, and a lot of valuable information, blue books and other data bearing on the subject of Old Age Pensions was produced for the guidance of the Commision in their deliberations. Several meetings were held, but before the Commission was in a position to report a general election took place, and, as I advised, terminated the labors of that Commission. There was no unnecessary delay on the part of these gentlemen in dealing with the question submitted to them. The work was a gigantic one, having regard to the general financial exigencies of the country They had to work out a scheme of Old Age Pensions that the Legislature would be warranted in adopting, and that would commend itself to the whole country. Not an easy thing to do in a country of very narrow financial resources and constantly fluctuating revenues. In England, the wealthiest nation of the world, statesmen of both political parties hesitated to move in this matter of Old Age Pensions without searching enquiry and the greatest caution. First there was a Royal Commission appointed to enquire into the subject in all its bearings,then a Committee of Reports, and then a Select Committee of the House of Commons. Twelve years were thus occupied and no conclusion was reached. The Old Age Pension passed by the Imperial Parliament in 1908 was the

outcome of the labors of the National Committee on Old Age Pensions which was representative of the Labor Unions of Great Britain, numbering three million members. These Unions sent delegates to what was termed the National Committee, which had for a nucleus such distinguished leaders of thought as the Right Hon. Charles Booth, Francis Herbert Stead, M. A. and Frederick Rogers. It was several years before the Labor Unions could agree as to a scheme of Old Age Pensions, but, guided by the wisdom and moderation of the gentlemen I have named, they became as a unit, and acting in unison they won the nation to their will. Strange as it may appear at first sight, the South African War hastened the day for Old Age Pensions in Great Britain. That war had cal'ed upon the taxpayers of Great Britain to contribute two hundred and sixty million pounds sterling in extra taxes for its carrying out. At the close of the war the National Commitee on Old Age Pensions, under the distinguished leadership of the Rt. Hon. Charles Booth, raised the battle-cry of "no reduction of taxes without first providing for Old Age Pensions," and it was taken up by the whole country, forcing Parliament to pass the Act of 1908. The history of the Old Age Pension movement in Great Britain is a most fascinating study, and at the same time conveys a lesson as to the care and caution that is necessary in dealing with a matter of this kind so as to do justice and inflict no injury on any person. I have scanned the history of this movement in England to show that the Committee or Commission appointed by the late Government to deal with the subject of Old Age Pensions was acting on the proper lines, and was not open to the censure that has been passed upon them for delay.

Again, the Premier says that the question of Old Age Pensions was made an issue at the last general election. That is not correct. How could a question be made an issue when both political parties had agreed on that question. The statement was not only incorrect, but absurd. What the present Government had done was to give a solemn pledge that they would immediately, if returned to power, give Old Age Pensions to all deserving persons, and now they were as solemnly breaking that promise by providing in substitution a pauper dole. In my manifesto of 1908 I used these words :

"With regard to Old Age Pensions. From my place in the House of Assembly I have clearly defined my position in relation to the same, and have clearly indicated the source from which such provision must necessarily come —namely : out of the general revenue of the country—when the Old Age Pension Scheme is adopted. A statement to the contrary would be nothing but a cruel deception. Any scheme of old age pensions would have had to be provided for upon a basis beyond peradventure ; therefore any body of men who realize their responsibility as trustees of the public, are bound in honor to move very carefully in a matter of this kind. The present Government, appreciating their responsibility in the premises, and having regard to the general fi-

nancial exigencies of the country, determined to call into their deliberations several gentlemen who hold the highest positions in this city as financiers. These gentlemen have been gratuitously giving of their time to the consideration of this important subject ; and, together with the Executive Government, are endeavoring to work out a scheme that the Legislature will be warranted in adopting, and that will commend itself to the whole community. The electors of the country may, therefore, confidently depend upon the present Government bringing into force such a measure at the earliest possible date."

In the face of this evidence, how can the Premier truthfully declare that the question was a party issue in the late election. The assertion is only an attempt to obtain party capital at the expense of political opponents, and it is an evidence of what impelling motive behind this motion really is. The Government evidenty desires to be the first to place on record in our Statute Books an Act entitled "Old Age Pensions," while in reality it is simply what parliamentarians term "a bastard arrangement" designed to deceive. Sir, I think the Government would have acted wisely if they had worked out a full and complete Old Age Pension Scheme. To my mind this proposal is neither practical, nor adequate, nor just. The secret force of social evolution, working the wor'd over, has declared that the expectation of the aged poor shall not fail ; that poor relief, with its degradation and disfranchisement, shall give place to the honor and respect that properly belongs to old age, and that no taint of pauperism shall attach or cling to the provision which the State confers on its veterans of industry. Now, universality alone can remove the pauper taint, and in my opinion the only right and just plan is to give a pension to everyone who needs it on attaining the age of 65 years—man and woman alike. Modern conditions of industry do not favor the aged. Work nowadays is rushed, and it needs more nerve and strength than the old can bring to it. The community gains, perhaps, but the old people suffer, and hence the claim to special consideration. This House is under a greater obligation to-day to pass an Old Age Pension Scheme than ever it was before. Since 1906, we have passed the Workingman's Compensation Act, which provides compensation to the laborer from the employer if he should be injured or incapacitated while performing his employer's work. This has forced employers in self protection to cull the men they engage, and the old and weakly are thus thrown out of employment. Then, with respect to the women. Are they not deserving of consideration ? The Government say no. Why not ? Do they not represent the wives and mothers who have kept the homes together under, in very many instances, a struggle for bare existance. The case of the women is even stronger than that of the men, for they may spend lives of the utmost social utility with hardly an opportunity of saving a cent for themselves. Yet, under the proposed Act, the poor old women of the country are left to starve or to

go down to pauper graves. You call this an Old Age Pension Scheme, do you ? I call it a most heartless travesty, a cruel injustice. Again, the Premier's remark would lead the House and the country to believe that there is a precedent for the legislation in the acts of other countries. I must remove that impression by declaring, without fear of successful contradiction, that there is no precedent in the world for such a Bill as this. You may look to Great Britain, Denmark, Belgium, Germany, France, Canada, New South Wales, New Zealand, and Victoria, which are the countries where old age pensions are in force, and I defy the Government to show that their proposals in any way resemble the scheme of either of these countries. The The Right Hon. Charles Booth, the father of the British scheme, says in his work on Old Age Pensions : "The most desirable age for a State Pension is put by various authorities at 60, 65, and 70. If we consider solely the usual working powers of men, 60 is now late enough in most manual industries ; but some employments press hardly, and in most cases the industrial breakdown precedes the financial breakdown by several years, so that we find 65 to be the age at which pauperism increases by leaps and bounds and thus this age has been commonly chosen as representing the time when strength is gone and money spent, and pensions are most excellent. As 65 is the usually accepted age, so five shillings per week is the usually accepted pension. England fixed the age at 70, Germany and France the same. Denmark at 60, Belgium at 65, New Zealand at 65, New South Wales at65, and Victoria at 65. The present Government fix the age at which the poor man will be entitled to an increased pauped dole, for it is not a pension, at 75, for which, as I say, there is no precedent in this world. They have evidently done this to make their absurdly small allocation of twenty thousand dol lars cover more cases. Now, according to the last census, there are within our jurisdiction, that is to say Newfoundland and Labrador, 1,830 females 65 to 70 years of age, 1,308 70 to 75 years of age, 799 75 to 80 years of age, 618 80 upwards. And males, 1,-897 65 to 70 years of age, 1,287 70 to 75 years of age, 818 75 to 80 years of age, 603 80 upwards. Total number of males and females, 9,160. Taking 65 as the age limit, and $50 per year as the annuity, what amount shall we require for a universal scheme of Old Age Pensions ? 9,160 people, at $50 per annum, equals $458,000 ; but we must deduct, for those whose incomes exceed say $2 per week, say 50 per cent., $229,000 ; for aliens, criminals, lunatics, and permanent paupers, 5 per cent., $22,900 ; total, $206,-190. The cost then of the estimated number of pensionable poor persons, say 5,039, would amount to $251,900 per annum. A vote of that sum would allow every pensionable person, male and female, over 65 years of age, fifty dollars per year pension. The Governments proposal is to vote twenty thousand dollars. That amount will only provide four hundred persons with $50 per year, and leave four thousand six hundred and thirty-eight pensionable persons without any provision whatever under this

Bill. Or, if this amount is divided amongst all who, under my calculation, would be entitled to it, then the so-called Old Age Pension Scheme only amounts to four thousand dollars per year, or less than one cent per day, and less than eight cents per week. Was there ever such a piece of absurdity and cruelty blended together before? Imagine a poor old couple, of whom it might truthfully be said that they had reached the period of life when the shadows of death are rapidly gathering around them, endeavoring to keep body and soul together on eight cents per week. But, I would be perfectly fair to my political opponents. They say we don't propose to divide up the twenty thousand dollars among all who would be entitled to it under any pension scheme known to the world. We propose, they say, to select four hundred old men of 75 years of age, who we may consider are deserving, and to give them fifty dollars per year or to increase their present allowance under the Poor Commissioner from $24 to $50 per annum. How can this be termed an Old Age Pension. The very suggestion of selecting from among the poor those whom the Governor in Council may conslder the most deserving is evidence that extreme poverty is the qualification under the proposed Bill. The very thing that a pension scheme is designed to overcome, namely, the taint of pauperism, the Government propose to perpetuate under this Bill. Again, this Bill is bound to cause the most bitter heartburnings, for out of fourteen hundred and twenty-one old men of 75 years of age and upwards in this Colony the Government propose to select only four hundred for this charity dole, that's to say two persons in every seven. What is to become of the one thousand old men of 75 years of age and upwards to whom this Bill will bring no comfort, no provision whatever. What is to become of the old men and old women, numbering four thousand six hundred and thirty-eight, between the ages of 65 and 80 upwards, who are not considered at all under the proposed Bill. The Premier says "half a loaf is better than no bread." But, there is no half loaf; the whole loaf goes to the chosen favorites of the Government. There is not even a crumb of the loaf to divide among the four thousand and odd poor old people, who are not considered in the proposed Bill. Again, I say this vote is nothing but a dole or largess to be distributed by the Government on no principle of justice. Such a scheme as is proposed by the Government must necessarily be administered with some appearance of arbitrary dealing for under it the Government must appoint someone to draw and force the lines of demarcation decreed by the proposed Bill. Some one in each locality, probably the Relieving Officer, will have the task assigned him of dividing the aged poor into classes of "deserving" and "undeserving." Such an investigation would necessarily have the taint of pauperism about it, and would thereby be entirely inconsistent with the principle underlying Old Age Pensions. Then, again, the Relieving Officer may be at personal or political enmity to the applicant, and the most deserving case may be left to suffer. Since the late

Government went out of power, as a result of their wise administration of public affairs during their ten years of office, the revenues of the Colony have been yielding large surpluses, so that the difficulties that forced the late Government and the Commissioners appointed in 1906 to consider of Old Age Pensions do not exist to-day. There is no reason why a universal scheme of Old Age Pensions should not be dealt with at once. The Premier says this cannot be done, because, first, the surplus revenue is required for telegraph extension, the building of lighthouses, and other such works. My reply is, that to take current revenue for such purposes is improper, because such public works are a proper charge against capital account, and what is required for such purposes should be raised by loan. The late Government were censured by the present Minister of Finance for their temporary loans, which it was the intention of the late Government to cover by a permanent loan for such public works ; but the course was entirely proper, and to argue that other Governments had paid for telegraph extension and lighthouses out of current account was not to justify in any way the practice. Further, the present Government have been boasting of their surplus revenue —a revenue that did not flow from anything that they had done —but I would remind the Minister of Finance that that it is not sound finance to have large surpluses. We should only tax to the extent of the absolute requirements of the public service. This principle was laid down by Mr. Gladstone, who, with the possible exception of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, was the greatest Finance Minister that England has produced. A portion of that surplus, namely, that which goes to pay the interest on the railway loan of last year, might more properly have been reserved in aid of Old Age Pensions. Now it goes out of the country to foreign bond holders to pay for wild cat railway schemes. Then there is another large portion which flows into the Treasury from the great industry at Grand Falls. I am told by one who knows that the revenue from Grand Falls this year will be no less than two hundred thousand dollars, an amount in itself from the district of Twillingate, which I have the honor to represent, to pay nearly the whole amount necessary for a universal scheme of Old Age Pensions. Another excuse put forward by the Premier on behalf of his resolutions is that time would be required in order to furnish necessary machinery for carrying out a large measure. To this I might reply that no special machinery worth considering would be necessary. The census to be taken within a few weeks from now will furnish the number of those who would qualify under a universal scheme, and if we follow the English precedent the pensions would be paid thro the various postoffices upon the production of a statutory slip furnished by the applicant from the Treasury Department. Nothing more simple, nothing more secure could be devised for carrying out a pension scheme. So the Premier's excuse under this head vanishes. The pension would not be a loss to the State, it would represent money in circulation

which eventually would find its way back to the Treasury. Under the circumstances to which I have directed attention I cannot support the Resolutions before the chair, which as I have endeavored to indicate are neither practical, adequate or just.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to allow these Resolutions to pass without expressing my opinion regarding them. In dealing with the question of Old Age Pensions, I think that every member of the Committee is agreed upon the princip'e that the establishment of these pensions in this country is most desirable. The general principle at the foundation of the subject which we are discussing is one which, I think, has been observed throughout the whole of the English speaking world ; and not only in the English speaking world, but in most of the Continental countries of Europe as well ; the principle of providing pensions for those who, having spent their lives in industriously contributing to the development of the country's resources and industries, have earned for themselves the right to look to the State to support them in their old age. That is a principle which is recognized now throughout the civilized world. The principle has not been adopted hurriedly. It has been in course of evolution during the last quarter of a century or more. Every country that has adopted this system of Old Age Pensions has done so after mature deliberation, and after a careful examination of its resources, and of the condition of its people ; the object being to distinguish the old age pensions from the relief which had heretofore been given to the necessitous poor, and those whose necessities demanded a help from the State for their support, in order that they might not become a burden on the State. The object of old age pensions is rather a reward for mertorious work done by the recipient in the prime of life towards the building up of the resources of the State. These principles, I think, apply with even greater force in every country, a country which requires a greater energy and greater exercise of courage, skill and initiative by its members in their prime, and whose work really counts for more in the pioneering of the country. All kinds of schemes for the reward of men who have in this way contributed to the building up of the country have been advocated from time to time. They vary from contributory insurance schemes, such as that in Germany, to the universal old age pension scheme in operation in New Zealand. These two schemes, I think represent the two extremes which are in existence to-day. Most countries have both schemes ; the scheme of insurance against either infirmity or old age, voluntary or compulsory. The only country with a compulsory scheme is Germany. In most countries, side by side with the pensions provided by the State, they have voluntary insurance and contributory schemes, which are entirely voluntary to the person contributing. In this country, I think, the system of old age pensions should be one resting on merit ; that it should not be limited to those whose necessity compels them to look to the State for their support as a necessary

consequence of their circumstances. The scheme which we are considering to-night, Mr. Chairman, is, to my mind, even in its broadest outline, one that rests entirely on the necessities of the case. The second Resolution embodies the principle at the foundation of these Resolutions. There is no one under these Resolutions who is entitled, as a matter of right, or by reason of the fact that his circumstances made him eligible to receive an old age pension. No person could come to the Government and say, "My circumstances are such by reason of my age, and by reason of my limited income," or any other fact, definite and certan, which will entitle him to the benefits proposed to be confirmed by this Act. The Resolutions provide that the old age pension shall be $50 per annum and that this sum is supplied from money provided by Parliament ; and the conditions which go to qualify for the receipt of these old age pensions is, first, that they must have attained the age of 75 years. That is the only definite statement in the whole Resolutions. The next condition is that the person must satisfy the Governor in Council that for not less than 20 years before the receipt of any sum on account of a pension he has had his residence, as defined by regulations hereunder in this Colony. We are not in a position to say what that means. These regulations the Committee are entirely ignorant of. They are left entirely in the discretion of the Governor in Council. The next condition is that the person must satisfy the Governor in Council that his circumstances or means of support are such as to render a pension necessary for his support. Now, Mr. Chairman, to my mind that last condition is very objectionable, and it points to the foundation upon which these resolutions are made. It is really an addition to the amount already provided for the relief of the poor, nothing else. It is in no way an old age pension. If instead of using the words, "old age pensions" throughout this Bill, the words "relief for necessituous poor over a certain age" were to be substituted, it would in no way change the character of the Bill. A person who receives poor relief does so because of the necessity for poor relief for his support. In other words, the same conditions and considerations which apply to the granting of these pensions. If any proof of this is needed it is to be found in the statement of the Prime Minister that a limited number of 400 pensions is to be granted. There are five or six times that number of people in this country over 75 years, with limited means, who, in any other civilized country in the world, would be entitled as a matter of right, and not as a matter of "Government dole" to receive this pension. In Great Britain it is distinctly stated in the Act the conditions under which a person is entitled to receive old age pensions, and if he qualifies under the Act he is entitled to receive a pension — notwithstanding any objection on the part of the Government of Great Britain. In Great Britain if a man reaches the age of 70 and has been for 20 years a resident in the United Kingdom, and his means don't exceed £21.10, he is entitled to come to the Government and demand a

pension as a matter of right, and it is then for the Government to say that, by reason of certain disqualifications, he is not entitled to receive it. But here in the scheme which we are considering at present a man applying to the Government for an old age pension is not in any better position by showing to the Government that he is in receipt of an income of $50 or $100 or any other amount. He has got to put his whole circumstances before the Government, and the Government has got to go into his condition and find out whether it is necessary for his support that the pension should be provided. The same enquiries have to be made by the Governor in Council as are made by the Commissioner of Charities when enquiring as to whether an amount should be paid for poor relief. It is clear the provisions we are talking about now are not old age pensions. They are merely provisions for the relief of the poor. Again, Mr. Chairman, I think the Committee recognizes the difficulties the Government will experience in administering the Act to be founded on these Resolutions. You have provided a fund of $20,000 a year, out of which to pay 400 pensions of $50 each. We have got in this country men and women over the age of 75 years, numbering in the neighborhood of five thousand. This means that out of these five thousand you have got to select 400 to whom these pensions or allowances are to be paid. Even if we admit, for the purpose of argument, that one half of that number are men of such limited incomes that they would be deserving of pensions at the hands of their country, this would mean that there would be at least 2,000 people in the country who would be in similar circumstances to those receiving the pensions, who would be without it. This is an unfair and unjustifiable discrimination, and leaves too much room for personal and political favoritism. As the Resolutions stand at present, if a man in the district of St. Barbe reaches the age of 75 years, the pensioning officer, whoever may be appointed by the Government—probably the relieving officer—would have to enquire into all the circumstances of that man's condition and report them to the Government. The Government would then take the matter into consideration, as to whether the circumstances were such as to render it necessary for him to receive this allowance in order to support himself. We all know the frailties of this life at the age of 75, and while all this is going on the man may have passed to the Great Beyond. The method is too slow. In Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand and Australia these matters are dealt with promptly. Again, Mr. Chairman, these Resolutions are not based upon any matter of desert or merit at all. They are not in keeping with what are known as old age pensions in every other country where old age pensions have been established. The requirements of industrial life in the present century are such that a man becomes old much sooner than he used to under former conditions. The wear and tear of life is greater, and the limit is almost universally recognized when a man can, without any discredit to himself, or without losing that dignity which a well spent life merits, look to the

State for his support and for a pension which will help to keep him in the circumstances which he deserves. It is very difficult for a man in this century to support his family, educate them and make good citizens of them out of the incomes which are earned by the laborer, the mechanic or the fisherman, and allow him to put aside sufficient to enable him to continue these comforts after wearing himself out at his labors. That is the object of old age pensions—that a man such as I have described might with dignity to himself turn to the State for a return for the benefits which he has conferred upon it in his manhood. We don't find that. Why, Mr. Chairman, the amount which is provided here to-night, if it is to be universal to those having an income under a certain amount ($2 a week, if you like), who are over 65 years, would not be sufficent to provide old age pensions —not Government dole such as this—to the districts of St. John's East or West alone. And you are attempting, with a paltry $20,000 to provide for the support of those veterans of industry, those fishermen of the country who have worn themselves out in perhaps one of the hardest avocations in which it is the lot of man to take part. It would take ten times that amount to in any way provide a fund which the people who receive it could regard as anything else but a Government allowance, as a matter of charity. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Government were not justified under the conditions which we have had pictured to this House from time to time which the larger revenues which have been received have been largely squandered—they are not justified in providing this small sum to meet the provision which circumstance demand. Why, sir, if the Government had administered the funds which are in their charge, economically and properly, instead of $20,000 we should have at least $280,000 or $300,000 to spend upon the provision of old age pensions —that is real old age pensions— for the worn out and aged people of this country. The matter of old age pensions is not in the abstract a controversial question. All parties who have occupied seats in this House, and I think every member who has been here during the past number of years, has agreed with the principle of old age pensions. It is the practical application of it in this scheme now before the Committee ; it is the converting of old age pensions into a charitable dole, that is objectionable in this scheme, besides the unjust and unfair discrimination which must necessarily take place in the administration of this scheme. If the Government are going to select and pick the 400 from those who are deserving of old age pensions, I don't envy them the undertaking, and I think that when the discriminations that have been made are realized by the country at large, instead of the Government reaping the credit which they anticipate by the introduction of this measure they will find that the injustice of it will redound to their discredit. I am sorry the Government has not seen its way to introduce a real old age pension scheme, deserving of the individual support of the members of this Committee, without any difference of opinion whatever ; and I think if the

Government had accepted the principle in vogue in other countries, such as England, New Zealand, Australia or Canada they would have chosen otherwise. I do not intend to deal further with the question ; I simply wish to place myself on record as being of opinion that this scheme we are considering is not an old age pension scheme, and that the statements received by us from the members of the Executive Government, showing that the country has such a bountiful revenue and overflowing coffers, clearly point out that if the affairs of the country were properly and economically managed we could provide a well thought out and universal scheme, which the old men and old women throughout the country could receive as a reward for the benefits which they have conferred upon the country.

MR. DEVEREUX—Mr. Chairman, I beg to rise for the purpose of supporting the Resolutions before the chair. And if I might be allowed, I should like to repeat the words of the hon. the Premier that this is one of the proudest moments of my life. However unable I may be to say a word in favor of the resolution, no one feels more than I for the men worn out in the service of the Colony. The Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition talked about the English Parliament. It took them, he says, twelve years to consider the possibility of giving the poor of the United Kingdom a pension, and also told us after the expiration of that twelve years they were unable to come to any conclusion. I want you to mark that expresson of the right hon. gentleman, and see if I can relieve you from the impression such a statement is likely to create. He nominated a commission two years before the expiration of his administration. It was composed of such men as Hon. John Harvey, Hon. James Pitts, Hon. E. R. Bowring and W. B. Grieve, Esq. Is there not a similarity between the aristocratic members of the combined House of Parliament of Great Britain and the men mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. What sympathy, what connection can there be between the men herein named, such as Messrs. Harvey, Grieve, Pitts and others, with the poor and lowly of this country ? We have heard it said in this Parliament numbers of times that men such as these are the hereditary masters of the men that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, then Prime Minister, had expected to place in an independent position. Was there not something sinister in the hon. gentleman's mind when he placed such men as these upon a commission to help to make the men that were a'ways called the "hewers of wood and drawers of water ?" The right hon. Leader of the Opposition also told you that it is no strange thing to say that in the manifesto there was placed a condition that if returned to power we would grant old age pensions. Well, now, if facts are considered it will be found that the Manifesto of Sir Ed. Morris was published two days before that of Sir R. Bond. And if imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, the Hon. Premier ought to feel very gratified. He had to place that paragraph in his manifesto. He had promised to do it two or four years previous, and when he found that Sir Edward

had placed in his manifesto such a paragraph he found it was impossible to go before the country without something similar. So there was a certain amount of necessity for the right hon. gentleman to place this in his manifesto, although he tells you to-night there was not. A great deal has also been said with regard to the neglect of the Government in not giving women a pension. Well, now, it may be information to the right hon. the Leader of the Opposition to know that the women of this Colony do not receive pauper relief at all. The widows receive a salary ; it may be small, but it is not pauper relief. Although this Colony can afford to do more than this Bill embraces, we will not find the people of the country disappointed, as the right hon. the Leader of the Opposition and the other members on that side of the House have told us. The people know as well as ourselves that we are comparatively poor. We have a small population, at the most 250,000, and they cannot expect that universal pension scheme that the Right Hon. Sir Robert Bond speaks about. Universality is very well in principle, but who is going to do anything outside of the principle to-night that is not universal We are very limited. Everything is limited to a certain extent, and I am prouder to-night to be able to say that this Colony can pay four hundred pensions of $50 each to four hundred poor people in the Colony, than to have unlimited scope in these resolutions and sit down and listen to the right hon. the Leader of the Opposition telling us that the country, through this measure, will be insolvent in two years. As the Premier has told you, there are other matters to be considered. This Colony is being watched outside in both hemispheres. Although we are small, nevertheless, owing to the peculiarities of our geographical position and the interest in our mineral and timber areas, capitalists are watching us ; and if the Government is not stable and strong and does not protect every industry in the country we cannot expect them to come here. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition also told you that we had better have kept the money that we had paid away in regard to the extension of the railway, we had better have kept that and placed it in the pension scheme, and that also all this money was going out of the Colony. What would have been the result last year, after the fishery had failed almost completely on the Labrador ? Instead of building railways and earning a fair wage for work, this House, or whatever Government was in power, would have to pay out about a quarter of a million dollars in poor relief. But owing to the Peoples Party and the Government all the people were kept in comfort, and the revenue was greater month after month. And yet the Opposition tells us that this money was going out of the Colony. What nonsense ! It is true that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition can take to himself probably all the oratorical powers of this House, but many thinkers have stated during the last quarter of a century that the age of oratory is gone ; and the man who takes up the speech of Sir Robert Bond to-morrow or the next day will find that it falls as flat as the

manifesto fell which he launched to the country two years ago. The Bond Party are very much afraid because we are getting in those proposals first and they feel that this Bill, or rather these resolutions, will have the effect when carried out of placing them in the cold shades of Opposition not only for two years but for ten.

HON. THE PREMIER—Although I said practically everything this afternoon that I had intended to say in relation to the question of Old Age Pensions, I hope that the Committee will not think that I am unreasonably trespasing upon its patience in briefly replying to what has been said by the learned Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. John's East. I am sorry the hint I threw out was not accepted by the other side and this queston treated as a large, national, non-partizan measure, but the Opposition have chosen to make this a fractional issue, to declare that "no good can come out of Nazareth," maintaining that nothing originated by this side has any value, and that they should oppose everything we bring up. The regret was expressed from the other side a moment ago that a Bill had not been introduced which would meet the approval of the whole House. Well, I should like to know what kind of a Bill that would be. No art of men, no work of the very angels, could construct a measure that would win the support of those across this floor. They were determined to oppose this project even before it was outlined here, not through any demerits of its own, but because they imagined that such a course would be good party politics. They could not honestly oppose this project ; one had only to listen to them to know that their hearts were not in their work. It was an effort from beginning to end for them to say anything against this Bill ; but they tried to make the best of a bad case in the vain expectation that some partisan capital might be secured from the generalities uttered by them in criticism of the measure. One speaker there asked us to pause and consider and not go further, so that we might make this Bill more effective. How disinterested of him ! He is almost afraid we will do something to make ourselves unpopular ; he is on the watch lest we make a mistake. I reply to him that "we fear the Greeks bringing gifts," and we regard him as most dangerous when he comes with advice to us. I tell him we are not prepared to accept his advice, that we do not need his suggestions. We feel that in this, as in other cases, the responsibility rests upon ourselves. The Opposition will not be our judges, nor shall we be tried by them, but by a higher court, by the common sense of the people of Newfoundland, and to that tribunal we submit ourselves with every confidence. I say again, Mr. Chairman, that I regret the attitude of the right hon. gentleman with reference to this Bill. He described the measure as a "bastard" measure. Perhaps it is in his opinion, but measures that have been termed "bastard" often succeed where others are still-born. What is "bastard" about this measure ? Has it not been blessed by Holy Church ? Is it illegitimate, be-

cause it comes from this side of the House ? I know of no other reason, nor do I see wherein it merits this offensive epithet. Then he went on to describe the amount as a "pauper's dole," or only a few cents a day. I deny this characterization equally. The amount proposed under this measure is the amount suggested as an Old Age Pension scheme from the very inception of the movement therefor in this Colony and I fail to see that the right hon. gentleman advocates anything larger himself. He next insinuates that we have tried to appropriate the credit for originating this project, but, on the contrary, I went out of my way in introducing these resolutions to give the history of Old Age Pensions in this Colony and in the world at large, and I submit that the Bill we are now proposng contains the best principles of all these measures. He then charged that we were trying to rush this matter so as to get it on the Statute Book. This I deny likewise. We are not rushing this Bill, nor do we want the credit for ourselves. I stated here this afternoon that when a Resolution respecting Old Age Pensions was brought before the Legislature in 1906 it received unanimous support. It originated from the Opposition, was moved by the Opposition Leader ofthat day, seconded by the late Capt. Charles Dawe, and strongly supported by Sir Robert Bond, then leading the Government, but now at the head of the Opposition. Every member of the Opposition, every member of the Assembly of that time, supported the principle, and when I assumed the Leadership of a political party in this Colony, I declared myself unequivocally in favor of inaugurating a practical scheme of Old Age Pensions ; and this my Government is now submitting to the House. Then my right hon. friend went on to say why no provision was made for the aged women of the Colony. I answer this now, as I did this afternoon, by pointing out that we are making a start in this matter, and that this is an aspect of the problem which will be promptly dealt with as soon as conditions will permit. The Government's position is very clear. It wants to deal first with the most needy and deserving cases, those having the strongest claims. Some of the old men will have their wives or sisters living with them, and these will share in the benefits as they shared in the earnings of the breadwinner while he was capable of earning. But we can only move gradually, and neither this Goovernment nor any other Government in Newfoundland to-day can hope to start out by grapplng with every case, old men and old women, that calls for Legislative action. Moreover when the principle of Old Age Pensions was affirmed by the Legislature in 1906, did my right hon. friend himself advocate the case of the old women of the Colony ? When he appointed the Old Age Commission which was in existence for three years and did nothing, did he make any special effort to have the case of the aged women considered by it? The most he could tell us to-day that this Commission did was to empower its secretary to write for blue books to the countries which had Old Age Penson schemes already working. But I

submit, Mr. Chairman, that this was the least important of the matters before the Commission. The Blue Book literature about Old Age Pensions has been digested and put into practical form for every student and what was required for this Colony was that the Commission when appointed should grapple with the peculiar circumstances existing here and endeavor to devise the scheme ap plicable thereto. My right hon. friend appointed a Commission and three years went by and nothing was done by the Commission or by himself. Then we came into office, and to-day, without appointing any commission, or delegating to others the responsibility which we think we should bear ourselves, we have grappled with this problem, and we have evolved a measure which we believe will prove satisfactory to the country. We have made a beginning and from year to year we hope to increase the scope of the operation of this measure. Now, the right hon. gentleman, after havng done nothing himself, proposes a resolution declaring that the Old Age Pension scheme should be universal, and that every aged man and woman should be included in it. If a universal pension scheme is adopted the House will have to sit down and vote at least $200,000 a year, even to cope partially with the problem, that is to say, to apply it to all who are in absolute want, while if any more general standard than that is fixed where are we going to stop? Everybody will want a pension! If we increase the taxation $200,000 by putting the duty on flour, molasses and other articles in order to give a universal pension then we should be told again that this is the first step towards Confederation and bankruptcy. We are not proposing a universal scheme. We are not going to pledge this Colony to an uncounted cost. We propose to pass a moderate scheme that will benefit the old men of this Colony, and that will not involve increased taxation. We propose to give 400 persons this year, 400 more next year, and 400 more the year after. This, in three years, will mean 1,200 at $50 each, or an outlay of $60,000, and yet the right hon. gentleman tells us that this is a miserable "pauper's dole." All I need say in reply is that when the other side come into power again they can increase the amount and the number of pensions. My right hon. friend next went on to dispute my statement that this question was an issue in the last general election, and that I had made it so by placing it in my manifesto. He argued that because it was in his manifesto it was not a party issue in the districts. I reiterate what I said. I assert now and challenge truthful contradiction, that my party was identified with Old Age Pensions, and that the electorate never identified his party with such a policy at all. It is quite true, as he says, that the question was discussed in the Legislature in 1906, but it was a mere academic debate. His Government held office until 1909, but did nothing in the meantime. In March 1908, or twelve months before that, I made the subject an issue in my preliminary manifesto, when I promised that if I was returned to power my Party would inaugurate Old Age Pensions. That pledge was repeated

in the fall election of 1908, and the spring election of 1909, from every platform in the Colony. We advocated Old Age Pensions very strongly, but the supporters of my right hon. friend opposed the policy just as strongly, even though it was in his manifesto.

For instance : Hon. John Anderson, a Legislative Councillor, who was a strong supporter of the late Government, used it in a manifesto which he got out, as the strongest argument in favor of his contenton that our success would mean ruin for the country, and ultimately Confederation. In October, 1908, during the height of the political campaign, he addressed a public meeting in the British Hall in this city in favor of the candidature of Messrs. Kent, Shea, and Dwyer, the Bondite members for St. John's East, and among others on the platform was Hon. George Knowling, a member of the late Executive Council. Mr. Anderson made a long speech, bristling with figures, which the Evening Telegram published the next night, to the extent of four columns, with large headlines, and in that speech Mr. Anderson declared that our Old Age Pension measure meant bankruptcy, and the sale of the country to Canada. The Evening Telegram, the organ of my Rt. hon. friend, endorsed in the issue containing this speech everything that Mr. Anderson had said,, and strongly urged its readers to carefully peruse Mr. Anderson's speech, ponder upon his figures, and see for themselves how clearly he had shown that our policy could not be carried out unless disaster would follow. This afternoon, however, the Leader of the Opposition repudiated Mr. Anderson here, and said that he spoke as a private citizen, but my Rt. hon. friend's organ and mouthpiece endorsed his observations, approved of his figures, and identified itself most strongly with the course he had taken. Here is what the Telegram said on October 13th, 1908 :

" We are able to-day to put be-
" fore the electors of Newfound-
" land part of the great speech
" delivered on Thursday evening
" last in the British Hall by the
" Hon. John Anderson, which we
" trust will be carefully read by
" every person throughout the
" country. M r. Anderson, on
" rising, was greeted with great
" cheering from the vast audi-
" ence which filled the hall, many
" hundreds only finding standing
" room. Never in the history of
" a general election has there
" been such industry shown in
" the cause of Liberalism in St.
" John's, both East and West. So
" many great questions were at
" stake that it devolves upon
" every right thinking elector,
" who has the welfare and love
" of his country at heart, to vote
" for Bond and every candidate
" who supports him throughout
" the country, and save our Is-
" land Home from bankruptcy
" and Confederation."

The people, however, believed in the sincerity of this pledge as made by us, and returned us to power, and we are now making good our promises. I did not in my manifesto state the number that would receive pensions or the amount that would be given, because that was a matter calling for careful thought and consideration, but now, having gone into the question thoroughly, we have

come down here to propose this scheme. We are starting entirely out of the new, and I pointed out this afternoon that after the Bill had been in operation for a year or two the Government, having the statistics before them, could, in the light of these statistics, modify the scheme as was considered desirable. The right hon. gentleman objected to the age limit, and argued that no other country had one so high. He quoted Hon. Charles Booth as authority for 65 years as the pensioning age, but England with all its experience and information went five years beyond him, and fixed it at 70. Even at 75 years we can get great numbers of men eligible for pensions.

My right hon. friend next complained of the smallness of the present grant and of our building branch railways, and spending enough for these to pay universal Old Age Pensions. I do not quite understand what point he was making in this, because foreign bankers would not consider a loan of $4,000,000 to create a fund for Old Age Pensions. The money we pay for interest on the loan for the construction of the branch railways comes out of the general revenue, and for the construction of these branch railways we have a mandate from the people. We proposed them as part of our policy, the country endorsed our policy and in no uncertain manner, and we are providing these railways for the sections of the Colony through which they will be built because these sections are as much entitled to railway communicaton as the rest of the Colony when it is found possible to provide these facilities without hampering the progress of the Colony or imposing any burdens upon the people. As we proposed branch railways so we proposed Old Age Pensions, and we intend to carry out these promises fairly and honorably, and build branch railways as fast as our financial circumstances will admit and to increase the number of Old Age Pensioners in the same way. We shall carry out these items in our policy and every other progressive measure outlined by us, telegraph extension, coastal steamships, new industries, more lighthouses and breakwaters, more public works, everything that a progressive administration can provide, consistent with caution and sound financial methods in the administration of our affairs. We are not going to be frightened by the criticisms of the Opposition now any more than we were frightened of that party and its newspapers in the last two elections. We successfully combatted all their most reprehensible arguments and vilest and most cowardly contentions and misrepresentations regarding our policy and our purposes. It was not alone criticisms of the branch railways and Old Age Pensions that we had to contend with, but if one would sit down in cold blood and read the articles contained in this bound volume of the Evening Telegram, which I have on my desk, one would see the most scandalous attempts made to stampede the electorate against this Government that ever disgraced the annals of this or any other country. I regret that the hon. members opposite did not rise to the occasion today and leaving party politics aside, join with us to help improve the condition of the aged

poor of this Colony. Imagine what an impassioned speech the Leader of the Opposition would have delivered if he were in my place in this House and bringing in this measure, because this Bill is similar in every respect, except as to the age limit, to the proposal which was before the Legislature five years ago when the resolution endorsing the principle of Old Age Pensions was unanimously adopted by the House. But now the scene is changed, and those who were then in power, but are now in the cold shades of opposition are doing their best to-day to belittle this Bill and defeat it, so that the few outside who blindly follow may be left to think that there is something to be said against the measure.

But these criticisms have no terror for us. There is little to criticise in this or any other measure emanating from the present Government. Ours is a policy of construction ; theirs is a policy of criticism, and no matter what we bring in it is sure to be opposed from the other side. I said in closing my previous remarks that I desired no happier association than for my name to be identified with the introduction of this measure ; and my right hon. friend in closng his speech pointed out that he had a recollection of Mr. Morine saying similar words in reference to his connection with the 1898 contract. Well, Mr. Chairman, is there any reason why Mr. Morine should regret introducing the 1898 contract ? Surely in this country nobody could wish for a happier epitaph. I could not help smiling when I looked at my friend, Mr. Shea, as he listened to his leader's comment upon Mr. Morine's choice of epitaph, for Mr. Shea was one ofthe framers of the 1898 contract, being a member of the Executive Council of that day. Others, like myself, only had the privilege of voting forthe measure, but Mr. Shea was one of the framers, and I am sure he wants no better epitaph than Mr .Morine. When the future historian deals with the 1898 contract, apart from the political outcry made against it, and when it is viewed in the bright light when every item of it can be properly and impartially considered—the railway, the bay steamers, the dock—and viewed in no partisan light, the verdict of history will be in accord with those who wish to be associated with that measure. Go to the dock to-day and see it—a hive of industry where thousands are employed—and compare it with what it was before that contract. What matters it to the working man who owns the dock as long as he can obtain employment there. The dock cannot be taken out ofthe country and sent to Japan or South America; if it could then the bargain would have been bad ; but it stands today where it did then, and no matter who owns it the working people will get employment there. Then the bay steamers. You cannot get a steamer to-day to perform coastal service for twice the amount asked for under that contract. We have steamers on Fortune Bay and Fogo district to-day and are paying twice as much for them as the steamers on Placentia Bay and Bonavista Bay under the 1898 contract. We gave land to Reid for operating the road, that is instead of pay-

ing him in gold we paid him in land, and the land could be no use to him unless he worked it, and then the Colony was benefitted also Every enterprise established on these lands, every industry developed in the interior, must benefit the country as well as it benefits him ; and yet the people who supported that measure were pilloried for years as men who tried to sell the country. I am prepared to take all my responsibility of that contract.

Before closing I would deal with one comment of the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Kent, who argued that the pensions would go to political partisans. Why does he think this ? Are we not as capable of doing right as he is ? If so why does he advance a charge like that ? We have as high a sense of what is right as he has, and there is no justification for his making such a charge. He also said that the Government would regret the introduction of the measure. But I think it is the Opposition who will regret, and who are sorry now that they are not in our place and presenting it to the House. They would do it if they could, but because it comes from us they oppose it, regardless of its purpose or its effects.

In conclusion I would say that the principles underlying this Bill have been carefully considered for two years, and that it has been discussed by the Government on at least twenty occasions We have gone into all the schemes in operation elsewhere at the present time and this Bill has been framed with caution and judgment and not hurriedly and with a view of being the first to put it on the Statute Book. We regard it as the performance of a sacred pledge and promise. It will prove a great help to 400 old people and next year we hope to add as many more, and the year after that still another 400, while when we come back to power again we shall endeavor to provide for all the old people in need, but we cannot do that at the present time, for we are not entering into any scheme merely as a bid for popularity, disregarding the solvency of the Colony and sound financial prudence, nor will any such idea be considered while we are in charge of affairs.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect thereto.

Ordered : That this report be received and that leave be granted for the introduction of the said Bill.

Thereupon the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Old Age Pensions" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act further to amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1903," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Ag-

riculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act further to amend the Crown Lands Act, 1903," was read a third time and passed—after the House had divided thereon, when there appeared for the motion: The Hons. Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Finance and Customs, Minister of Agriculture and Mines and Mr. Emerson, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Minister Public Works, Messrs. Bennett, Devereux, Goodison, Kennedy, Moulton, Murphy, Parsons, Seymour, and Whiteway (16); and against it, Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond, Messrs. Earle, Gear, Kent, Roberts, and Shea (6); and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order an on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Motor Car Act, 1906," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the law relating to the Encouragement of Agriculture," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting certain Retiring Allowances" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitle "An Act to amend the law respecting Forest Fires" was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister Justice, the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up frim this House entitled "An Act respecting the Esquimaux and Indians resident in Labrador," were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly had passed the said amendments without amendment.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr, Kent gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when this House rises it adjourn until to-morrow (Wednesday), March 15, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 15.

The House met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I ask leave to present a petition from the merchants, shipowners and residents of Catalina, setting forth that the business and shipping trade of Catalina is greatly retarded by reason of the shallowness of the water over the bar between the harbor and the North East Arm. Petitioners state that because of this obstacle laden vessels outward or inward are often considerably delayed, and in many cases have to discharge portions of their cargo before they can pass the said bar. The bar consists largely of sand and loose boulders, which could be removed without difficulty, and the petitioners request that when the new Government dredge is available it be sent to Catalina for the purpose of dredging the bar. This petition is very largely and influentially signed, and I have much pleasure in giving it my support.

I also ask leave to present a petition from John Guppy and other residents of Port Rexton and vicinity on the subject of the proposed lighthouse and fog alarm on the Horse Chops. Also a petition from George Freeman and other residents of Salmon Cove on the same subject. I have already spoken in favor of similar petitions, and I ask that they be also referred to the Department of Marine & Fisheries.

I also ask leave to present a petition from William J. Loder and other residents of Smith's Sound, asking for an allocation for a road running from Snook's Harbor to the Bar Point, connecting with the line of road from Bluff Head Cove to Snook's Harbor. Petitioners state that the said road will be very convenient for people who desire to cross Smith Sound, to or from Random Island, as there are times in winter when it is impossibe, owing to ice and weather conditions, to cross by boat below Gooseberry Point. As there is no road in that section of Random Island, people have to go to Elliott's Cove, a distance of two miles, then proceed nearly seven miles to the Bar. The distance from Snook's Harbor to the Bar Point is six miles, and the proposed new road will consequently be of great benefit to the people in that vicinity.

I also ask leave to present three petitions from the residents of Hatchet Cove, St. Jones Within, and Long Cove, in the South West Arm of Random, asking for a grant for the purpose of extending the main line from Northern Bight to Long Cove, a distance of about twelve miles. Petitioners state that this road is increasing in importance every year. In my opinion there is no part of the district where better roads are more needed than in the vicinity of Random. I ask that these petitions be also referred to the Department of Public Works.

Ordered that these petitions be received and referred to the departments to which they relate.

THE MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES laid upon the table of the House the Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year 1909-10.

MR. F. J. MORRIS, from the Select Committee, to which was

referred the petition of Edgar R. Bowring and others, in relation to a Bill entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Marine Insurance Company of Newfoundland, Limited," presented its report as follows :—

The Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of Edgar Bowring and others asking for incorporation as "The Marine Insurance Company of Newfoundland, Limited," have considered the matter to them referred, and report that in their opinion it is advisable to grant the prayer of petitioners, notwithstanding that full and sufficient notice has not been given, and that the rules of the House in that respect be suspended, and that leave be given to introduce the Bill hereto annexed.

Respectfully submitted,
F. Morris, G. Shea, H. J. Earle, J. R. Goodison, R. Watson.

Committee Rooms,
March 13th, 1911.

On motion, the said report was received and adopted, and leave was granted for the introduction of the said Bill, and it was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Resolutions on the subject of Fire Patrol.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—The object of these resolutions is to give the Governor in Council power to make arrangements with those companies interested in forest areas, so that the work in connection with the saving of those valuable forests can be more easily and effectually looked after than in the past. It was some time in April when the Government made an arrangement whereby those interested in lands met here in St. John's, and there was formed a committee now known as the Central Committee, whose headquarters are at Grand Falls. They sent certain recommendations, and asked the Government to concur in them, which the Government did. The ordinary vote for the expenditure of the department has been $1,500, but that for a number of years back has always been over-expended, and usually the sum has been $2,000. While the great number of men were working on the branch line, we had that line patrolled, and they put out in the neighborhood of 220 fires on it, and no fire of any serious consequence has taken place over the line that has been patrolled. The Government has helped the Central Committee in every way possible, giving instructons to all the magistrates and police, postal and telegraph clerks, and other Government officials, to report all fires. The Marine and Fisheries Department was made use of in this way, that all the licenses issued to sportsmen and tourists had printed on them a section of the Forest Fires Act, and attention was drawn to this and to the penalty. The resolutions are asking for $4,000, so that the Government can contribute that amount to the Central Fire Committee.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the

Minister in charge if any steps have been taken by the Government to compel the contractor to clear the railway of the inflammable debris that is lying along the line, as provided by the several railway acts.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Nothing has been done further than has been done in the past, except that the railway contractors have helped and assisted the companies interested in the Central Committee. The position is the same as during the past twelve years.

HON. THE PREMIER—The legal position is the same. There is the same legal liability.

RT. HON. SIR R. BOND—The legal position, as I take it, is that the contractor is bound to clear the right of way of all inflammable material. In regard to this question it will be found that there is a considerable amount of correspondence between the Department of the Colonial Secretary and the Department of Justice relating to the compelling the contractor to carry out his contractual obligation in regard to the clearing of the right of way. If we have a law which can force the contractor to carry out his obligations , that law should be enforced. It is only a resonable request, nothing more. Again, sir, the Hon. Minister in charge referred to a Central Committee. Who constitute that committee ?—

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—The Committee is composed of Mr. Scott, Mr. Harris, Mr. Gulnac, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Graham, and others.

SIR R. BOND—I see. They are all gentlemen having a personal interest in the prevention of forest fires. A very good committee. I have no objection to the Government helping in a liberal manner this committee in carrying out the laudable work, provided that the contractor is not by this work being relieved from his contractual obligations, whatever they may be. I submit, sir, that as advised from time to time by those who have had care of the special office of justice that the contractual obligations in regard to the clearing of the line are not being carried out. Now, we ought to consider this. It is not only that it is the fulfilment of a contract but because of its non-fulfilment we are endangering all the vast timber areas thro forest fires. Now, sir, if an ordinary attempt to clear the line were made, it would be some consideration, but, as I have been advised by those who travel over the line, no attempt whatever has been made to clear the right of way of any of the inflammable material which is endangering all the forest wealth of the country.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, I think the position taken by the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition a very reasonable one, and may be a very sound one. As to the position in relation to the question asked as to whether the Government has taken any steps in relation to clearing the right of way, I may say that nothing has been done in that matter, and it remains as it has been for the past twelve years. It would take some consideration to decide as to what is the liability of the contractor to clear the railway, to what extent he is bound to clear it, and to what distance, etc. I believe there is something on record on the mat-

ter in the Justice Department. That may or may not be ; but I take it a great deal depends upon what are the obligations of t he contractor under the contracts. First, we will have to see what it was we gave under the contract of 1898, and whether he was bound to do this under that contract, or, in other words, whether he was only bound to maintain the stakes and lines in repair, and when necessary clear the line from one end to another. All these matters have to be carefully looked into. I have heard it said that it would be more dangerous to clear the right of way, and that it is better to have this green stuff growing on the side, because it is the best preventive against forest fires. I do not know how true that is, but it will have to be taken into consideration also. The right of way might be cleared, or partially cleared, of all the debris, and might then be a greater menace than the green bushes growing up there. However, as I say, that is a matter to be looked into. Of course, the present Bill is merely to authorize the Government to contribute a sum of money towards a common fund, and have a patrol along the line in addition to what the contractor is bound to do. Later on in the session a Bill will be submitted to you in relation to this question of Forest Fires, which, I think, will perfect, as far as possible, this scheme, and will call upon the contractor to substitute better methods in connection with the locomotives, and get people all over the country to use greater safeguards against forest fires. It is a great misfortune that we have not been able in the past to stop these fires. I do not suppose that anyone is to blame ; but it is a great misfortune that such an awful destruction of forest areas has taken place, not only along the railway, but for a hundred miles from the railway. Why, Notre Dame Bay was ravaged a few years ago by these fires, and this was put down to the railway. However that may be, there is no doubt but that millions have gone up in smoke. Some put the amount at twenty, others at thirty and forty, and in some instances as much as fifty millions. There is no doubt that a lot of money is to be accounted for when we consider that a small area is often valued at millions. Not alone is it the timber itself, but the ground, as a result of these fires, is damaged, and for many years is of no use whatever. A mere consideration of these facts has led the Government to do something in addition to what everyone else is bound to do. Not in substitution, but in addition. We are not relieving the contractor. We are doing something supplementary, which does not relieve him from his obligations and liability. This Committee represents all the timber interests of the country. They have all contributed altogether s o m e eight or ten thousand dollars. It is a voluntary tax. The Reid-Newfoundland Company contributed $2,000, and the other companies something in the same ratio. The Government paid $4,000. And this Bill is to make this a more or less permanent arrangement with these people, who are all interested in stopping the spread of these forest fires.

MR. ROBERTS—Mr. Chairman, I might say that the Hon. Premier is quite correct in his statement in reference to what has occurred, and the extent of valuable lands that have been burnt down round and about the neighborhood of Notre Dame Bay. From my personal knowledge, I am sure that the forest fires originated on the line of railway. And it is all the more reason in my opnion why, if persuasion has no effect with the contractor, force should be called into requisition. I do not think that is a sound position about the green wood. There is very little of it that has come under my own observation, very little indeed. I think if the Hon. Minister in charge will make enquiries he will find that of the large number of fires extinguished last year, the greater majority originated along the line of railway. If something be not done soon in the direction of stopping these fires, there will be no timber left in the country, not only for the carrying on of industries all over the Island, but for the use of the fishermen along the shore. This is a very good effort to assist the contractor ; and that being done is also a better reason why he should be made to do his share and carry out his obligations in regard to preventing these forest fires.

SIR R. BOND—Mr. Chairman, I desire to thank the Hon. Leader of the Government for the manner in which he has received my observations. I desire to assure him that what I have said is only intended to be helpful and to intimate that there is no difference of opinion on this question. I think that no matter what has happened in the past, in the future there should be no differences of opinion, and where there is any question affecting these valuable assets of the country, I say that it is the duty of this Legislature, as trustees of the public, to see the contractual obligatons carried out. There is another matter, sir, to which I wish to draw the attention of the Minister in charge, and while it is not strictly on the question before us, it is still somewhat germane to the matter. I have reference now to the tremendous destruction of timber daily taking place in this Colony in the shape of cutting of sleepers, railway ties so called. Now, I notice in one of the Government organs that something like 700,000 sleepers are required this year for the branch railways. Supposing that we put it down to 500,000 ; that is a tremendous destruction, I think. I am also advised from competent sources that it takes 50,000 sleepers per year to keep in perfect repair the various sections of the Newfoundland railway. The Newfoundland railway is divided into five sections of 50 miles each. It is probably more than that. Anyway, there are five sections, and it takes 50,000 sleepers a year to keep each section in permanent repair. That means that if I take 500,000 as being required this year for the branch railways, there are 250,000 more required for the upkeep of the railway. And that means that 750,000 sleepers at the least will be cut this year. What does that mean? It means this, sir. On an average I am told, the stakes on the Peninsula of Avalon only cut to one sleeper. A sleeper is seven feet

long and six inches square. This means that two third of each stick is left in the woods—left as a serious danger, because it becomes dry and inflammable and, therefore, a serious danger to the whole forest. But, sir, there is another consideration. What are we getting for this wood? Nothing. Should not the railway contractor be compelled to obtain these sleepers from his own areas? Should we not insist that no sleepers be cut outside the areas granted to the contractor? Why should the land be depleted of their forest growth and those of the contractor preserved? I know from what I have seen myself that between Brigus Junction and Bay Roberts they are cutting sleepers right and left. They began to cut on my private property, and I had to stop that. Are we going to have the Peninsula of Avalon depleted of all its wood? Supposing we take 700,000 sleepers as cut from Crown Lands this year, it means that there is 10,500,000 feet of lumber upon which we have got nothing. I am allowing fifteen feet to a sleeper, and that is a generous average. Now, multiply 700,000 by 15 and you get 10,500,000 feet of lumber of which we are deprived. On this we should be getting stumpage. But besides all this, there is the amount left in the woods. While we have lost our stumpage on 10,500,000 feet of lumber, there is left in the woods twenty-one million feet of lumber. Now, think what this means. Surely we should take some steps in reference to that. The contractor is granted certain areas of timber lands, from which he is supposed to get all the sleepers required for the working of his railway; and in the name of common sense and common justice, why do we, as a Legislature, allow this draining of the public domain. Then, sir, there is another consideration from which we must regard this question. At the present time there is a tremendous cut of firewood all through the country. Carload upon carload is being cut around Brigus, Bay Roberts, Carbonear and elsewhere. They are stripping the country of everything. The cutting of this enormous quantity of wood is going to materially affect the climate, and that means that the agricultural outlook will be affected. It will affect the rainfall seriously. This, sir, is a very large question, a question which, I think, the Government should take immediately and seriously into consideration.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, I think the position taken by the right hon. the Leader of the Opposition an exceedingly good one, and the question raised by him one of sufficient importance to be taken into consideration without delay. But being such a big question I do not see that there is any possibility of considering it here while in this Committee on this Bill. The position of the contractor in relation to the cutting of sleepers and other timber for the operation of the railway is, of course, governed by the contracts under which he is working, but I do not think he has any rights under these contracts to cut timber. There are the contracts of 1890, '93, '98 and the one under which he is now building the branch lines, and I do not think he has

any rights to cut sleepers under these contracts. Of course, I am now speaking from memory. My recollection is that there is no such rights in the contracts, but areas were granted to him from which to cut his sleepers. There was an idea that he could cut his sleepers from the lands granted to private persons, but this is not so. Under all the grants from the Crown, issued to-day, there is a right distinctly reserved to the Government to cut timber for public purposes ; under this the Reid-Newfoundland Company entered upon private property to cut their sleepers. An action was taken in the Supreme Court, and it was held there that they had no such power, and that their contract was entirely outside. Accordingly they had to pay compensation for every stick they cut. Some compensation was sought for cutting near Botwood and the judgment of the Court was given by, I think, the late Sir Frederick Carter. Now, the present position is this, that they have no right to cut their sleepers from Crown Lands. All over the country men go in on those lands and cut wood for firewood and domestic purposes, but I know of no reason why the contractor or his servants should not be restrained from cutting on these lands for his own operations. But it is an entirely different position to say that a man who wants to cut a sleeper to sell to the contractor to be restrained. No man has a right to go upon the public domain, but when for firewood and domestic purposes he has to do so, it is sanctioned by usage and custom, and has to a certain extent been recognized. But I think that the contractor, cutting for the purpose of manufacture or for sale, should be restrained on the public lands.

SIR R. BOND—I can quite see that there is a distinction as between the man who cuts for fishery purposes and for his own domestic use, and the man who deliberately goes into the woods for the purpose of cutting sleepers for the contractor. I say that the contractor, through his servants, is deliberately depleting the public lands, for there are hundreds of men in the woods today who are cutting sleepers to sell to the contractor. That is what I complained of. The contractor has lands of his own, and if he wants sleepers, he should have them cut on his own lands and not on public lands.

HON. THE PREMIER—I merely wish to point out that we can draw a distinction between the case where the contractor sends out a number of men to cut sleepers and where a man, living at Whitbourne, or any other place, cuts sleepers to sell to the contractor. In the former case they should be restrained, but the latter is in a different position altogether.

MR. ROBERTS—The idea prevalent is that the timber on the three mile limit is being preserved for fishery purposes. A very large number of petitions have been presented against timber being cut on these limits and being converted into lumber. What do we find to-day ? That instead of those lands being preserved there are gangs of men cutting the timber for sleepers. A very great waste of timber occurs fromthe cutting of sleepers. Nearly two-thirds of the tree is wasted. I hope that the Premier

will take this into consideration and take some steps which will prevent the cutting of railway ties upon the three mile limit.

MR. KENT—I would like to ask the Minister if any agreement has been entered into for fire patrols.

HON. THE PREMIER—There has been no agreement. Last year's was only a temporary one.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Resolutions without amendment; and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect thereto.

Ordered: that this report be received and that leave be granted for the introduction of this Bill.

Thereupon the Bill entitled "An Act respecting a Fire Patrol" was introduced and read a first time and ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend 5 Ed. VII., Cap. 17, entitled, 'An Act to provide for the protection of woods against fires and for other purposes.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and passed the Bill without amendment.

Ordered: that this report be received and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Pilots and Pilotage for the port of St. John's," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the payment of Old Age Pensions" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Roberts gave notice of question.

Mr. Earle gave notice of question.

Hon. Prime Minister gave notice of motion.

Hon. Minister of Finance gave notice of motion.

On motion it was ordered that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, March 16th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, March 16th.

The House met at three p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I ask leave to present a petition from George Reid and other residents of New Melbourne, in the district of Trinity, asking for a grant to construct a agricultural road. Petitioners state that there is a quantity of good land in that vicinity, but they are much handicapped for want of a road, and it is consequently with great inconvenience

that they are able to take in their manure in the spring and bring out their produce in the fall. I also ask leave to present a petition from John T. Stone and others of White Rock, in the district of Trinity, asking for a special grant for the construction of a branch road which wi'l connect with the main line. The road will lead to a number of saw mills in the interior, and it will be of great benefit to nine families as well as to the general public. I also ask leave to present a petition from Gilbert Bugden and others of English Harbor, in the district of Trinity, having reference to the proposed fog alarm and lighthouse on the Horse Chops. I have already presented a number of petitions from Trinity district on this subject and I have only to add that I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give the matter his best consideration. I ask that these petitions be referred to the Departments to which they relate.

MR. MOULTON—I beg to present a petition from Rev. H. J. Read, Emanuel Pike and others of Channel, on the subject of the Game Laws. I may say that this petition represents the sentiment of the whole district of Burgeo and La Poile. The people claim that the present laws bear on them most unfairly and unjustly. They point out that their position is a peculiarly trying one in that before the deer have migrated to their section of the country and they are able to shoot them to provide themselves with meat the shooting season is over, and no matter how desperate their need might be, to shoot a deer would bring down on them the penalty of the law. They suffer almost similar disabilities with partridge hunting. The people have to travel a long distance to get these birds and are not allowed to keep dogs. The only time it is easy for them to get a few birds is in the months of January and February ; but this is in the close season and of course they are not allowed to shoot them then. Because of their peculiar situation the people look upon the Game Laws as a great hardship, and they ask for an extension of the time for shooting caribou. They claim they are just as much entitled to consideration as the sportsman. To them the deer mean food, to the sportsman only pleasure, and if laws are to be enforced it should be against the latter. Petitioners also ask permission to can venison for their own use and not for export. They are allowed to tin other game and they ask that they may be able to put away their venison in the same way. If by any good fortune the fisherman is able to kill his three deer, as the law permits, he is not able to eat it all at once, and he would like to be able to preserve it in some way to keep it all summer. That is the reason for this request. In a nutshell, the people ask that the season for shooting rabbits and hares be extended to 1st March, partridge to 15th February, and deer from the 1st of February to the 1st of March, and I think their requests are very reasonable. I ask that this petition be referred to the Marine and Fisheries Department, and I hope something will be done to redress this grievance.

HON. MR. EMERSON—I have very much pleasure in supporting

the petition presented by the hon. member for Burgeo for although it emanates from the people of Channel and vicinity, its subject matter affects my constituents. The petitioners ask that the time for killing deer be extended to the last of February. This is a very reasonable request, for under the present law the people along the South Coast are prevented from killing the number allowed under the Act owing to the fact that these animals do not, as a rule, come near the coast till the month of February. These people during the year get very little or no fresh meat. They heretofore enjoyed the privilege of taking venison during the winter months. The residents contend that those animals were placed there in the country for their use as an article of food for themselves and families, and it is very unfair to have harsh laws in force against them in this respect. I am very much opposed to any man killing more than the number allowed by law and I think great restrictions should be placed on the sale of caribou, but by all means let those people kill an animal or two during the month of February, should they require the meat for food. The same principle applies to the killing of partridges. The close time commences on the fifteenth of December, which practically prohibits the fishermen from getting a bird. For some reason or other these birds have increased along the South Coast a thousand fold, and yet the people are prevented from killing them after the middle of December. This is clearly wrong. I feel sure that if this matter is taken up in the right spirit by the game commissioners a plan could be devised which would satisfy the residents of these two districts, and at the same time would not lessen to any appreciable extent the game of the country.

HON. PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in relation to this petition. As far as the Government is concerned, the situation amounts to this. It is a matter now entirely for the purpose by Act of this Legislature. I have had many conversations with the hon. member for Burgeo in relation to this alleged grievance of his constituents, and I am sure they are indebted to him for the way in which he has brought it to the notice of this House. Of course it is inconceivable that the present Board would do anything to inflict an injury upon this district and we may rest assured that if the law is defective and is working an injury anywhere, it is not the result of any intentional act on the part of the Commissioners. What object could they have in doing anything except what is for the advantage of the country ? Whether it be in relation to the Game Laws or any other laws. Their only desire is to do what is right. One of the most enthusiastic members of that Board, who has to deal with this as well as other matters, has never shot a deer or partridge in his life. I refer to Mr. McNeily ; he is keen as regards trout or salmon, but he does not shoot. It is not because these men happen to be sportsmen and to live in St. John's that they would do anything unfair. They are members of the Board because they are particularly fitted to deal with this work. But I can also see

the other side of this matter. It must, I can see, be very galling and hard for the people of this district to see people come in from outside having the right to shoot these deer when they cannot. But the object of that is to advertise the country to sportsmen and tourists, and to get revenue from them when they come. Last year 5,000 strangers came to Newfoundland, most of whom were tourists, fishermen and sportsmen. They came here for the fish and sport. Now suppose each of them spent $100 in the country (and I know some that spent $1,000), that would be half a million dollars to the country: And most of this is spent on that very side of the country. If we look forward some day to this country having a large influx of tourists, we must make it known to the whole world that we are going to protect our game. So that really, Mr. Speaker, it comes down to this, whether we can combine the two results or not ; whether we can protect our game, but in such a way as will not work a hardship on any of our people. Under the presidency of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a humane sportsman, who would be the last man in the world to keep a mouthful of partridge from the fishermen, this matter will be taken up by the Board in such a spirit as I am sure will be satisfactory to all parties.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker, just one word with reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Fortune Bay as regards the sportsmen in St. John's and the Game and Fishery Board. I happen to be a member of that Board, and I think the work done by that Board has justified its existence, and I wish to assure the hon. member for Fortune Bay that no individuous distinctions have been made by the Board. Everything has been done by it wtih the one and only object of preserving the game and inland fisheries of the Colony, particularly the salmon fishery. It is well known that last year the salmon were more plentiful than ever before, and that is entirely due to the discontinuance of the practice of putting nets at the river mouths. That may have worked a hardship on the fishermen, but if they are destroying the inland fishery by preventing the salmon from going down the rivers they should be stopped. With regard to partridge shooting, is it not a fact that there was a danger of these grand game birds becoming extinct, and have we not seen the advantages brought about by proper protection ? With regard to deer shooting, as the Premier has pointed out, that is one of the things that induces tourists to come here, and if we hold out no inducement they will not come. The fisheries of this Island are a great asset, and the only object of the Game and Fishery Board is to preserve the game fishes and birds for the whole country.

MR. MOULTON—Just a few words, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the slaughtering of deer and killing them out. I would be one of the first to put my foot down on that. All I ask is that our fishermen be allowed to kill within the time asked for. I understand the great benefit of having tourists come here, and sportsmen ; still I think the fishermen ought to be allowed a longer

time in which to kill the deer and partridge.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—With regard to the remarks in relation to the petition presented by the hon. member for Burgeo and La Poile, I am sure that when this petition comes before the Game and Fishery Board it will receive the deepest consideration. The Board is still thinking about these matters, and a great many reports are coming in about them but I don't thinkany member can say that it has been more lenient with the sportsmen of St. John's than with the fishermen of the country ; and I can assure the hon. member for Fortune that I don't think his constituents will go hungry for want of being able to kill a deer or a partridge.. I have much pleasure in laying on the table the report of the Game and Inland Fisheries Board, and I think that if the members will read it carefully they will see that it has done excellent work.

HON. THE PREMIER gave notice of motion of resolutions in relation to Coastal Steam Service.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUTOMS tabled the Auditor General's Report.

MR. EARLE—I ask leave to present a petition from J. B. Wheeler and others of Musgrave Harbor, Doting Cove, Carmanville, and other places, asking for a sum of money to build two slips with capstans, one on each side of the harbor. I feel sure that nothing I can say can add to the petition, for the petitioners have set forth the greatest need of the slips.

Ordered that these petitions be received and referred to the departmnts to which they relate.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS laid on the table of the House the Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of the St. John's Municipal Council for the year ending December 31st, 1910.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled, " An Act to amend 5, Ed. VII., Cap. 17, entitled 'An Act to provide for the protection of woods against fires and for other purposes,'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committe of the Whole on the Bill entitled " An Act to provide for the Payment of Old Age Pensions."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the bill without amendment.

On the motion for the adoption of this report Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond, leader of the Opposition, moved, seconded by Mr. Clift, the following amendment :

Whereas in the session of 1906 this House unanimously decided in favor of Old Age Pensions, and both political parties in this

House were therefore pledged to the carrying out of such a scheme as soon as the finances of the Colony warrant the same ;

And whereas the revenues of this Colony now evidence that without imposing any extra taxation a universal scheme of Old Age Pensions is within the competency of this country :

Resolved : that in the opinion of this House the proposal outlined in the Bill before the Chair is neither practical nor adequate and that a sufficient sum of money should be voted by the House to provide a pension of fifty dollars per annum to all persons of 65 years of age and upwards.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the amendment : Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond, Messrs. Clift, Earle, Shea and Roberts (5), and against it, Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Colonial Secretary, Minister Finance and Customs, Minister Agriculture and Mines and Mr. Emerson, Minister Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Bennett, Goodison, Moulton, Parsons and Seymour (12).

So it passed in the negative and the original motion for the adoption of the report of the Committee was then put, when there appeared in favor of it : Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Mr. Emerson, Minister Marine and Fisheries, Messrs. Bennett, Parsons, Goodison, Moulton and Seymour (12) ; and against it, Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond, Messrs. Clift, Earle, Roberts and Shea (5).

So it passed in the affirmative and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting a Fire Patrol," was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions to confirm an agreement with the Western Union Telegraph Co., Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—The object of these resolutions is to confirm an agreement made between the Governor in Council and the Western Union Telegraph Company Ltd., of New York, under which that company is allowed certain landing rights for telegraph cables. It will be remembered that after the original telegraph cable was landed here by the Anglo-American Telegraph Co, or rather by its predecessors doing business under a different name, their charter gave them the exclusive right for fifty years to land cables here, but that exclusive right expired in 1904, and shortly afterwards an agreement was entered into with the Commercial Cable Company under which they landed a cable here. That agreement was confirmed by the Legislature in 1906, and during the past year the present agreement was entered into ; and the Committee will observe that in making it we have copied the agreement made with the Commercial Cable

Company in 1905, giving them the right to land their cable here, but not allowing them to enter into competition with the Government telegraph system. The Government will grant to the Company, free of charge, unimproved land for building site not exceeding fifty acres, also the right to lay its cables in trenches from the landing point to the station, and, if necessary, to erect poles for the purpose of an overhead line in connection with its office. In addition the Government will allow the Company to admit free of duty, tools, equipment, and also spare cable for repairing purposes. The right is given the Company and its servants and workmen, to enter public and private land for the purpose of constructing a trench in which to lay a cable, or to do other work in connection with their business. Provision is made for the ascertaining of damage done and the amount of compensation for damage to be paid to the owner of the land by arbitration. In addition to these provisions a section has been inserted in order to make it clear that the Company shall be liable to the tax imposed by the Act 5, Ed. VII., Cap. 7. It will be remembered that there was a question about this in the case in which the Anglo-American Telegraph Company was sued for taxes on its cables. They set up the defence that the tax of $4,000 was on one cable only, the "through cable," that is, a cable from England landing here and then carried on to the American continent. While the Supreme Court did not find it necessary to decide the point specifically, it was clearly intimated that the tax would accrue on each. The Court would consider the cable from England to Newfoundland as one complete cable, and the cable from Newfoundland to America as another. The reason why the point was not decided was that there was a proviso in the Act that no Company should be liable for a tax on more than five cables, and the Anglo Company had more than five cables. To avoid any question on the matter, the Government have placed in the agreement a distinct covenant and stipulation that the Company is to pay the tax of $4,000 upon each complete cable, in other words, $8,000 for each "through cable" landed here. That, in short, is the whole of the purpose of the Resolutions.

MR. BENNETT—Before the Resolutions are adopted, I would like to say a few words in reference to them, although I do not rise to take any exception to them. I think it must have been observed that for the past few years there has been a great inrush of cable companies to the Colony, and one naturally asks why they are coming here. There must be some reason beyond the fact that they wish to do business here, and I have no doubt that their eagerness is due to the fact that our geographical position and other circumstances make it desirable to come here. Such being the case, I think it is our duty to conserve the interests of the Colony by putting a proper valuation on the advantage which the companies will obtain through landing their cables here. I am informed that landing the cables here gives them a far greater capacity than they would have if they continued on to the main-

land, and consequently the companies can do an immense amount of work more than could be done under the old system. I have had the opportunity of obtaining some information in this connection, and am informed on the best of authority that the fact of the cables being landed here has increased the earning capacity of on of the companies by three million do'lars a year. If we possess these peculiar advantages that are so necessary to these companies, are we putting a proper valuation on our position? I have no wish to object to the resolutions now before us, but to find out if the tax on each cable is sufficient, for it appears to me that we have an opportunity of obtaining revenue in this way, and that we ought to put a proper valuation on the facilities which we give to these companies.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—There is a great deal for consideration in what my hon. friend has said, and it is quite true that the companies come here in their own interests. The amount of their increased earning capacity which he has stated may or may not be correct, but it is generally understood to be correct that by landing the cables here the receiving power of the cable is from 25 to 30 per cent. more than its capacity would be if it were carried directly from England to the American continent.

In connection with the point raised, I may say that the agreement does not limit the company to a yearly payment of $4,000 on each cable, but the company is in the same position as other companies in that they are liable to such taxes as may be imposed. There is nothing in the agreement to prevent the raising of the tax to any sum to which the Legislature thinks is fair and proper. The law at present is than any company that comes in here shall pay a tax of $4,000 on each cable, not exceeding five in all. The company requires no agreement with the Government or with the Legislature in order to land its cables, and if they can secure the land they have the right to land them. All we say is that when they come in they are subject to the general tax, and if in the future we think it desirable to raise the tax on the cables we can do so.

MR. KENT—This agreement has not been tabled, and up to the present time we have not had the opportunity of reading it. I do not mean to infer that the Opposition will oppose the Bill, but I wish to reserve any criticism of the measure until it comes before the Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the resolutions without amendment; and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect thereto.

Ordered: That this report be received, and that leave be granted for the introduction of this Bill.

Whereupon the Bill entitled, "An Act to Confirm an Agreement with the Western Union Telegraph Company," was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Hon. Minister Justice the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions to confirm an agree-

ment with the Direct United States Cable Company Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—The object of the present Resolutions is to confirm an agreement with this Company on precisely similar terms as those which have been confirmed in the case of the Western Union Telegraph Company. The same observations as I made then apply word for word to these.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a bill to give effect thereto.

Ordered : That this report be received and that leave be granted for the introduction of this bill.

Whereupon the bill entitled, "An Act to Confirm an Agreement with the Direct United States Cable Company, Ltd., was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the bill entitled "An Act Respecting Pilots and Pilotage for the Port of St. John's."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—This section 4 makes the first change, and instead of the pilots paying $4 annually for a license and $8 each towards the pilotage fund, this bill asks them to pay $50. I understand that last year the pilots paid $15 each, but, as far as I can make out from the law, they were only compelled to pay $12. Probably Mr. Shea, who is one of the Commissioners, will be in a position to explain this later, but the present law proposes that the pilots shall pay $50 per annum, and make no other contribution towards the pilotage funds. Anybody interested in the trade knows that fomerly the pilotage work was done by small boats, four boats accommodating three pilots and an apprentice each. The pilots collected the fees, and out of receipts from pilotage paid their apprentices and also kept up the boats. Last year a change was made, and, instead of open boats, a motor boat propelled by oil was purchased by the Commissioners, and the pilots were allowed to have the use of her. This, of course has made a considerable change in the method of carrying out the pilotage system. To some extent, it has rendered less apprentices necessary, and it has also rendered the old open boats unnecessary ; but, of course, it has increased the expenditure, on account of the upkeep of the steamer. That was provided for by the increase of 10 per cent. in the pilotage rates, and that 10 per cent. was placed in the hands of the Commissioners to be used for the upkeep of the steamer. I understand that the experience of the last nine months—from April to the end of the year—shows that the steamer cannot be kept up out of this 10 per cent. From a statement which, I think, is in the possession of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and which was furnished by the Commissioners, it will be seen by the Committee that the pilots will receive the same amount of in-

com,e besides having the greater comfort and convenience of a steamer, as compared with the old open boats. As far as I can make out, the pilots earn annually from pilotage fees alone an income of between eight and nine hundred dollars, and in addition, their income from casual work in connection with the berthing of steamers increases the amount to $900 or $1,000. They will receive this, or possibly a little more, under the present Bill. This is the principal change which it is proposed to make in the law.

MR. SHEA—I must congratulate the Minister of Justice on the practical way in which he has introduced this Bill. I may say, as far as we are concerned, we have been collecting that fee of $15 ; whether legally or not, the pilots have paid it. As he says, we have been compelled to increase this amount to $50, and, financially speaking, the pilots will be no worse off than they were before, as they will not have the expense of maintaining the boats, nor will it be necessary for them to keep the same number of apprentices. They can work with more efficiency and more comfort in this boat than in the open boat. The fees that are necessary to maintain this boat are estimated by the Commissioners at $1,500 and $1,600. We get $1,000 to $1,100 under the pilotage tax imposed last year, and it is proposed to get $600 more out of the pilotage funds. That would be sufficient to provide for the upkeep. As I said last year, in speaking on this question, the old system was played out, and there were many complaints from the trade all round. Of course, it is too early to speak of improvement in this connection, because the new system has only been working eight or nine months, but as far as I can understand the service has been much more efficient and given greater satisfaction. Next year, if we can, we propose to get a man to take permanent charge of the boat, instead of the pilots taking charge alternately, as at present. So far, we have not been able to do this, on account of the funds at our command not being sufficient. In addition to the eight or nine hundred dollars which the pilots make for the pilotage fees, there is also twelve or fifteen hundred dollars made from what are known as "hobbles." This amount is divided amongst the pilots, and gives them eighty or ninety dollars each. This, as the Attorney General has said, is practically the only change made in the Bill ; the others are merely matters of verbiage.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I support this Bill. The Commissioners have done their very best in the interests of the convenience and comfort of the pilots. When one considers the pilotage system in the different parts of the United States and Great Britain, and then comes back to Newfoundland and sees these men earning their living in these open boats in the twentieth century, it is apparent that a change is necessary somewhere. Last year the Commissioners took this into consideration, and provided a motor boat, and placed her at the disposal of the pilots. Since that time, I think, all the pilots appreciate what has been done for them. Now, to keep that boat running for their benefit, they are asked

to pay annually the sum of $50, instead of $12. It is done for their benefit, and I have no doubt that they have all agreed to pay that amount. From the figures that I have before me, I am convinced that the expense to them will be less than formerly, and at the end of the year there will be a saving to the pilots of about $112, besides the comfort and convenience and other things too numerous to enumerate. I therefore, Mr. Chairman, have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

MR. BENNETT—I would like to say in reference to this Bill that it gives me great pleasure to give it my hearty support. I am sure that the whole country will appreciate the work that is done by the Pilot Commissioners. They have certainly shown a great deal of unselfishness and interest in this matter, and their services should be appreciated. In connection with the providing of the motor boat, I am sure the pilots of to-day much appreciate the comforts which they have in comparison with the time when they used open boats, and that the whole marine world must appreciate the extra efficiency of the service. In the past, when a ship was lying outside in the fog, unable to enter, the pilots in their open boats were often unable to go outside the Heads ; now, that they have this steamer, they can go out in almost any kind of weather. It must, I am sure, afford a great deal of pleasure that the Commissioners have been able to finance this thing without very much hardship to the pilots, who, it has been stated, under the present Act, will not suffer any loss of income. I have very much pleasure in endorsing this Bill, because I think that it safeguards the interest of the whole shipping community.

SIR EDWARD MORRIS—I would like to say a word in support of this Bill. At first there was a lot of misunderstanding as to how it was going to work out, and the other day a half dozen of the pilots called up to see me to know how the Bill was going to affect them. At first they could not see where the benefit lay when they were called upon to pay an increased fee of fifty dollars instead of fifteen annually, but I put myself into communication with the Commissioners, and the following figures which I obtained will, I think, immediately convince the Committee that the pilots, although paying $50 next year instead of $15, as last year, are going to effect a saving in another direction, which will make their income next year larger than it has been formerly. The following were expenses of pilots for the last year : twelve pilots, license fee at $15, $180 ; four apprentices at $18 a month each, $864 ; general upkeep of boats, $100 ; total, $1,144. In other words, the pilots last year contributed $1,144. Now, after the passing of this Bill, they will contribute : twelve pilots at $50, $600 ; two apprentices, at $18, $432 ; total, $1,032. From these figures it will be seen that there is an actual saving of $112, which will be divided amongst the pilots. When they called on me, they wanted it made clear that under the new arrangement their income would be in no way cut down, and I told them that I felt sure that the commissioners were not go-

ing to do that ; and now that they have seen the figures they are perfectly satisfied. I thoroughly agree with my colleague Mr. Bennett that the system at present inaugurated is a very good one, and it is a great advantage to the port of St. John's to have it known abroad that we have a good pilot system, and it is safe for vessels to come in on the coast ; and it is in our interest to make it almost impossible for accidents that have occurred in the past to be repeated.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and passed the same with some amendment.

Ordered that this report be received, and that the said Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Mr. Clift gave notice of question.

Hon. Prime Minister gave notice of motion.

Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice of motion.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, March 20th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 20.

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

Mr. Speaker acquainted the House that he had received the following message from His Excellency the Governor :

"The Governor has the honor to inform the Honorable House of Assembly that he has received a despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, conveying an expression of His Majesty's sincere thanks to the House of Assembly for their Address expressing the sympathy on the death of His late Majesty, King Edward VII., and loyal adherence to the person and throne of his present Majesty.

"RALPH WILLIAMS,
"Governor.

"Government House,
"St. John's, Nfld.,
"16th of March, 1911."

MR. KENT—I ask leave to present a petition from Patrick McCaffery, on behalf of himself and the tanners of Newfoundland. The petitioners ask that the present tariff in relation to undressed leather be made the same as the tariff for the finished product. I am informed that the subject matter of this petition has been a matter of correspondence between the Government and Mr. McCaffery and others representing the tanners. This matter goes back as far as 1898, when, on the invitation of the then Minister of Finance, Mr. Morine, the tanners met him to discuss matters relating generally to the business of the tanning industry. As a result of that interview the tariff was changed. At that time the tariff on rough undressed leather was 25 per cent., the Government reducing this to 10 per cent. in order to enable the tanners to complete the tanning of this rough undressed leather. The result was different to what was anticipated. Others took advantage of the change in the tariff to establish what are called finish factories. As a result the compe-

tition is unfair and bears very heavily on the tanners of the Colony. I understand that the value of this industry to the Colony is about $300,000 a year, and also represents a very large amount of employment in different directions. The time taken to finish the imported article is only about a week, and the number of hands employed is considerably less than what are required for the production of leather from the raw hide. It takes four months to finish the latter. Petitioners claim they can produce as good an article, and can also supply the trade in either large or small quantities. It appears, sir, then that this change in the tariff has worked, and is working, injury to this trade, and I think that the matter is one which is deserving of the closest consideration. I would ask that this petition be referred to the Minister of Finance and Customs, for his consideration, as I hope he may make the desired change when the Budget in introduced.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—In reference to the petition just presented, I may say that evidence is being taken from both parties, and when completed will be given every consideration.

MR. CLAPP—I ask leave to present a petition (handed me by courtesy of the Premier), from William Towns, Geo. Morgan and others of LaScie, asking for the sum of $1,000 to complete a public wharf at that place. La Scie is an important place with several business places, and great inconvenience is experienced by reason of their being no facilities to get freight from the steamers. I ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. EARLE—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Fogo in which they make several requests. They ask for a sum of money to build a public wharf at Fogo, for a sum of money to build a coastal wharf at Joe Batt's Arm at Pearce's premises, and they state that the Fishermen's Protective Union are agreeable to give five hundred dollars worth of free labor to it. They also ask for the sum of $500 to build a public coastal wharf at Seldom Come By, and the Union will assist this by giving free labor to the extent of one third of the grant. They further ask for a grant of money for the erection of a telephone system from Musgrave Harbor to Carmanville; also for the grant of a sum of money to erect a building midway between Fogo and Seldom Come By to serve as a shelter for those who travel that way. There is one more request and that is that the Government will adjust the regular sailing days of the Fogota from St. John's in order that she may be able to connect with the Clyde at some harbor and thus enable the people of the district to connect with the train. I may add that these matters are of great importance to the people of my district, and I have petitions not only from Fogo, but from Seldom Come By, Barr'd Island, Horwood, Carmanville, Tilting and Indian Islands on the same matters, which is a proof of their importance to my constituents. I therefore ask that the petitions be referred to the departments to which they relate, and I trust

they will receive favorable consideration.

MR. MOORE—I beg leave to present a petition from Daniel Quirk and eighty other inhabitants of Tor's Cove, in the district of Ferryland, in which they ask that the fishery laws be amended regarding the use of trawls. They ask that trawls be allowed from July 1st to August 1st, and from October 10th to the end of the voyage. I ask that the petition be referred to the proper department, and I trust it will receive careful consideration.

HON. MIN. AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Hare Bay in reference to saw mills. I have already presented several petitions asking that the mills be closed up, but this one asks that the mills be allowed to continue in operation.

MR. DOWNEY—I beg to present two petitions from the district of St. George's, one of which is from Petrie's Crossing, asking for an allocation for the building of half a mile of road between a new settlement there and the main business centres. The other is from Rattling Brook, and also asks for the grant of a sum of money for roads. I might say at the present time that in view of its population as compared with that of other districts, the district of St. George's is entitled to a much larger grant than it has so far received. Roads are essential to the district, for many of the people there are farmers, and I therefore give these two petitions my very hearty support.

MR. EMERSON—I ask leave to present a petition from Reuben Lewis and other inhabitants of Conn River asking for the grant of a sum of $250 to construct a bridge across the river. The petition has my hearty support.

MR. DEVEREUX—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Haystack, Placentia Bay, on the subject of a road. The sum asked for is $150. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. KENT—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Torbay on the subject of a road there which leads to the main road. Nothing has been done to it for two years, and it is now in a very bad state of repair. I have also a petition from Wm. Martin and others of the same place asking for the allocation of a sum of money to repair Waterman's Lane, which is also in a very bad state of repair, nothing having been done to it for the past two years. The Department of Public Works has had its attention called to the matter but nothing has resulted in consequence. I have also a petition from Charles Tapper and others of Torbay on the subject of a road from Tapper's Cove to the main road. Although this is an importan road leading up from a central fishing locality, nothing has been done to the road either during the past two years. While I am speaking on this matter I am glad to see my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, in his seat, and that I have an opportunity of drawing his attention to the fact that the roads of this place have been very much neglected. On a couple of occasions I have written to him and called his attention to the matter, but nothing has been done. I do

not know if the Minister is to blame as much as those under him, but somebody is certainly to blame. The main road from here to Torbay is in a terrible state, and the inhabitants have themselves turned out and endeavored to clear the gulches. I have myself brought the attention of the Department to this matter. I trust that in future the district will receive better treatment at the hands of the department.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —It is quite correct, as my learned friend has said, that the roads of Torbay are not in a very good condition just now, and that he has written me on the matter on different occasions. I think he will admit that I endeavored to give a satisfactory answer to them and to comply with the requests that he made. The fact is that the Torbay roads have been no more neglected than the other roads have been. Considerable money has been spent by the department in levelling gulches in St. John's East, but the state of the weather makes it impossible to have the roads in good condition. However, I shall endeavor as far as possible to attend to the demands of his district. I shall try to do my best to amend matters.

Ordered that these petitions be received and referred to the departments to which they relate.

The Hon. Minister Finance and Customs laid on the table of the House the report of the Comptroller and Auditor General upon the revenue and appropriation accounts for the fiscal year 1909-10.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend the 'Game and Inland Fisheries Act, 1910,'" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting Pilots and Pilotage for the Port of St. John's," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister the Bill entitled, "An Act to Provide for the Payment of Old Age Pensions" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting a Fire Patrol."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Bill without amendment.

Second reading of Marine Insurance Bill.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—There is no need for me to add anything

to what I have already said when presenting the petition on which this Bill is based, and I shall therefore merely mention the different sections of the measure in order that hon. gentlemen may see what its scope is. The first section gives the names of the twenty gentlemen who are promoters of the measure, and the next section provides that they shall be provisional directors of the company till the general meeting is held. The third section provides that the capital stock shall be $150,000, divided into shares of $100. I am pleased to be able to say that already over $100,000 has been subscribed. The fourth section gives the directors power to increase the capital stock to $500,000, and the fifth section states that the head office of the company will be in St. John's. Section 6 provides that as soon as $50,000 has been subscribed, ten per cent. shall be deposited in a bank. Section 7 deals with the election of a board of directors of the company, and the next section provides that no person shall be a director of the company unless he holds ten shares in his own name. Section 9 states that the company's affairs shall be managed by the directors, who shall appoint the officers and servants of the company. Section 10 provides that the annual meeting of the company shall be held on the second Tuesday in January and each member shall have a vote for every share. Under section 11 thec ompany shall not commence business until $10,000 has been paid into the funds of the company. Section 12 deals with shareholders who refuse to pay the calls on their shares, and section 13 exonerates the shareholder from any liability beyond the amount of stock held by him. Under section 14 the company has the right to make certain contracts. Section 15 gives the company power to make bye-laws for the government of the company. Section 16 provides that all policies shall be issued under the seal of the company. These are the principal matters that the Bill deals with, and I have much pleasure in asking that it be now read a second time.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time and ordered to be referred to the following select committee: Hon. Colonial Secretary, Mr. F. J. Morris, Mr. Earle, Mr. Goodison and Mr. Shea.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice the Bill entitled, "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract with the Western Union Telegraph Company, Limited," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of a contract with the Direct United States Cable Company, Limited," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Clift gave notice of question.

Mr. Gear gave notice of question.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice of motion.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 21st, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 21.

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

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Chapel's Cove, asking for the sum of $100 for the building of a new road there. The petition is largely signed and I trust that all will be done that is possible to meet the demands of the petitioners.

MR. KENT—I ask leave to present a petition from a number of inhabitants of Bell Island on the subject of a road. This petition was forwarded to the Hon. Prime Minister, but he was kind enough to give it to me for presentation to the House. The petition asks that a road that crosses Bell Island from the main line leading to East Wabana and coming out in the neighborhood of the mine be completed. About two or three years ago the road was opened, the right of way having been acquired from land owners, and the road was nearly all graded and drained. Since then nothing has been done to complete the road. Very little will be necessary to open it for traffic, but to make a good road a great deal of money will be needed. The road promises to furnish one of the main thoroughfares of Bell Island for the main current of traffic is between Lance Cove Road and the mine. At the present time the people with horse and carriage have to go to the east end of the Island thus extending the journey by nearly a couple of miles, and foot passengers have to go by the track, which is forbidden and which is very dangerous. Several accidents have already occurred in this way. I think that if the prayer of this petition is acceded to a very useful road will be opened up for traffic on the Island. I think that this petition and the immense amount of traffic on Bell Island deserve the prompt consideration of the department.

MR. CLIFT—I ask leave to present a petition from William Small and others of Farmer's Arm, Dildo, asking that it be made a port of call for the Clyde. Also a petition from the inhabitants of Loon Bay, Birchy Bay and Sunday Cove asking that either of these places be made a port of call. I have much pleasure in presenting the petitions, and ask to have them referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

Ordered that these petitions be received and referred to the departments to which they relate.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS laid upon the table of the House—

Statement Current Account of Colony for 1909-10.

Statement Treasury Balance Sheets for 1909-10.

Statement of Public Debt Account for 1909-10.

Statement Geological Trust Account for 1909-10.

Statement Teachers' Pension Fund for 1909-10.

Statement Game License Trust for 1909-10.

Statement Colonial Secretary Department Trust for 1909-10.

Statement of Public Works Trust for 1909-10.

Statement of Departmental Trust for 1909-10.

Statement of Railway Arbitration Awards for 1909-10.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Hon. Minister Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr, Chairman, it is with unusual satisfaction that I am able to congratulate the House, in presenting this, my third Budget, upon the fact that the past fiscal year, which ended on the 30th of June, 1910, broke all records in the financial history of our Island Home. Three new standards were created for this year, by these facts—

First—That for the twelve months which then ended, the Colony's total trade was greatly in excess of that for any previous year ;

Second—That the revenue collected was by far the largest ever realized in Newfoundland ; and

Third—That surplus over the expenditure for the year much exceeded any previous surplus and justified the Government in projecting important new undertakings in the public interest.

Printed statements of the public accounts already on the desks of hon. members exhibit the details of these records.

It is a further pleasure to be able to assure this House and this Colony that unexampled conditions of prosperity which have prevailed almost since the hour this Government assumed office, and which now continue in an increasing degree, give promise of maintaining themselves on a still expanding scale in the years to come.

As our financial year closes with the end of June, the presentation of an annual Budget, Mr. Chairman, implies a consideration of the fiscal operations of the Colony for three years—for the year that has passed, for the year that is now passng, and for the year which begins in July next. We can thus review the accounts of the past year, which have been closed and of which a finalized statement is possible ; the transactions of the current year, of which eight months have passed and with respect to which we can, from the figures in hand and the experience of previous years, fairly estimate the outcome ; while for the year that is coming we can reasonably estimate the revenue receivable and the expenditure to be incurred, so that a fairly accurate prospect of the financial situation up to the summer of 1912 is now possible.

I may, therefore, summarize at once the facts, which I shall detail more fully later, and inform the House that for the last fiscal year the revenue on current account was $3,447,998, which gives a surplus of $420,213 over expenditure; that for the current fiscal year I estimate a revenue of $3,503,000 and an expenditure of $3,366,000, which should give a surplus of $142000 ; and that for the next fiscal year, ending with June, 1912, my estimate is a revenue of $3,460,000 and an expenditure of about $3,332,000, which would leave a surplus then of $128,000.

With reference to the fiscal year of 1909-10, that which closed last June, it is not necessary for me to say very much. It has spoken for itself, and various announcements in the press have more of less prepared the country for some of the facts which I shall set out here. The total trade for that fiscal year reached the unequalled figure of $24,624,693. In order to illustrate what this means, I have prepared a table showing the import and export figures for the past five years, as follows—

Year	Imports	Exports	Total
1905-6	$10,414,274	$12,086,276	$22,500,550
1906-7	10,426,040	12,101,161	22,527,201
1907-8	11,516,111	11,815,769	23,331,880
1908-9	11,402,337	10,848,913	22,251,250
1909-0	12,799,696	11,824,997	24,624,693

From this table it will be seen that the value of the imports for 1909-10 was a million and a quarter dollars greater than the best previous year in our history. This must be attributed of course largely to the imports last year of materials for the Harmsworth and Albert Reed mills, their imports of articles on which they are allowed free entry under the tariff clause regarding new industries being considerable, while the value of their dutiable imports may be gauged from the fact that the duties collected at Grand Falls increased from $49,324 in 1908-9 to $101,374 in 1910, while Bishop Falls, not a port of entry at all in 1908-9, accounted for $3,456 in 1909-10. A further evidence of what these industries will mean to the Colony may be gleaned from the fact that the Customs revenue collected at Grand Falls from July to December last amounted to $84,470, and at Bishop Falls, $1,941.

The exports for the fiscal year, as the above table shows, were almost the largest ever known, and in them was included a new contributory, the product of these mills to which I have referred, the export of pulp and paper up to June 30th being valued at $421,319. Apart from this, however, the exports show a very stable condition of trade, being valued at nearly half a million dollars more than the previous year, in spite of the smaller catch of fish which figured therein.

The revenue which in my first Budget Speech in June, 1909, I estimated would reach $3,000,000 for the fiscal year on which we were then just entering—and which estimate was criticized at the time as erring on the side of over-confidence—actually realized on current account $3,447,998.84, while the expenditure was only $3,137,774.94, so that a surplus remained of $420,213.90. In explanation of my short estimate I think it is only fair to point out that this Government had barely taken office after a double election and a period of uncertainty that prevailed for several months and the policy of the present Government was only beginning to be shaped, so that it was impossible for us, new to office and

without opportunity to study economic and fiscal conditions, to accurately foreshadow the results that would accrue therefrom. The principal increases making up the large addition to the revenue, which was $655,000 over that of the previous year (for eight months of which our predecessors were in office) and which represents an increase of practically one-fifth of the total revenue of their last year were nearly $320,000 in Customs revenue, and nearly $200,000 in Crown Lands receipts. The last administration may fairly be said to have been responsible for five years of fiscal control, because we were not sworn in until March 1909, and the year ended in June, during which period we simply administered the finances on their estimates. I have prepared a table showing the Customs revenues for these five years, with the increase or decrease from year to year, and it shows that in the first four years there were increases aggregating $266,342, and in the last year a decrease of $46,681. The table is as follows :

Year	Cust. Rev.	Increase	Decrease
1904-5	$2,295,959	$63,900	
1905-6	2,335238	39,278	
1906-7	2,354,056	81,182	
1907-8	2,472,074	81,982	
1908-9	2,425,393		$46,681
		$266,342	$46,681
		46,681	
Net increase in five-year period..		$219,661	

Our record for 1909-10 is a Customs revenue of $2,743,364, an increase of $317,970 over 1908-9, or, in other words, the increase in the Customs revenue for the first year of this administration was 50 per cent. more than the increase therein for the whole five years our predecessors enjoyed control of the public affairs of this Colony. The moral, if I may use the term, of this is that public confidence in the prospect of a capable and progressive administration of the Colony's business was strengthened by the present Government securing power, and an effective stimulus was thereby imparted to the industrial and commercial operations generally and the investment of extensive capital in all our industries.

A still more remarkable showing was made in the Crown Lands Department. The revenue of this department had never reached $60,000 under our predecessors. In the year they went out it was but 53,000, while during our first year it went up to $251,000—nearly five times as much. This was a direct outcome of the altered policy adopted by the present Government of granting no "pulp" licenses, but only "timber" licenses, because the latter permitted the applicant to hold the land for only thirty days, without payment of fees, while

the former allowed them to retain it for a year, and our policy resulted in the same lands being secured by various applicants during a short period and in substantial payments being made, as a result of these turn-overs, holders having to pay the fees or else forfeit the lands.

Imports of silver amounting to $350,000 had been made by our predecessors as follows :

1900	$100,000
1904	100,000
1907	50,000
1908	100,000

and during the early months of our term a sum of $100,000 was imported by us.

When last I met this House with a Budget statement—in March, twelve months ago—the Government was sufficiently certain of the possession of a record-breaking surplus to provide before hand an appropriation therefrom to effect a reconstruction of marine works damaged by the gales in the preceding December, and also to set on foot necessary repairs to public roads and bridges. Accordingly out of the then estimated surplus of $380,000 this Legislature voted $100,000 at the last session, half for marine works and half for roads and bridges, and another $10,000 to provide for the Colony's participation in the Festival of Empire, in London, which was planned for last year. This left in the treasury an actual surplus remaining, when the accounts for the last fiscal year were closed, of $310,213.90, and this amount the Government now suggests be appropriated as follows :

$200,000.00 to be set aside as the nucleus of an Old Age Pension Fund, this sum to be permanently invested in debentures and the interest applied, together with an appropriation from the current revenue of $12,000 to pay pensions to 400 aged and infirm, who are otherwise destitute, at the rate of $50 per annum ;

$100,000.00 to be expended as was the similar sum last year—half for marine works, and the other half for roads and bridges ; and

$10,213.80 (the remainder of the surplus) to be also utilized in connection with the Festival of Empire.

This affair, as is already well known, had to be postponed last year owing to the death of King Edward, and is being held in London this summer on a somewhat different scale. As a result of the visit of the Prime Minister to London last season, he affected arrangements with the Imperial Institute for the securing of a court therein and the placing of a permanent exhibit there, and the intention is to have all the display that is made at the Festival of Empire removed at its close to the Imperial Institute and housed there permanently in the court in question for the advertising of this Colony and its resources. All the show cases, specimens, etc., which are being sent over this time will be utilized in this fashion, and therefore the vote in question may really be regarded as representing provision for this permanent exhibit.

I now turn to the affairs of the current fiscal year, the revenue for which I estimated in my last Budget as likely to amount to $3,256,000. I am gratified to be

able to say to-day that all the indications thus far point to this estimate of revenue being considerably exceeded.

The Customs receipts for the current year will probably exceed by $100,000 those of last year, which it should be noted, were adjudged abnormal, because they represented the rebound from the depression of the previous year, a rebound accelerated by the change of Government, the restoration of public confidence, and the stimulating influences of the new projects set on foot by this administration. These factors continue to operate as fully as before, and large sums, as I have already shown, are being paid into the Treasury as duties upon articles for the new pulp making centres in the interior. I, therefore, confidently anticipate a Customs revenue at the end of June of practically $2,840,000. The excess is made up of $65,000 from increases in Customs duties, and $35,000 from ore royalties. The postal and telegraph revenues will, I estimate, yield an additional $25,000 ; the postal revenue for eight months having increased $17,000, partly owing to sales of the Guy Centenary stamps ; and the Telegraph revenue increasing $4,000 in the same period ; so that an estimate of but $2,000 on each account for the remainder of the year seems not unreasonable.

The Crown Lands revenue for the eight months up to the end of last month (February 28) was $124,000, somewhat in excess of the receipts for the same period last year ; but while $130,000 was received on this account between the first of March and the 30th of June, in 1910, I do not look for more than $100,000 for the same period this year, and so am prepared for a drop of $30,000 on this account between now and the end of June. I must, however, emphasize the fact that this decline by no means indicates any failing financial interest in the utilization of our Crown Lands. The fact is that the law provides that only half the rental is exacted after the first year on lands held subject to certain of our laws, so that where parties acquired lands a year ago by paying $4 a square mile, they have to pay only half that amount this year, and in view of the large transactions in the previous fiscal year, a decline would not be unreasonable this season.

We shall, however, have to help offset my estimated shortage of $30,000, the sum of $24,000 from the landing taxes paid by the Western Union and Direct United States Cable Companies in accordance with the terms of the contracts tabled here a day or two ago with regard to their cables landed last fall at Harbor Grace and Bay Roberts. The Commercial Cable Company has disputed the Colony's claim of $16,000 on account of last year and this, and as the matter is now under adjudication, I prefer to say nothing more respecting it beyond pointing out that if the Colony's contentions are upheld and this $32,000 is received, it, together with the $24,000 which is certain from the other cable companies that came in last autumn, and the $25,000 increases in the Postal and Telegraph revenues will more than make up any shortage in Crown Lands receipts.

The receipts from various other sources of revenue—stamp and

liquor licenses, fines and forfeitures ,fees from institutions, Municipal Council interest, bank and other taxes, and miscellaneous amounts will, I estimate, yield fully as much as last year, so that I count upon the close of the year showing us to have a total revenue of about $3,503,000. The expenditure, including Supplemental Supply, on account of this year, to the amount of $311,000, which I shall ask the House to vote to-morrow, will make a total outlay on current account this year $3,361,000, so that the surplus of revenue over expenditure on the 30th June next should be somewhere about $142,000.

The estimated revenue for the year which ends with June next is :

Customs	$2,870,000
Postal and Telegraphs.	185,000
Crown Lands	220,000
Miscellaneous, general.	178,000
	$3,453,000
To which add interest on unexpended portion of Railway Loan	50,000
	$3,503,000

The estimated expenditure for the same period is :

Interest Public Debt ..	$933,000
Disburse. re Hague Arbitration	20,000
Disbursements by all departments	2,303,000
	$3,256,000
To which add one year's interest on Railway Loan, $140,000 less $35,000 voted last year	105,000
	$3,361,000

The Supplemental Supply is made up as follows :

The Finance Department $115,000.00, made up of $105,000 for interest on the Railway Loan for the past year, as already explained, and $10,000 overdraft on account of Legislation.

The Colonial Secretary's Department $1,000 ; $300 being for education and $700 for annuities for retired policemen.

Department of Justice $2,750 ; $1,000 for Supreme Court contingencies and $1,750 for Magistrate's contingencies.

Public Charities $28,000 ; of which $12,000 is for Smallpox, $6,000 for Public Health and $8,000 for Extra Relief.

Agriculture and Mines $27,000 ; of which $23,340 is in connection with the Government's agricultural policy and the remainder for overdrafts in the other branches of the work in that department.

Marine and Fisheries $950.

Customs Department, $7,000.

The Contingencies Department $11,000, made up as follows : $1,000 for Prime Minister's office, $1,500 for Colonial Secretary's office, $3,000 for Finance office, and $5,500 for General Contingencies.

Public Works Department $30,000, which amount represents over expenditures on a number of services administered by that department.

Post Office Department $63,500, of which $2,800 is made up of extra salaries and allowances in the Postoffice Department ; $2,500 additiona[1] for couriers and contractors ; $21,200 additional for steam subsidies ; $5,000 for Postoffice Contingencies ; $1,600 for

manufacture of Stamps ; $2,300 for telegraph salaries ; $10,000 for telegraph contingencies ; $8,000 for telegraph construction ; and $9,000 for Marconi construction.

For the fiscal year which begins on July 1st next and terminates on June 30th, 1912, I estimate a revenue of $3,460,000, and an expenditure of $3,332,000, which will leave a surplus of $128,000. Every head of revenue should, I estimate, yield a larger return than in any previous year, except Crown Lands, but I think the House should be prepared for a decline in the receipts from that source forthe reasons I have already stated. The expenditure would be made up of the principal supply as represented by the estimates already voted here this session amounting to $3,272,545, and additional estimates to the amount of $59,169, or a total of $3,331,714 ; say $36,327,000 in round figures ; of the additional estimates, which I shall invite the House to consider tomorrow, the items are as follows:

Interest on Proposed Loan	$4,800.00
To provide schools in sparsely settled localities	7,000.00
Main line railway mail clerks, provisions for six men, 312 trips at $3.25, $1,014 ; whereas only $500 was voted	514.00
Mail Clerk on second steamer across Cabot Strait	600.00
Allan Line, increased contract.....	7,000.00
Reid Line, second steamer across Cabot Strait	13,000.00
Northern winter service	6,000.00
Railway mail subsidy, Bonavista branch, ...	6,255.00
Postal contingencies	4,000.00
Telegraph contingencies	10,000.00
	$59,169.00

We propose to submit to the House to-morrow a bill for a loan of $120,000, made up as follows : For the St. John's Municipal Council, $32,000, of which $20,000 is to provide for the purchase of the building, lease and improvements in the new Town Hall ; $10,000 to provide for connecting the old and new water services in the city in order that the fullest advantages may be taken of these for fire protection and other purposes ; and $2,000 for the fencing what is known as the Parade Ground, which the Council proposes to convert into a sort of park or playground for the residents of the thickly-settled portions of the city which adjoin that area. The other items of this loan are $15,000 for the completion of the new public building at Harbor Grace, and $73,000 for improvements to the General Hospital, the erection of the proposed King Edward Home for nurses ; the remodelling of the Hospital by reason of the quarters now occupied by the nurses being converted into additional wards ; and the modernizing of all the accessory departments of that institution. This will involve an addition to the interest charge of $4,800 a year.

The members of this Committee should not fail to note that we have made provision this year for the interest on the whole of the Railway Loan and that, therefore, there will not be any decided addition to the Estimates on that account next session, any votes which we may have to ask being for the increased expenditure necessary for the conduct of the ordinary general public services. The Estimates already voted this year show an apparent increase of $217,000, but, as I explained when introducing them, a large proportion of this amount is made up of the vote for interest on the Railway Loan ; the additional sums now asked will, I feel sure, commend themselves to the Committee as absolutely necessary.

The foregoing review, Mr. Chairman, deals with the fiscal situation for the three years comprehended in this Budget presentation, and I am sure that it will be gratifying to all interested in the well-being of this Colony to note that it has enjoyed such a period of unbroken prosperity of late, and that each year in its turn shows the condition of the people to be one of greater comfort in their homes and greater material betterment in their avocations. In spite of the fluctuations in the price of fish, the returns realized from our staple product are highly encouraging, and the prosecution of our subsidiary industries is being attended with excellent results. A still more gratifying fact is that new industries, such as mining, pulp and paper making, local manufacturing and otherwise are being enterprised, all contributing their quota to the improvement of the condition of the people and to the stabilitation of the general prosperity of the Colony.

We have cause for thankfulness that while other countries on both sides of the Atlantic have been subjected to the misfortune of financial panics, commercial depression and industrial discontent, this Island has enjoyed freedom from any of these adverse conditions and that through her fishery supremacy in these North Atlantic waters, the output from her mines, the product from her pulp and paper mills, and the fruits of agricultural and manufacturing operations within her borders, she is assured of a permanence of prosperity and advancement which few countries can excel.

It will scarcely be disputed that perhaps the largest factor contributing towards the permanent well-being of this Colony in recent years has been the fruition of the railway policy inaugurated by the late Sir William Whiteway. Only through the instrumentality of the railroad could the farm and forest resources of our vast interior be utilized, and as the years go by we become more and more convinced of the wisdom and foresight of the departed statesman, whose memory will ever be associated in the annals of our Island with the construction of railways and the development of home industries. It follows, therefore, that the present Government in embarking upon the railway policy for which it received a mandate from the people at the polls, which was endorsed by this Legislature last year, has every prospect of seeing substantial results accrue to the Colony in the

future in a proportionate degree, as have been derived by Newfoundland from the railway enterprises up to this time, and the Finance Minister of some future period may, I trust, be able to as truthfully ascribe the prosperity of our Island Home in his day to the railway policy of Sir Ed. Morris as I am now too credit its prosperity at the present time to the railway policy of Sir Wm. Whiteway.

Other contributing agencies have, however, played their part in bringing about the great result, and among these may be mentioned increased prices obtained for fish and the investment of much local and outside capital in various undertakings throughout the Colony. The demand from Canadian centres, too, for quantities of local fish required to supply the Canadian markets in the West Indies and elsewhere, which the catch along the Nova Scotia coast is inadequate to satisfy, has helped not a little to maintain the local rate for fish at a higher figure than formerly, and to relieve the strain on our own foreign markets, so that the problem of disposing of our catch is rendered less difficult thereby.

The various avocations of our people the past year were attended with encouraging results in the main. The bank fishery was unusually successful and a number of additional vessels have been purchased to engage in it this year. The shore fishery on the West Coast was a good one, and that from St. John's around to the southward proved fairly remunerative, but northward the total was not so good. The resulting prices, though, enhanced as they were by the fact of a short catch, contributed materially to maintaining an average in the financial return, while the fact that the Gloucester fisheries disclosed a shortage of some 7,000,000 pounds of cod, forced American dealers to seek for supplies in our ports to satisfy their market requirements, thus aiding in the same result. Trade conditions generally were satisfactory; imports for the eight months of the current fiscal year, as shown by the Customs returns, have been unusually large, and this is of course the best evidence of the prosperity of the country, because when times are not good people content themselves with the purchase of the bare necessaries of life, and these are in the main admitted to the Colony duty free, so that when the total import duties shows a substantial increase, it is clear that the people are sufficiently well off to purchase largely of duty-paying articles.

The same condition is reflected by the fact that the increase in the pay of the laboring man to $1.50 a day, occasioned by the Government stipulating this as a minimum in the contract for the construction of the branch railways, has resulted in this rate being now recognized in virtually all the industrial activities of the Island, and thus in improving the condition of the working classes. I may be pardoned for quoting in this connection the following extract from the last annual report of the Board of Trade, published on the 17th of January last, in which the improved circumstances of the Colony are thus attested :

"The Estimates of the Minister of Finance were last year considered by a good many to be somewhat extravagant, but he has been justified in the position he then assumed by his having collected for six months a surplus of about $70,000 over the previous year . . . The financial condition of the Colony is good. The two or three failures which have occurred during the past year have effected the general trade of the Colony very little, and it is a fair forecast to say that, with the increasing industrial enterprises, which is evident everywhere and fair fisheries during the coming year, that 1911 will excel all its predecessors in general prosperity."

During the fiscal year 1909-10, the Funded Public Debt of the Colony was increased by the sum of $185,199.00 net, viz. :

Increased by—	
5th Ed. VII., Cap. 1 for conversion of debentures	$39,000.00
St. John's Rebuilding Act	2,450.00
9th Ed. VII., Cap. 3, Public Service	183,250.00
	$221,700.00
And reduced by—	
Surrender of debentures under Conversion Act	36,501.00
Net increase of	$185,199.00
Making the total debt at the close of the year	$22,943,196.85

The difference between the issue of bonds, that is $39,000, and the surrender of debentures for the same ($36,501) is contained in the cash received under the Conversion Act, referred to above.

Of the addition to the debt for the year, $102,450 is chargeable, as a guaranteed loan, to the St. John's Municipal Council.

The net Public Debt of the Colony stood as follows at the close of the fiscal year 1909-10, viz. :—

Gross Public Debt		$22,943,196.85
Less—		
Owed the Colony by the St. John's Municipal Council ...	$1,303,341.22	
Scrip of the Harbor Grace Water Co.'s stock held by the Government	13.700.00	
Paid off by the operation of the Sinking Fund established under 56 Vic., Cap. 13, as on June 30th, 1910	501,944.65	1,818,895.87
Leaving net debt at		$21,124,210.98

Since the beginning of the current fiscal year, the Pubic Debt has been increased apparently by $4,000 through the raising in London by the Prime Minister, last summer, of the loan for the construction of the branch railways. As has already been announced in this House, this loan was raised on terms more favorable than any previous financial transaction in the history of the Colony. As a result of the raising of this loan, the Public Debt on the 28th of February of this year, amounted to $27,160,230.18. I might point out, however, that this increase does not represent an actual liability of the Colony to that amount, because interest is being received by the Colony on the unexpended portion of this loan, and we are actually gaining something thereon, because the interest is compounded at quarterly intervals. Really the Public Debt on the 28th of February last was not $27,000,000, but about $24,235,000, the railway contractor having been paid up to that day $1,212,000, and the right of way, arbitrations, etc., having cost $80,000. The branch railway to Bonavista Bay is now about four-fifths completed and will be.finished early this summer. It has opened up a country of much promise, as I can personally testify from a visit there last season, and it should result in greatly increasing the industrial and commercial possibilities of that section of the Island. It afforded employment to large numbers during last summer and fall, and proved an important agency in maintaining good times throughout the Colony by creating new avenues of labor. During the present season the branches to Heart's Content and Trepassey will also be started, and will be carried to completion as speedily as possible. As these branches, and the others that are to follow, will render large tracts of virgin country accessible, they should be succeeded by a substantial impetus being imparted to agriculture in the districts of Bonavista, Trinity, Bay de Verde, Ferryland, Placentia and St. Mary's, Burin, Fortune Bay and the West Coast, and as occasion demands highways will be provided to connect with these branches and bring their advantages home to the greatest number of people.

The Bell Island ore royalty has exceeded from a financial viewpoint even the expectations of the Government. For the calendar year 1910 the recepts from this source amounted to $82,000, and the coming year a still greater return is expected, as both the Dominion and Scotia Companies, which are operating there, contemplate an increased output, which will likewise call for the employment of a large number of our people.

It is not possible to exactly estimate at present what the product of the pulp and paper mills will be henceforth. But the Customs returns for the past fiscal year, which ended on the 30th of June, show that the exports of the products of the Grand Falls mills from the starting thereof in January until June 30th last amounted to—

7,866 tons paper valued	$352,155
6,853 tons pulp valued.	69,164
	$421,319

The exports of the same products for the six months from July 1st to December 31st were as follows :

11,120 tons paper, value $498,208
14,453 tons pulp, value. 144,463

$642,671

It would therefore appear that during the calendar year 1910 the export of pulp and paper amounted to $1,063,990. This would not, however, represent a normal output, because the mills at the start were not operated to full capacity, and the output the present year should be much larger. Moreover, this year the Albert Reed Company, at Bishop Falls, will also be starting operations, and its product should swell the total volume and value on this export.

One of the circumstances which best attests the favorable conditions prevailing in this Colony is that the Crown Lands Revenue is maintaining itself so admirably. As I have already observed, the greatest revenue from that department for any year before this Government assumed office was about $60,000. But as a result of our policy, which meant a prompt collection of fees or the cancellation of licenses within thirty days, there has been a greatly enhanced activity in the direction of acquiring wooded and mineral areas, and it looks at this juncture as if these conditions would be continued for some considerable time to come.

A similar gratifying condition of affairs exists in the Postal and Telegraph departments. A comparative statement of the revenue for the eight months ending on the 28th of February, in the present year, and the two previous years discloses the following figures :

Year	Postoffice	Telegraphs	Total
1911	$68,576.92	$41,548.60	$110,125.52
1910	51,003.83	37,889.21	88,903.04
1909	47,341.10	33,046.65	80,387.84
Increase (1911 over 1910)			$21,222.48

The fact that the revenue is increasing both from the Postal and Telegraph branches, forms the fullest justification for the policy adopted by this Government of reducing the postage rates with the United States to two cents and of extending the telegraph system to the remoter districts of the Island. From the last report of the Postmaster-General, tabled in this House a few days ago, it will be noted that the progress in every branch of his department is highly gratifying, and he foreshadows the early approach of the time when the receipts from Postal revenue will exceed the expenditure. Commenting on the income and outgo of his department for last year, he observes—

"From these figures it will be seen that the postal revenue exceeded that of 1908-9 by $10,376.27, while the increase of expenditure was only $6,666.97. and the total ordinary postal expenditure for the year being $96,560,63, and the revenue $90,338.41, it is evident that very soon there will be a yearly surplus to go towards

payment of subsidies. In fact, the revenue for the six months ending December 31st, 1910, is $15,304.04 in execess of that for the same period in 1909."

An equally gratifying circumstance is the fact that the foreign parcel post business is growing amazingly, the number of parcles handled having increased in the same period from $14,757.17 to $20,685.81. In addition to this, the number of local parcels despatched from St. John's during the same period increased from 33,965 to 101,844 ; truly a colossal expansion and a testimony to popular appreciation of the value of the Postoffice as a business agency.

In this House, a few days ago, some criticism was offered of the department, and it was suggested that it should go into the express order and package business. These figures will, I think, be somewhat of an eye-opener to those who imagine that the Postoffice Department is lagging behind, though the possibility of further extending its sphere of usefulness is not being overlooked by the Government. A further evidence in the same direction is the fact that the operations of the money order branch have increased proportionately in the same period. The total number of money orders issued in the Colony for the year 1905-6 was 26,026, amounting in value to $403,932.20, while for 1909-10 the numbed issued was 49,271, valued at $661,893.57. The total number of orders paid in the Colony in 1905-6 was 24,895, valued at $448,-159.22, whereas the total number paid for 1909-10 was 45,902, valued at $712,563.10. I might remark with respect to the money order branch that there has been a remarkable increase in its operations the past year or so, a circumstance attributable, of course, to the construction and operation of the pulp and paper mills at Grand Falls and Bishop Falls, and the larger number of men finding employment in the iron mines on Bell Island. The Postmaster-General remarks that "it is evident from the increased revenue that the postal telegraphs have been availed of by our people more than ever the past year."

But he is somewhat critical respecting the operations of the Marconi wireless agency on Labrador, of which he speaks as follows :

"The same (that it is satisfactory), however, cannot be said of the local business with the stations on Labrador. The receipts do not in any way approximate the amount paid for royalties. This is owing to some extent to the high rate of seventy cents for message of ten words between Newfoundland and Labrador, and also to the delay in forwarding them. It will be seen from the latest report of our Governor, His Excellncy Sir William MacGregor, who visited the Marconi Labrador stations in 1908, that these offices are closed during the greater part of the day, and that the operator can only receive messages from the station next to his North and South at six o'clock in the evening. Neither do the stations furnish any weather reports or fishery information to the fishermen. There would appear, therefore, to be very little benefit derived by the public from the operations of these stations under present

conditions as compared with their cost and maintenance. I have not received from the Marconi Co. their report for 1910, and am consequently unable to say what improvement, if any, was effected in last year's business. The whole matter, I have no doubt, will receive due consideration by the Government when making terms for the operations of new Marconi stations."

This comment must occasion regret that the unwise policy was adopted by our predecessors in 1906 of giving the Marconi Co. a ten year monopoly in this Island, because there remains no doubt that otherwise, with the progress the world is making of late years in wireless telegraphy, a much more efficient and satisfactory service could have been secured.

The Report of the Newfoundland Savings Bank for the calendar year 1910 shows the deposits to have been on the 31st December last $2,794,027.73, an increase of $152,017.27 during the year. This increase is the largest for many years, and the profit of $12,587.50 is the largest made by this institution since 1894, being nearly $4,000 more than was made in any year from that time up to the present, which fact must be regarded as a very favorable augury for the future of the institution. The Savings Bank at the close of 1893 had on deposit $3,068,000, but circumstances caused substantial withdrawals, reducing the total on deposit within the next two years to about $1,250,000. Since then the total has been gradually mounting up again, but whereas in 1909 the increase was but $10,-559.98 over the figures for 1908, the enormous additional enlargment of deposits by $150,000 during 1910 is perhaps the most conclusive testimony that could be desired of the greater prosperity of the Colony, the more favorable circumstances of our people, and the growing usefulness of the Savings Bank, as further evidenced by the successful outcome of the experiment of establishing several new branches last year.

The deposits in the Savings Bank department of the three Canadian banks which do business in this Colony amounted on May 31st, 1910, to $3,324,856.14. This means that—including the Colonial Savings Bank—there are on deposit in this Colony, therefore, as savings proper, $6,118,883.87. There are lodged in the three Canadian banks in the Colony as deposits bearing interest, and, therefore, fairly to be considered as savings in the same sense, the sum of $3,263,862.53, making a grand total of $9,382,746, as against a total under the same head the previous year of $8,-967,493, and as against $8,452,462 the previous year, showing that the savings of our people have increased $415,253 the past year, and $930,284 over the preceding year. In other words, our people have put aside as savings nearly $1,000,000 in the past two years.

The value of the debentures and bonds of the Colony, which are held locally to-day, amounts to $3,109,983, an increase of $185,199 the past year, and the reserve or re-insurance value of life insurance policies, to protect policyholders, is now $1,300,000, an increase of $159,000 over last year. In other words, our people have invested a sum of almost $900,000 the past year by means of deposits

in the banks, purchasing of debentures, and effecing life insurance. Twenty-two years ago the deposits in our Savings Bank amounted to $2,500,000,in round numbers. To-day our Savings Bank itself has a larger amount on deposit, and the Canadian banks have in their savings departments and on deposit receipts bearing interest $6,600,000, or more than twice and a half as much. No better illustration could be desired of the manner in which the prosperity of this Colony has advanced in recent years.

In the same connection a comparison of the dutiable and free imports into the Colony in the past year and the previous year will help to show the ascending scale in the prosperity of our people. In 1908-9, the value of the dutiable imports into the Colony was $6,601,854, and of free articles $4,800,483, making a total of $11,402,337, while in 1909-10, the value of the dutiable imports was $7,736,738, while the value of the free imports was $5,062,958, a total of $12,779,696. In other words, the value of the duty-paying imports the last fiscal year exceeded their value in 1908-9 by $1,134,884, while the value of the free imports showed an increase over the previous year of $262,473. Few, if any, statistics could more conclusively prove the betterment in the circumstances of our people than this, viz.—that there was imported itno the Colony during last year an additional $1,000,000 worth of articles paying duty over and above those articles which enjoy free entry. On those articles which pay a duty of 35 per cent. and which form the backbone of our general imimports, the valuation in 1908-9 was $1,381,685, while in 1909-10 the value of these imports amounted to $1,700,000, an increase of $320,000, in round numbers.

In order to realize the progress that Newfoundland has made within the past fifteen years, I supply tables here of the imports and exports at intervals of five years during the period, which will be found to illustrate very thoroughly the nature and extent of the progress the Colony has made—

Year ended June 30.	Imports.	Exports.
1895	$ 7,164,738	$ 5,811,160
1900	7,497,147	8,510,140
1905	10,279,293	10,592,531
1910	12,799,696	11,878,455

A further table covering the same period gives the value of the fishery products and other exports—

Year ended June 30.	Fishery Products.	Other Exports.
1895	$5,144,589	$ 665,571
1900	7,015,964	1,611,612
1905	8,734,275	1,935,067
1910	9,578,984	2,299,471

It is now slightly over two years since this Government took office, and, as this House well knows, it had, when it did so, to face a deficit of virtually $160,000 on current account, not to speak of liabilities on capital account, for which loans of $175,000 had to be raised—all of these arising out of the transactions of our predecessors. Having disposed of these outstanding problems and secured a clean sheet, the present Government started with a new era on July 1st, 1909. The first year's operations resulted, as you are aware from the statement which I have just made, in the Colony enjoying the greatest prosperity on record, whilst the present situation and future outlook are equally favorable. An unqualled surplus was realized last year ; a surplus greater than any other under the regime of our predecessors is in sight for this year ; and we look forward to an almost equally large surplus a year hence. It is the settled policy of this Government to give back to the people, in the form of direct disbursements amongst them, all of these surpluses, as far as possible, by providing for increased appropriations every year for the services through which the great mass of the taxpayers benefit most directly, and by special appropriations with the same object in view. For instance, in the session of 1909 we added $30,000 to the vote for education. Last year we added $25,000 more. This year we are providing a further addition of $7,000—making within the brief period of three years a direct increase of $62,000 to the education vote, whereas for the previous nine years, under our predecessors, the total of the increases was only $100,000. Next year we hope to add $13,000 more, to give full effect to the policy of providing a school in every outport, and when this is done the annual provison for education will be $75,000 above what it was when we took office. In addition to this, however, we have provided the sum of $100,000 on capital account for the improvement and erection of school buildings, which is, with one exception, the only direct outlay made for this purpose since Responsible Government, the previous one being a sum of $40,000 in the year 1875. Under these circumstances, I submit that this Government can fairly claim that it has done its full duty towards the people in the way of providing them with educational facilities since it has assumed office.

In a Colony like ours, where the majority of the people live by seafaring pursuits, the providing of lighthouses is a most essential accessory to the efficient conduct of their daily avocation. It is really an insurance for life and property against the perils of the sea. This fact early impressed itself upon the Government, for in the Manifesto of our Leader, special prominence was given to this matter. Therefore, last year, a capital sum of $100,000 was provided to complete the lighthouse system of the Colony, by the erection of lighthouses, fog alarms and beacons in the most necessary places ; while, from the annual revenues, year after year, the necessary allocations will be made for the maintenance of these institutions. An adjunct to these new coast

aids will be the extension of the Marconi system along the Labrador coast ; the erection of Marconi stations between Fogo and Bell Isle, both for general convenience and for the benefit of the sealers ; and the further extension of the telegraph system to sections of the Island not yet suppled with this facility. The annual appropriation voted by this House a few days ago on account of the Lighthouse Department is $17,000 more than voted by our predecessors the last year they held office, and the Government has spent, since it came into power, $43,000 on the erection of lighthouses, $10,000 on the erection of Marconi stations, and $30,000 on the extension of telegraphs. In view of these facts, it will scarcely be disputed that the present Government has done its part, in the brief time it has been in office, to provide the fishermen of the Colony with such advantages as are derivable from the establishment of these beneficial agencies.

Nor has the Government been unmindful of the claims of several sections of the Island for better steam communication. Since its advent to power it has provided a service for Bell Island and parts of Conception Bay at a cost of $2,800 ; a service for Fogo District at a cost of $18,500; a service for Fortune Bay at a cost of $20,000 ; and a second Labrador steamer, to ply on the northern part of that coast ; while it has in contemplation the providing in the near future of better services for parts of the Colony which are without adequate facilities in this respect at present. Provision has also been made for a northern winter coastal service. This year the Bowring Company were induced to give an additional trip of the s.s. Prospero ; then the Newfoundland Produce Company gave a trip of the s.s. Fogota ; and a temporary boat is now performing the service until better provision can be made. It is intended to have a fortnightly service when ice and weather will permit, the Government considering that the northern districts are entitled to enjoy the advantage of a coastal steamer in winter while the coast is free enough to afford it to them. The coming summer the Reid Newfoundland Company will commence operating a daily express service across the Island, which service will be undertaken without additional cost to the Colony. A service between St. John's and Port aux Basques would, of course, be lessened in value except a steamer was put on Cabot Strait in addition to the Bruce, so the Company has undertaken to provide such a steamer, one in every respect equal to the Bruce, and the Government has undertaken to pay her a subsidy, during the eight months which it is estimated she will run each year, on the basis of the subsidy now paid the steamer Bruce ($20,000 a year), so that the Colony will thus be getting all the advantages of a daily train across the Island and a daily steamer across the Strait —the latter for eight months of the year—for the sum of $13,000 annually. It is felt that the requirements of the Colony would not necessitate a second steamer during the winter months, at any rate until traffic increases beyond the point it has reached at present. It will hardly be question-

ed, I think, in the light of this recital, that the needs of the various parts of the Colony for coastal steam and the need of the whole of the Colony for increased communication with the outside world have been adequately met by this Government up to the present time.

In view of the determination expressed by the Reid Newfoundland Company to undertake this daily express service, it will, I think, interest the Committee to study the figures which show the traffic increase effected by this Company during the past six years. I have made this comparison from the statistical returns which the Company furnishes the Legislature every session, taking the year 1903-4 and the year 1909-10,the former being the first full year that makes comparison possible, because the previous statement covered the period from September 1st, 1901, when the new railway contract became effective, to June 30th, 1903. The table is as follows—

	1903-4	1909-10
No. passengers carried	136,010	194,844
Tons of freight carried	122,935	133,343
Miles run, passenger trains	190,425	207,573
Miles run, freight trains	51,296	78,366
Miles run, mixed trains	200,821	287,529
Passenger traffic earnings	$206,940	$274,490
Freight traffic earnings	159,941	231,266
Mail traffic earnings	41,812	42,000
Other earnings	22,724	43,834

Out of the surplus of $420,000 on account of last year, the Government secured an appropriation of $100,000 from the Legislature at the last session, anticipating events to that extent, for the construction and repair of public works, marine works, etc., and out of the $310,000 still available as a surplus on 30th June last, the House is now being asked to vote a further sum for the same purpose. This will mean that in addition to the ordinary grant of $175,000 for roads and bridges every year, and the similar grant of $18,000 for marine works and dredging, the districts will receive $200,000 additional within these two years for the further improvement of the several works of these classes all over the Island, a provision that in its scope and amount has never been approached in our history. This additional appropriation is equivalent to an increase of fifty per cent. of annual grants, and will, so to speak, give the people of every section of the Island $3 to spend on these works to every two they had before. This provision, of course, is entirely apart from the expenditure of $4,000,000 for the construction of branch railways, which is proceeding apace, and which will, within the next few years, provide various sections of this Colony with daily railroad communication, and all the advantages of being able to get from point to point with the greatest comfort, convenience, and cheapness, and which will be followed by the same uplifting of the Colony and the more robust

commercial and industrial development as has been the experience of railway extension heretofore. The interest on the expenditure on account of this undertaking has been provided entirely out of current revenue, and yet the Government has been able to show the largest surpluses on record.

The Government has also devoted its attention to agriculture in a special degree, and has inaugurated an agriculture policy, the details of which have already been set before this House by the Head of that Department. A feature of that policy was the holding of an Agricultural Exhibition in St. John's last fall, and as an evidence of the success of that Exhibition I will simply quote from the annual report of the Board of Trade, which says—

"The Agricultural Exhibition was a marked success, the buildings being prettily decorated; the exhibits of vegetables were good and nicely arranged. The needlework contained some specimens of rare excellence, as well as those of ordinary use in the artizans' and laborers' homes. The poultry on exhibition was extremely good, and it is a pity that these excellent breeds are not more extensively bred in the outports instead of the dwarfed and unsatisfactory birds which are generally found there. The live stock exceeded general anticipation, some very fine specimens being on exhibition. The Exhibition will serve a very excellent purpose if the people of the Colony will take its lessons to heart, and strive to improve the agricultural produce and live stock. The Government are entitled to all commendation for the way in which they stimulated the Exhibition by offering a large number of prizes, and because of the way in which they are now endeavoring to utilize the lesson of the Exhibition by providing seed of improved kinds, at actual cost, to any one in the Colony having use for the same."

I might, in passing, observe that the Manufacturers' Association co-operated with the Government in regard to this Exhibition, and that their display was equally meritorious. The Government feels that in no respect can the industrial development of this country be better assured than by stimulating its people to greater agricultural efforts, and accordingly it has decided to double the annual appropriation for this object, a policy in which it feels that it has the concurrence and co-operation of the Legislature, and which it believes will be abundantly justified by results.

Another phase of the Government's activities is comprehended in its provisions for the poor, the suffering and the afflicted. I need not dilate upon the details of the Government's Old Age Pension scheme. The Hon. the Premier, in his speech in proposing the Old Age Pension Resolutions here last week, set out the case very clearly. Provision is being made this year for four hundred pensions of $50 each, for the aged and infirm who are otherwise destitute. The Government hopes to be able to set aside a further sum next year, to be added to the Pension vote, which will enable the number of pensioners to be increased. Since the Government has taken office it has provided for a thor-

ough reorganization of the General Hospital at St. John's, and in order to ensure much-needed room for additional wards in the present hospital buildings, the demand on which is very great, it is arranging for the construction of a Nurses' Home within the hospital grounds, as a Memorial to our late King. This will enable more beds to be provided in the main hospital ; it will enable the number and efficiency of the nursing staff to be increased ; and it will testify to the late King's humanitarian labors during his life. The cost of the proposed building, completed and equipped, will be about $40,000, and the Government has now on hand the equipment of the hospital on the most modern and efficient lines with operating instruments, appointments, etc.; the reorganization of the heating and lighting service ; the providing of a morgue and other necessities, as well as the remodelling of the quarters which the nurses will vacate. All of these undertakings will call for a substantial outlay, but when the works are completed, which it is expected will be about the end of the present year, the hospital will challenge comparison with any of its size and kind in the world, and will be provided with every agency to assist in alleviating the sufferings of those confined there and in promoting their convalescense, that this Government, by appropriations in which nothing is stinted and no request refused, can endure for the benefit of the sick and injured of this Colony.

The present Poor Asylum in St. John's has been described as "the saddest place in Newfoundland," and the Government has recognized that something should be done for the unfortunates residing there to improve the conditions under which they live. Accordingly, a vote of $150,000 was provided in a Loan Bill last year for the construction and equipment of a new Poor Asylum, and work on this will be started in the spring, so that it may be possible, it is hoped, to transfer the institution to its new quarters before the snow comes again. The new Poor Asylum will be of fireproof material, designed on the most approved modern lines, and ensuring the greatest comfort possible for its occupants.

There is yet another institution to be dealt with, and that is the Lunatic Asylum. The Government have determined upon a thorough-going reform of this institution, both as to the buildings comprising it and as to the most modern scientific methods of treatment, so as to ensure the largest possible percentage of "cures" among those sent there. We feel that our policy in regard to these institutions will meet the approval of the people of the Colony, and that every dollar which is spent on God's poor, suffering and afflicted will be cheerfully granted by the warm-hearted taxpayers of our Island Home.

Finally, while making provision in all these respects ; in disbursements amongst our people of existing revenues ; and providing of every service that can ensure to their comfort and advancement, the Government has gone a step further and provided so far as it can for the development of conditions which will enable our people to earn a better livelihood, and to secure a larger

return for the fruits of their labors. In other words, it has negotiated for the establishment of a cold storage enterprise in the Colony, the details of which you are already familiar with. This enterprise will mean the establishment of a large business by capitalists of recognized reputation, familiar with this undertaking, and capable of carrying it on advantageously, and such can have but one result for our fishermen—and that to secure for them better prices for their catch of cod and other fishes. The coming of this concern, with five cold storage plants, each with a capacity of five hundred tons of refrigerated fish, which they will ship to the United States, cannot but be productive of immense advantages to our fishermen. Competition means higher prices in any business or industry. The more purchasers of fish that come to this Colony from abroad, the higher will be the price that our people will secure for their catch and every quintal of cod absorbed by these concerns will mean so much withdrawn from our regular markets, and thereby help to increase the price paid not alone for fresh, but also for salt cod, because the smaller the quantity of the latter we have to offer to Southern Europe and Brazil the more money will be obtained for the commodity. The Government's obligations under this agreement will amount, at most, to but $25,000 a year, and assuming, for the purposes of argument, that every contention advanced against the project by its opponents is maintained, the fact remains that if the coming in of these people will only increase price of cod ten cents a quintal, it will put $150,000 into the pockets of our fishermen every year not to mention what the increase in the price of other food fishes will yield to our people; and out of this $150,000 a year, $50,000 will return to the revenue in the way of duties on imports, for that is the admitted proportion we get; so that, after paying the $25,000 to this Company, the Colony would still benefit directly through its revenue to the amount of $25,000 a year, and our people would make a clear gain over everything else of $100,000 per annum.

The printed returns, which show our imports and exports, have already been tabled here, but in connection with the movements of trade, as between the Colony and the outside world, I append a table showing the proportion of import trade enjoyed by the United Kingdom, the Dominion of Canada and the United States in respect of fifteen subheads of articles on which they can fairly compete, and of which we obtain more than $100,000 every year. These tables show the fluctuations in these categories the past four years, and will well repay the student of trade problems desirous of estimating the present position and future tendency of our trade relations with these countries. I shall not delay to read them, but they will appear in the speech when it is printed.

The position of the Surplus Trust Fund at the close of the fiscal year 1909-10 was as follows—

Dr.

Total received 1901-2 to 1907-8, both years inclusive.....	$462,931.29
And received from 1909-10	310,213.90

Cr.

Expended on Roads to June 30th, 1909	$178,910.93
Lighthouse Construction	45,000.00
Harbour Improvement	10,000.00
Carbonear Public Building	7,500.00
Extension Marconi System	14,000.00
New Postal Telegraph Offices	10,000.00
Outport Court Houses	5,847.82
Finishing Fever Hospital	3,000.00
Construction New Museum (part cost)	30,000.00
Extension General Hospital (part cost)	30,254.48
Marine Works	45,234.61
Encouragement Herring Fishery	22,381.87
General Elections, 1908	40,238.59
To cover part deficit Current Account, 1908-9	6,786.92
	$449,245.22
Balance.....	323,899.97
	$773,145.19

The only amount spent on account of the Surplus Trust Fund in 1909-10 was $3,133.07 for the encouragement of the herring fishery.

The balance to the credit of the Surplus Trust Fund is made up thus— .....

Encouragement of Herring Fishery	$ 13,686.07
Awaiting allocation by Legislature	310,213.90
	$323,899.97

The following statement shows the position of the several Loan Accounts on June 30th, 1909—

	Bal. 1908-9.	Raised	Expended 1909-10	Balance to 1910-11
1. Loan Act, 1898.....	$10,000.00			$10,000.00
2. Agricultural Bonus Act.....	3,920.47		$ 2,721.28	1,199.19
3. Loan Act 1909	31,424.47		23,584.15	7,840.28
4. 5 Ed. VII. Cap 1....	1,223.52	3,005.52	306.00	3,922.52
5. 9 Ed. VII. Cap. 3.....		190,250.00	100,000,00	80,250.00

The balances at the Bank of Montreal to the credit of the Colony at the close of the year 1909-10 were as follows—

1. Loan, 9 Edward VII, Cap. 3	$ 80,250.00
2. Debenture Conversion Account	3,922.52
3. Surplus Trust Fund	323,899.97
4. Agricultural Bonus	1,199.19
5. Loan, 61 Vic. Cap. 1 (Market House)	10,000.00
6. Reserve Fund	500,000.00
	$919,271.68

And to its debit in the same bank—

7. Temporary Loan Account	$545,354.00
8. Exchequer Account, 1908-9	199,221.57
9. Imported Copper Coin	724.62
	$745,300.19

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that I have made clear to the Committee as I have endeavored to do, the facts and figures which may be said to present a truthful picture of this Colony's financial position. Whatever may be our party differences, we can all unite, I am sure, in an expression of satisfaction that this Newfoundland of ours is progressing and prospering, and in the sincere hope that it may continue and prosper even more so in the future. Everything points to the fact that by the diversifying of our industries the sure and certain foundation for permanent stability in the welfare of our Island Home has been laid ; and we have the best reasons for confidence that the structure now being upreared thereon is such that as will defy the gales of adversity for many a year and long. We can justly feel that a brighter day is dawning, and that much as has been accomplished heretofore, greater things, I am convinced, are yet in store for this ancient appendage of the British Crown ; and in the promise of the future we are warranted in rejoicing as fully as we are in the certainty of the present.

I turn now to the amendments which we propose to make to the Revenue Bill by alterations in the tariff. They are as follows—

We propose to put on the free list ammonia for refrigerating purposes, vegetable oils for use in curing fish, gasolene when used in connection with cold storage or the fisheries, printed and lithograph labels when imported into the Colony for fish tins or fish packages, and when such labels cannot be manufactured in the Colony, mineral and lubricating oils for machinery in connection with cold storage, and tin, metal and solder when used in connection with the cold storage or the fisheries.

The foregoing, as the Committee will understand, simply makes general in its scope the concessions already granted to Trefethen and Lord.

The only article which we propose to put on the free list is

wire for the manufacture of brooms, and this puts wire so imported, on the same footing as wire imported by manufacturers of boots and shoes in their own factories.

We propose to amend the tariff by changing the duty on higher-priced soap, so that all soaps costing over $4 per cwt. should pay two cents per pound, including cost of wrappers and covers ; as it is now the cheap soap and the dearer soap bought pay the same rate—one and one-half cents—and it works out on a valuation that the poor man's soap pays at the rate of 35 per cent., while the rich man's soap pays at the rate of 21 per cent.

We also propose to change the duty on cigarettes and cigars. At present the rate for cigarettes is six dollars per thousand, and 30 per cent. ad valorem. This operates to the disadvantage of the revenue, for the ad valorem duty has to be assessed on the invoice price, and some corporations give cheap rates to the large buyer or allow excessive trade discounts. We now propose that cigarettes should pay $2.75 per pound and five per cent ad valorem, which will insure a fairer assesment of duty on different grades of these articles.

Cigars now pay $10 per thousand and twenty per cent. ad valorem. The short cigar and the cheap cigar pay as much under the former heading as the long cigar and dear cigar, so we propose to change the duty so as to make the tobacco in all cigars pay duty by weight, besides which there will be less danger of fraudulent invoices. Accordingly, we propose to make the duty on cigars 15 per cent. ad valorem, and one dollar per pound.

Proposals have been made to the Government with a view to the manufacture within the Colony of the article known as compound lard, materials required to make this are the same as some of those used in the making of butterine, and it is proposed to produce the article in tins, pails and tubs. The article will be manufactured in bond, and we propose to charge an excise duty thereon of two and one-quarter cents per pound, which we estimate will yield the Colony the same revenue as is now derived from the imported article.

We also propose to make a clerical amendment of Item 133 of the tariff, which will make clearer the purpose of the duty now levied on liquors, viz.—that the duty is intended to be levied on them at the rate of so much per gallon when reduced to the strength of proof. We propose to take the power to inquire into the matter of rough, undressed leather, imported by tanners for the final stages of manufacture here, and regarding which a petition was presented to this House yesterday.

I now propose, Mr. Chairman, that this Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again on Thursday next, then to stand first on the order of the day. I appreciate that honourable members, especially on the other side, will desire an opportunity to study the details of this Budget before undertaking its discussion.

STATEMENT OF CURRENT ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 1909-10.

Dr.

Customs Duties, St. John's and Outports	$2,680,217.75	
Light Dues, St. John's and Outports	30,263.02	
Miscellaneous, including Royalties, $22,201.74	32,883.25	
Total Customs Revenue		$2,743,364.02
Postal Revenue	90,388.41	
Telegraph Revenue	67,771.75	
Crown Lands Revenue	251,234.01	
Stamp Revenue	17,790.49	
Liquor Licenses	5,162.55	
Fines and Forfeitures	5,285.56	
Broom Department	9,726.15	
Fees Institutions	2,940.28	
Municipal Council Interest	48,869.67	
A.A. Telegraph Co. Tax	22,869.37	
Bank of Montreal, Interest on Cr. Balance	13,283.33	
Municipal Council's Contribution to Fire Department	12,000.00	
Bank Tax	10,000.00	
Express Tax	2,000.00	
Carbonear Water Company	1,260.80	
Grand Bank Harbor Board	712.50	
Interest on Harbor Grace Water Company's Stock	548.00	
Life Insurance Assessment	434.35	
Insurance Licenses	250.00	
Miscellaneous	605.91	
Imported Silver	135,809.19	
Fortune Harbor Board	237.50	
		704,624.82
Loan Account		23,584.15
Surplus Trust	3,133.07	
Agricultural Bonus	2,721.28	
		5,854.35
		$3,477,427.34

STATEMENT OF CURRENT ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 1909-10.

Cr.

Expenditure under the following Heads :

Head	I. Interest, etc., Public Debt	$881,468.11	
	II. Civil Government	156,373.71	
	III. Pensions	10,616.70	
	IV. Administration of Justice	194,973.59	
	V. Legislation	33,658.97	
	VI. Education	289,957.83	
	VII. Public Charities	290,598.80	
	VIII. Lighthouses	84,992.14	
	IX. Agriculture & Mines ...	58,420.00	
	X. Marine & Fisheries ...	150,519.03	
	XI. Roads, Bridges and Ferries	214,092.57	
	XII. Postal Telegraphs Department	497,192.77	
	XIII. H. M. Customs	151,034.61	
	XIV. General Contingencies .	31,159.77	
	XVI. Coal and Water Refunds	62,506.39	
	XVII. Additional Estimates ..	20,209.95	
			$3,127,774.94
Audit Act		10,000.00	
Loan, 9th Ed. VII., Cap. 3.....		23,584.15	33,584.15
			$3,161,359.09
Surplus :			
Revenue in excess of expenditure for the year			310,213.90
Surplus Trust		3,133.07	
Agricultural Bonus		2,721.28	5,854.35
			$3,477,427.34

Examined by me and found correct,
F. C. BERTEAU, C. & A. G.

M. P. CASHIN,
Minister of Finance and Customs

PUBLIC DEBT ACCOUNT ON 30th JUNE, 1910.

1909-10. **Dr.**

July 1.—To Balance, viz. :	$ 1,581,666.66	
Loan at 3 per cent.	13,065,546.66	
do 3½ per cent.	8,295,983.53	
do 4 per cent.		$22,943,196.85

Cr.

By Act 54 Vic., Cap. 8 at 3 p. c.		$1,581,666.66
do 56 do 1, do	3,384,960.00	
do 56 do 2, do	4,708,800.00	
do 60 do 4, do	456,980.00	
do 61 & 3 do 6 & 4 do	351,373.33	
do 1 Ed. VII., Cap. 6, do	2,263,000.00	
do 5 do 2 do	1,900,433.33	
at 3½ per cent.		13,065,546.66
do 44 Vic., Cap 24, at 4 p. c.	11,300.00	
do 46 & 7 do 5 & 4, do	19,336.00	
do 49 do 15, do	55,400.00	
do 49 do 3 do	60,000.00	
do 50 do 6 do	480,000.00	
do 50 do 7, do	320,000.00	
do 51 do 3, do	50,000.00	
do 51 do 5, do	218,000.00	
do 51 do 5 do	82,150.00	
do 52 do 5, do	408,000.00	
do 54 do 6 do	2,400.00	
do 56 do 1, do	92,633.48	
do 56 do 24, do	27,630.00	
do 58 do 4, do	65,292.00	
do 58 do 13 do	2,676,666.66*	
do 60 do 2 do	973,333.33	
do 61 do 10 do	50,473.75	
do 61, 2, 3, do 33 do	85,352.93	
do 59 do 15 do	52,500.00	
do 2 Ed. VII., Cap. 28 do	35,592.46	
do 4 do 18 do	9,550.00	
do 5 do 1 do	2,328,500.00	
do 9 do 3, do	180,250.00	
do 62 Vic., 37, do	11,622.92	
		8,295,983.53
		$22,943,196.85

*Note—$501,944.65 of this Loan has been paid off by the Sinking Fund under this Act.
$1,307,104.22 Municipal Debt.
$12,700.00 Hr. Grace Water Stock.

Examined by me and found correct, F. C. BERTEAU, C. & A. G.
M. P. CASHIN, Minister of Finance and Customs.

TOTAL IMPORTS OF NEWFOUNDLAND FOR PAST FOUR YEARS.

Articles.	1906-7	1907-8	1908-9	1909-10
	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars
Total Imports of all Articles (including Specie)	10,426,040	11,576,111	11,402,337	12,799,696
Coal	565,208	648,391	6 5,997	691,734
Leather and Leatherware	352,235	346,562	347,338	421.641
Dry Goods	386,462	37 ,989	388,716	432,036
Cotton Fabrics	262,250	252,688	342,622	323,935
Hardware	3 0,207	293,585	56,342	347,380
Smallwares	232,101	211,155	216,766	249,742
Hemp Yarn	211,835	251,715	158,68	91,411
Readymades	206,831	183,518	181,155	215,293
Tweed	162,763	133,968	138,674	160,355
Women's Dress Goods	129,767	123,744	108,305	127,853
Salt	101,737	142,865	111,388	105,835
Machinery and Locomotives	368,849	400,326	336,624	516,404
Groceries	13,335	144,437	138,985	144,035
Fruit	130,208	151,714	133,154	116,115
Stationery	128,000	100,325	103,372	142,546

BALANCE SHEET TREASURY ACCOUNTS.

1909-10.

Dr.

Revenue, viz. :		
On Current Account	$3,447,988.84	
On Loan and Trust Accounts	29,438.50	
		$3,477,427.34
Bank of Montreal, General Account		$84,172.52
Exchange Account, Bank of Montreal, 1908-9		199,221.57
Imported Copper, Bank of Montreal		724.62
Temporary Loan, Bank of Montreal		545,354.00
Bank of Montreal Trust Accounts		835,099.16
Harbor Grace Water Company Stock		13,700.00
Public Debt		22,943,468.85
		$24,621,468.72

BALANCE SHEET TREASURY ACCOUNTS,
1909-10.

Cr.

Expenditure, viz. :		
On Current Account	$3,137,774.94	
On Loan and Trust Accounts ..	29,438.50	
Revenue in excess of expenditure	310,213.90	
		$3,477,427.34
Loan 9 Ed. VII., Cap. 3	$80,250.00	
Debenture Conversion Account..	3,922.52—	$84,172.52
Bank of Montreal E.A., 1908-9..		199,221.57
Bank of M. Imported Copper ...		724.62
Bank of M. Temporary Loan ...		545,354.00
Agriculture Bonus	1,199.19	
Loan 61 Vic., Cap. 1	10,000.00	
Surplus Trust	323,899.97	
Reserve Fund	500,000.00	
		$835,099.16
Stock Account Hr. Grace Water Company		13,700.00
Sundry Acts		22,943,196.85
		$24,621,468.72

Examined by me and found correct,
F. C. BERTEAU, C. & A. G.

M. P. CASHIN,
Minister of Finance and Customs.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Committee have leave to sit again on Thursday.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider resolutions for the confirmation of agreements made by the Newfoundland Government with the Newfoundland Produce Company, Limited, in relation to Coastal Steam Services.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, the resolutions which we propose to submit to the Committee, as you will notice by a perusal, are a confirmation of the two agreements entered into by the Government with the Newfoundland Produce Company. The first agreement is in relation to the service between St. John's and Change Islands, that being the terminal port for the district of Fogo, and the other agreement relates to Fortune Bay and the

various intermediate ports mentioned in schedule 15. It will not be necessary for me to go into any detail to the Committee in relation to either of these measures for the reason that both services have been in operation for over a year, and if it were not for the fact that the agreements were not signed they could have been submitted last year for ratification. To a large extent they complete the Bay service and coastal service all over the Colony and with the exception of two or three points the coastal service of the Colony is fairly well provided for. I think this House is already in possession of the notice as well as the tenders received, which really constitute the agreement, but for the convenience of the Committee I shall table the notice issued from the Department of the Colonial Secretary on September 15th, 1909, and the tenders received in response to that notice. There were only two tenders received for both services and in both cases the contract was awarded to the Newfoundland Produce Company. In the case of the Fogo service the work is done at $500 weekly. In the Fortune Bay service there were only two tenders also, and the one accepted was originally $2,000 a month. It is quite true that the lowest was $24,000 a year and the Government thought it too much even for a superior service, because the condition laid down called for a superior service, because the conditions laid down called for superior boats classed A1 at Lloyds, with a capacity for steerage, second class and saloon passengers, and all the other requirements of a similar first class service. Considering the contract of 1898 the Government thought that the amount of $2,000 was too much, but they succeeded in getting it down to $20,000 a year, which is a reduction of $4,000. Both the contracts entered into by the Government and both services have new boats which have been going for nearly 18 months, and as far as I can gather they have been much appreciated by the travelling public generally, and by the residents of the Bays where the services are particularly carried out. The general sections of both contracts follow almost verbatum the contracts with Reid and Bowring. I think in this we have taken every safeguard to protect the public interest and in that respect all have been able to follow with considerable advantage the well considered sections and agreements that for so many years now have been found to meet all the necessities to safeguard the Colony. With this explanation I beg to move the first resolution. I forgot to mention that the Government has obtained the regular certificates from the Harbor Master and Mr. McLaughlan that the boats came up to standard and I table copies of these certificates for the information of the Committee.

Mr .Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the resolutions without amendment and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect thereto.

Ordered that this report be received and that leave be granted for the introduction of the said Bill.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confimation of an Agreement with the Newfoundland Produce Company, Limited," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Fire Patrol," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bills entitled respectively, "An Act for the confirmation of a contract with the Western Union Telegraph Company, Ltd.," and "An Act for the conformation of a contract with the Direct United States Cable Company, Ltd."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and passed the same without amendment.

Ordered that this report be received and that the said Bills be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend the Game and Inland Fisheries Act, 1910," was read a second time and ordered that it be referred to Committe of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. F. J. MORRIS presented the Report of the Select Committee to which was referred the Bill entitled, "An Act to Incorporate the Newfoundland Marine Insurance Co., Ltd., of St. John's, Newfoundland," which is as follows :

"The Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill entitled 'An Act to Incorporate the Newfoundland Marine Insurance Company, Limited, of St. John's, Newfoundland," have considered the matter to them referred and report that the preamble of said Bill has been approved.

(Sgd.) R. Watson
F. J. Morris
Geo. Shea.
J. R. Goodison
Henry J. Earle.

"Committee Rooms, Tuesday,
March 21st, 1911."

Ordered that the said report be received and that the Bill be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker acquainted the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled, respectively, "An Act further to amend the Education Act, 1903," and "An Act to regulate the manufacture, storage and importation and sale of explosives," without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed

the Bill sent up entitled, "An Act to extend the operation of 5 Ed. VII., Cap. 18, entitled, 'An Act to encourage the Manufacture of Peat'." with an amendment, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice the said amendment was read a first time and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

Mr. Clapp gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 22nd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 22.

The House met at three p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

MR. HOWLEY—I would ask leave to present a petition from Rev. Arthur Shorter and other residents of Arnold's Cove in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, asking for a sum of money for a road from Arnold's Cove to the railway. I might point out that this road is of service not alone to the residents of Arnold's Cove, but to the lower section of Placentia Bay, and whilst lots of other petitions will probably come before this House that will probably receive as much or more attention as the one I now present, I beg to submit that the parties whose names are signed here are deserving of the utmost consideration. I also beg to present a petition from Richard McGrath, Thos. Manning, and other residents of Little Harbor West in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's. The petitioners point out the great inconvenience they suffer from want of postal and other means of communication, and they ask that the mail boat call there, and if this is impossible they ask that Little Harbor be connected by courier with St. Joseph's, which is a port of call for the mail boat. In supporting the petition, Mr. Chairman, I would say that I know the amount of trade that is done at Little Harbor and would recommend that the prayer of the petition be acceded to.

MR. SQUIRES—I beg to present a petition from certain of the inhabitants of Heart's Desire, district of Trinity, on the subject of roads; also one from Clarenville on the same subject; one from Elliston on fishery matters and fishery rules; a petition from Gooseberry Cove on the subject of a well; one from Great and Little Catalina on the subject of fishery rules; also one from Elliston on the subject of a lighthouse and fog alarm on the Horsechops; also one from Clarenville on the same subject.

HON. THE PREMIER—I beg to present a petition from the citizens of the districts of St. John's East and West on the subject of an amendment to the Temperance Act in relation to the closing of licensed houses. The Premier in introducing this petition said that it had been handed to him just before coming into the House. It was from the citizens of St. John's, together with the people of the outlying settlements, and was signed by His Grace Archbishop Howley, Mayor W. J. Ellis, Rev. D. O'Cal-

laghan, James F. Parker, Revs. James Bell, H. P. Cowperthwaite, D.D,. F. W. Mathews, L. Curtis, D.D., J. W. Bartlett, J. K. Curtis, W. C. White, J. Thackeray, J. J. McDermott, M. Fenwick, J. F. Pippy, G. R. Godden, H. Uphill, F. J. Goff, J. Brinton, W. P. Kitchen J. J. St. John, E. P. Roche, V.G., P. N. Kelly, P. Sheehan, J. J. Greene, J. S. Sutherland, C. H. Barton, G. H. Willett, Lieut.-Col. Rees (S.A.), Capt. Cave and about 3,800 others. He understood from the gentlemen who intrusted the petition to him that there was also another petition with 300 other signatures attached, which had not been received by them up to the time they waited on him. He considered that such a petition, so largely and influentially signed, should receive the most sympathetic consideration. Temperance had never been made a party question in the Legislature and he felt sure every member would give this question his best thought. He regretted it had not come earlier in the session, but felt honored that he had been entrusted with submitting it to the House. He dealt at much length with the gradual spread of temperance in this Colony, instanced localities in his own district, like Petty Harbor, Broad Cove, Goulds, etc., where there was not a solitary man addicted to drink, the same thing being true of the Ropewalk, the shoefactory, the foundry, the dock works, and the mercantile premises in this city, so that, whilst there was doubtless too much indulgence in strong drink by some, he would strongly insist that our people were an abstemious people and that drunkenness as it exists in other countries was practically unknown here. He then scanned the history of temperance legislation in the Colony since 1873, when the first Local Option Act was introduced, and referred to the work of the Temperance Commission in 1905, the local option contest in the city in 1909, and the Bill passed last year to close the saloons until 9 o'clock in the morning. He analyzed the arguments for and against the present movement, declared himself a great believer in moral suasion and eulogized the work done by societies and clubs in this city the past twenty years, especially among the young men who are to be found now in athletic and social organizations where liquor is banned, while in former days they haunted saloons and beer shops. He believed in doing justice to all parties, and pointed out that the petition was understood to have signatures and promises of others which would probably represent a majority of the electorate of both districts; and that if the majority willed this legislation, then it should be enacted.

MR. SQUIRES—Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of rising to say just a few words in support of the petition presented by the Prime Minister, and I would ask your permission to join with it a petition from the Temperance Committee of the Methodist Conference of Newfoundland. It is signed by Hon. Jas. Angel, Mr. John Leamon, Rev. Dr. Curtis, Rev. F. Matthews, and Rev. J. K. Curtis. All these have signed the petition presented by the Premier, but they present this petition on behalf of the Temperance Committee of the Methodist

Church. It would be out of place for me, after the lengthy manner in which the Premier has discussed it, to refer to the subject otherwise than briefly. The petition which has been presented shows that there is a certain development going on year after year in the public opinion of the city. Year after year legislation has been introduced and passed in this House ; and this petition now before us shows that the general opinion of the people of St. John's, East and West, is sufficiently strong to justify this legislature in considering further measures. The petition which I am entrusted with covers two or three points in the existing law which appear to need attention, particularly as regards Section 12 to 16 of the Act of 1906. It will be remembered that that Act deals with the granting and surrender of all licenses within the limits of St. John's. That board was to have certain discretionary powers and responsibilities in dealing with these various matters, and I am informed that it has not taken upon itself the responsibility entrusted to it and governed by sections 12 and 16 of the Act, and consequently there is a great deal of dissatisfaction. The second part of the petition refers to the matter of an appeal from the decisions of the Licening Board, and points out that while in ordinary cases there is an appeal from the decisions of magistrates, and also under the general arbitration law, still from the decisions of the Licensing Board there is no appeal. This petition not only supports and confirms the one presented by the Premier, but it also deals with the question as to whether this Legislature should not take into consideration the re-enacting the provisions of sections 12 and 16 of the Act, to make them more operative, and also the provision of some appeal from the decisions of the Licensing Board. I have much pleasure, as a representative of a local option district, and on behalf of those who signed the petition, in giving it my hearty support.

MR. KENNEDY—Being a total abstainer, I should like to say a word upon the petition. After the exhaustive speech made by the Prime Minister, it would be presumption on my part to go any further. Any petition that comes here to restrict the selling of intoxicating liquors will always have my hearty support. I am speaking now from experience, and I know that the working men have benefitted from the law passed last year prohibiting the opening of liquor saloons before 9 a.m. Now the working man comes to work sober, and is able to do a good day's work, and I believe that with the early closing at 6 o'clock in a very short time there will be no such thing as people going home to their families half intoxicated.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that I view the petition in the light of a mandate to this House, as, if time had permitted, it would have contained the names of many more, or half of the voting people of this district. It goes without saying, and is generally and universally admitted, that we are a law-abiding and sober people, but unfortunately there are, as in every community, a certain number of weak-minded individuals in this

town to whom this House should extend such measure of protection as lies within their power to give. I am pleased to see that this petition emphasizes the fact that the people of St. John's are living up to their best traditions, and that they are prepared to help those unfortunates who are unable to control their appetites. Fortunately the number of confirmed drunkards in our midst is very small. We daily profess our desire to love and serve Almighty God, but I don't think anyone can go through the streets of St. John's at night without hearing His name infamously blasphemed by those who are unable to control themselves; and it is up to us to make some demonstration of our sincerity in that respect. Actuated by this idea, and being convinced of the soundness and genuineness, I give the prayer of the petition my hearty support.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the great importance of the petition now before the House. A petition so largely and influentially signed cannot but demand from the members of this House the most serious consideration, and, as a representative of the district of St. John's West, I don't think I would be fulfilling my duty if I sat in my seat without giving an expression of opinion as to this petition. I don't think for a moment that any member of this House would consider any action that would in any way tend to degrade or lower his fellow man. Since I occupied a position in this House, on every occasion on which I thought it necessary to express my opinion, whether in relation to my district or to the whole Colony, I have always done so without fear or favor. I feel that it is incumbent upon me to say a few words upon the question that is agitating the mind of the public at present in a very marked degree. I have some experience of the lives generally of the working classes of this community, and I have no hesitation in saying that they compare favorably with those of any part of the world. To-day the laboring classes of St. John's are in a very much better position, and leading very much better lives than they did ten or twenty years ago. We have in this country a great many institutions that have done good work in the uplifting of the more unfortunate of our people. A great deal of credit is due to temperance organizations for the present condition of the working men, and to the clubs where the young men can meet and enjoy themselves. Last year a petition was presented to this House, having for its principal object the control of the licensed public houses, which passed unanimously. That was a step the temperance people were to be congratulated upon, and which in a great measure satisfied their demands. For the past twelve months this new law has been in operation, and has been observed to the letter.

The position I take in the matter is that if this business is recognized legally as a regularly licensed business to do certain things under certain conditions, and the articles used and sold are brought here, and duties collected on it, which are used to help the upkeep of our public institutions, then it has its rights and

privileges. It is unfair to legalize the business on the one hand and throttle it on the other. I am not speaking now in the hope of having more drinking and intemperance in this community ; I merely speak in the interests of fair play. I think it would be more desirable if this question were taken up as a whole, and settled once and for all. I am a strong believer in temperance reform, and I would rather be supporting a petition to have the liquor business wiped out once and for all, than be dealing unfairly with a legalized business. I appreciate the fact that my remarks are not what some people would desire me to make. It may not be popular to talk as I am talking, but as I said, while I am on the floors of this House I shan't hesitate to express my opinion without fear or favour. As the Premier pointed out there are always two sides to every story, and whilst the petition before us is numerously and influentially signed, I am not here to represent those alone who signed it, but also those who did not ; and I intend to do my duty to the whole district which I represent. I appreciate the sincerity of the prime movers in this matter, but matters of this kind should be thoroughly ventilated and debated, and we should get the concensus of opinion from all parties on both sides on a question so far-reaching. I think the licensing laws are observed as well as in any other country outside of Newfoundland. I hope my remarks will not be taken amiss by the gentlemen who have done so much for temperance in the past as I should be sorry to do anything to hamper their good work. When this matter comes before the House in the form of a Bill perhaps I shall be in a position to say something further, and in the meantime, we shall have an opportunity of getting the views of a still larger number of people than we have at present.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I have delayed saying anything on this petition except that it comes from both ends of St. John's, the members of both ends would have something to say on this matter ; but as the debate seems to be about over, I should like to say a word or two in favor of the petition. I thought it a very hopeful feature when the Rev. Father O'Callaghan came in here, that he was cheered by the very large audience which now fills the House, and I think he and the other gentlemen associated with him deserve all the praise they can get. This is a sincere and disinterested attempt on their part for the welfare, not only of St. John's, but of the whole country. Now, it is to be regretted that this movement was not taken up before, but it is never too late to do good, and I hope that before the subject matter of the petition comes before the House in the shape of a Bill that these gentlemen will not relax in their efforts, but will go on, and by the time the Bill comes in, there will be such a tremendous expression of opinion that it will have the effect of convincing the House that the people of St. John's East and West want this improvement. Now, what do they ask ? Simply that the man who has been working all day when he leaves his work to go home, may do so without meeting the temp-

tation of the public house. That is all. Some hon. gentleman spoke of the sober condition of the working population of Newfoundland. That is quite true. On the whole the people, particularly the people of the outports, are sober. But I think it is equally true that there are a large number of persons who are addicted to the immoderate use of liquor. These are the people that this movement is intended to benefit and the wives and families of these people. We feel that if the public houses are closed at six o'clock they will do more good than preventing their opening until nine o'clock, as was done by the Legislature last session. Now the usual argument, the old staple argument, was used that, if we restrict the liquor traffic, the amount now collected in duties on this stuff will not be collected, and the revenue will be that much short, and the public services of the country suffer. It would only take a schoolboy to work that out We have been told that the liquor traffic means one million dollars a year to the consumer. That means that if that one million dollars were spent, not in liquor, but in ordinary dutiable goods, the revenue would get $330,000 as duty. Now we get $300,000 a year, between $250,000 and $300,000 a year duty from intoxicating liquors, so that we would really collect more revenue than we do from the liquor traffic. But, outside that, what will we have ? We will have more comfortab'e homes, happier wives and mothers, better clad children, less expense for the poor house, less expense for the police, less expense in all these directions, by the diminuition of the business of selling liquor. We are told here to do what is right and just. That is what we are here for, and besides doing right to the licensed publican, we must also do right towards the man who unfortunately is unable to control himself when he gets hold of liquor, and particularly to the wives and children of these men. I remember the time of which the Premier spoke, when it took the vote of two temperance men to be as good as the vote of one man who supported the keeping and sale of liquor, and I am pleased to be able to say that when I first came into this House in 1888 one of my first efforts was to bring before the House the unfairness of that principle ; and I am pleased to be able to record that after bringing it to the notice of the Legislature three or four times they removed the inequality and now the majority prevails in this direction in Newfoundland ; and I feel sure from what we have seen a couple of years ago at the Local Option election and the spirit that has manifested itself in connection with the petition, that if the matter were put before the citizens to vote upon again, local option would be in a majority. There is a great deal that one might say upon this subject, but I hardly think that this is the time to say it. So I will leave anything further which I have to say until the time when the Bill comes before the House—and when it does I will give it my heartiest support, because I believe it to be a Bill in the best interests of the citizens of the community.

MR. WHITEWAY—Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to occupy the time of the House by making any special reference to the question now before us. I merely want to take advantage of this opportunity to accord my hearty support to the petition presented this afternoon. But let me say, sir, further that I look upon this petition as a mandate from the people asking for the introduction of this measure. I have been watching this business for a long time, and I have always looked upon it as more or less illegal; and I think it is the duty of the House to legislate in this direction for the benefit of mankind. I was much impressed with the remark of the Hon. Premier that liquor was at the root of all evil. Well, I claim that if it is at the root of all evil, every member of this House ought not only take advantage of the privilege of voting for this Bill, but of assisting every temperance matter with which they have to deal. I hope and believe that the day is not far distant when, with one stroke, we will be able to destroy this enemy. I hope that the day is not far distant when the churches will be more consistent on this point. I claim today that churches of nearly all denominations are receiving money derived solely from the sale of intoxicating liquors, and that it is not consistent with their stand on the temperance question. And to get the sympathies of the people you must be consistent in your position. I shall reserve any further reference which I may have to make until the time for the consideration of the Bill which will come before the House, and in the meantime I will give the matter my earnest consideration. At present I am very pleased to have the honor to give my heartiest support to this petition.

MR. PARSONS—When this matter comes before the House again in the form of a Bill I will not have an opportunity of expressing my opinion, as I will then occupy the Chair. The matter has been brought before my mind, and I have thought it out, and I think, as Mr. Bennett has said, every man should express his opinion fearlessly. I am here representing a prohibition district (but I want it clearly understood that I do not associate that point with my consideration of the matter before us. I merely take it that here is a large petition, numerously and influentially signed, asking that the saloons be closed at six o'clock. A man working at six dollars a week can ill afford to spend say $1.50 of that on liquor. I know that I could not afford to do it when I was working for that sum. I returned to my family and I found that every cent of it was needed. I take it that this applies with equal force here in St. John's as it does in places brought under my notice in the outlying districts. I consider this no great concession to ask for. We have here the grocery stores, the drapery stores and all the other stores that close promptly at six o'clock, and I can see no valid reason why the liquor stores should not close at the same time. I have six sons at home who are watching my action in this matter, and to-morrow they will be asking "How did father act in regard to this question?" I look upon it as a

matter of conscience between myself and my God to support the petition now before the House.

MR. HOWLEY—Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to support this petition, although I have not seen it yet, but it has been represented to me as an amendment to the Temperance Law that is very desirable. I thoroughly agree with the remarks that there is a desirability of something being done to save the hopeless, helpless drunkard from himself, but I do not agree with the idea that legislation is the proper mode of doing it. It is not our business, to my mind, to legislate for the morality of the people, and, if it was our business, we would have an anomalous position, because sometimes, because of the alterations in the opinions of the electorate, we might have a party in power whose superior numbers might carry out legislation along the lines that we would not expect. But I support the petition on the grounds that it is desirable to have something done to help the man who ought to be on the Black list, and stop the supply of liquor to those who cannot take a drink and be done with it. That is the position which I take in regard to this petition. I fully agree with all that has been said of those who were the prime movers in this matter. I feel that we ordinary mortals have much to learn and much to gain by realizing the disinterested motives of those movers. I think that it does one good to see and to realize that there are in the community persons, irrespective of creed, irrespective of politics or of nationality, or of any other consideration, who are honestly and sincerely desirous of improving the conditions of their fellow men, no matter what their ideas or what their views on other matters may be.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in connection with the petition now before the House. I think it is the duty of every member of this House to have an opinion upon a matter of this kind, and I think that a man who has not formed any opinion upon a matter of this kind, a matter more or less coming under observation every day, is lacking in his duty to the community. This petition is very largely and very influentially signed, represents a large section of people of this community, and should be received by this House with all due consideration. It has for its object the moral reform of the community. I am not one of those who believe that the business of selling intoxicants or the use of intoxicants is wrong in itself, but I hold very strongly to the opinion that it is the duty of every citizen to take every precaution to preserve everyone from the abuse of intoxicating liquors. I think it the duty of every citizen to warn the inexperienced ,and the duty of every good man to protect the weak and inexperienced. And I consider it the duty of the Legislature, when an evil is pointed out to it, to legislate along the lines necessary to reform this evil. This question of closing the saloons at six o'clock has only recently been considered, and there are only a few days left before a bill upon the question can come before the House, and then it will be the duty of every member of this House to vote upon that mea-

sure according as his conscience dictates. As I said before, I think that every good citizen, if he considers this measure to be one which will attain the good in view, it is the duty of such man to vote in favor of this measure. That there may be differences of opinion as to whether this measure will effect the good claimed for it cannot be doubted. But I think much good will result from any reasonable restriction placed upon the abuse of the sale of intoxicating liquors. I hope that this measure will come up at an early date, and that the matter will be decided one way or the other. The House is going to close in a few days, and I think that this measure should come up with as little delay as possible.

MR. SHEA—It was not my intention to speak upon this petition, as I had intended to reserve my remarks until the Bill came up for discussion. But, in view of the magnitude and importance of the petition, I do not feel that I would be doing my duty if I did not say a few words about the matter. I am not prepared to say that this petition will have my support, for this reason, that I will have to feel convinced that the majority of my constituents are in favor of the petition. I am entirely in their hands in the matter. Personally I am indifferent to the issue ; and I will have to feel that the majority of those people that I represent are in favor of the measure before I can give it my support. It was only last year, about nine months ago, that legislation on this matter was before the House. It was dealt with at the time in a very liberal manner, and the different people interested in promoting the movement were quite satisfied with the course adopted by the House. That was only nine months ago, and, as far as I know, nothing has happened in the meantime that makes it necessary to bring the matter up for consideration again. The gentlemen prompting this movement have earned the greatest respect of the community, but it is their business, and they have made it their business, to do their best to wipe out the trade. They have no hesitation in acknowledging that. These gentlemen have the object before them of wiping out this business, and they are bringing in year after year legislation which will interfere in every possible manner with the carrying on of this trade. In other words, they are trying to kill it out by slow progress. There is no question, so far as I am personally concerned, as to the enormities which follow the abuse of strong drink, but we must not forget that there is a certain class of people who are moderate drinkers, and as long as they exist they have certain rights which we cannot overlook. Now, Sir, I am not going to detain this House any longer, but when the Bill comes up I will be prepared to deal with it, and I will be prepared, if satisfied that the majority of my people are in favor of it, to give this Bill my hearty support.

Ordered that these petitions be received and referred to the departments to which they relate.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. Minister Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respect-

a loan for the Public Service of the Colony.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committtee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—In moving the resolutions, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the Order Paper to-day ; they will find notice of two loans. Number one is the Bill of last session, with the verbiage changed a little. We found that the denomination of the debentures was not altogether suitable or convenient. The debenture was for $500.00, and this Act is to change that amount so as to make it convenient for the department and the public. In the other, we ask for the sum of $120,000 this year for marine improvements and other works. For the St. John's Municipal Council $32,000 to pay for the building known as the City Hall, and for other improvements in connection therewith. The balance of amounts asked for in this loan are—$15,000 for the com pletion of the Public Building at Harbor Grace, and $73,000 for improvements in the General Hospital. The amount voted for this purpose last year was found insufficient, so we are asking for an additional sum to complete the several works now in course of operation. The principal of these amounts is for the Nurses' Home. $40,000 is asked for that building. That building is to be put up this year, and, as has been already stated in this House, will be put up as a memorial of the late King Edward.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman, from the Committtee, reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and passed the resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a bill to give effect thereto.

Ordered : that this report be received, and that leave be granted for the introduction of this bill.

Thereupon the bill entitled, "An Act to provide for the raising of a sum of money by loan for the public service of the Colony," was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, the bill, entitled " An Act for the confirmation of a contract with Western Union Telegraph Company, Ltd.," and an Act for the confirmation of a contract with the Direct United States Cable Co., Ltd.," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that they be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that they be sent to the Legislative Council requesting the concurrence of that body in their provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the bill entitled, " An Act to amend 'The Game and Inland Fisheries Act, 1910.'"

Mr. Speaker left theChair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committtee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman, from the Committee, reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and passed the bill without amendment.

Ordered : that this report be received, and that the bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Mr. F.J. Morris, the House

resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the bill entitled, "An Act to Incorporate the Newfoundland Marine Insurance Co., Ltd., of St. John's, Newfoundland."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committtee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman, from the Committee, reported that they had considered the matter to them rereferred, and passed the bill without amendment.

Ordered : that this report be received, and that the bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister, the bill, entitled "An Act respecting the ratification of certain contracts for Coastal Mail Service," was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to Committee of Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the bill sent up, entitled, "An Act to extend the operation of 5 Edward VII., Cap. 18, entitled, 'An Act to encourage the manufacture of Peat,'" were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquaintng that body that the House of Assembly had passed the said amendments without amendment.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice of motion.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, March 23rd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

THURSDAY, March 23.

The House met at three p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

MR. R. J. DEVEREUX—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Haystack, in the District of Placentia and St. Mary's, on the subject of telegraph extension to that place. Also a petition from the inhabitants of Colinet Island on the subject of the mail service. I have much pleasure in supporting both these petitions, and beg that they be referred to the department to which they belong.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Amherst Cove for a sum of money to build a launchway. I ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. DOWNEY—I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Port-au-Port, asking for a sum of money to construct a road at that place. I beg that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. EARLE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present several petitions : One from Change Islands, on the subject of a mail courier. The people there complain that they have only one mail courier, who is not sufficiently equipped for his work. There ought to be two men ; and it is not safe to trust it all to one. Also a petition from Carmanville and Fogo on the question of forbidding the landing of freight on the Lord's Day. Petitioners represent that this is contrary to their wishes

and feelings, and that they do not like to work on Sunday. They also ask the Government to prevent the erection of any more mills within the timber limit of three miles. They fear that if any more are erected and the cutting out of timber within the limit continued there will be none left. I ask that these petitions be received and referred to the proper departments.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I also ask leave to present a petition from Michael Snow and other residents of Little Heart's Ease and St. Jones Without, in the District of Trinity, asking for a grant to construct a road between the two settlements referred to. Later on, when the new grants for the district are available, I shall be glad to consult with my colleagues on the subject and will see whether anything can be done to meet the wishes of the petitioners.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Julien's, asking for a regulation against the use of trawls, which they consider tend to diminish the fishery along that shore. I have also a petition from William Curtis and others of Horse Islands on the same subject. For the past thirty years no trawling has been done there until last summer, when, because of it, the fishermen's voyage was almost nil. Also a petition from Little Harbor Deep upon the same subject. Also a petition from N. E. and S. W. Packet on the same subject. I would ask that these petitions be referred to the Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, and trust that they will receive the care and attention due to them.

MR. KENT—I ask leave to present a petition from Mr. F. Ryan and others of Pouch Cove. The petitioners refer to a grievance which the fish dealers have to contend with. They complain that in the night time their fish is stolen from their flakes and sold to pedlars, and they ask that some remedy be provided. I think I once before had occasion to present a similar petition. This grievance is felt in other places besides Pouch Cove, and is one of the natural consequences of the exposed way in which it is necessary to handle fish while drying it. The stealing is generally done by boys and girls under age, but the receiver is just as bad as the taker. I would ask that the matter be referred to the Dept. of Justice to be enquired into. Also a petition from Ed. Butler and others of Bell Island, on the subject of a road to a place called Freshwater Cove, I would ask that this petition be referred to the Dept. of Public Works.

MR. CLIFT—I ask leave to present a petition from Henry Knight and others of Jackson's Cove, in the District of Twillingate, asking that the telegraph may be extended to that place. Petitioners point out that Jackson's Cove is a place of considerable importance, and that they are considerably handicapped for want of a telegraph service. The nearest station is at Northwest Arm, across the bay, and it isn't always convenient or safe to get over there. I hope that the department having charge of telegraphs will take this into consideration.

Ordered : that these petitions be received and referred to the departments to which they relate.

The Hon. Prime Minister laid upon the table of the House the following copy of a despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, received on March 8th, 1911 :

"It is proposed that Colonial Naval Forces should be represented at Coronation ceremonies, and His Majesty's Government would be glad if arrangements could be made by your Government to send contingent of 20 men of Newfoundland Royal Naval Reserve to arrive about June 15th. Cost of passage and pay would fall on Newfoundland funds. All other expenses to be borne by His Majesty's Government.—Harcourt."

The Hon. Colonial Secretary laid upon the table of the House the Accounts of the St. John's Municipal Council for the year 1910, and also a statement of Revenue and Expenditure for 1910 and Estimates for 1911.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Hon. Mnister of Justice, the bills, entitled "An Act to amend 'The Newfoundland Medical Act, 1896,'" and "An Act to amend the law relating to the storage of Inflammable Oils," were read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, the bills entitled, ''An Act to amend the Game and Inland Fisheries Board Act, 1910," and "Act to Incorporate the Newfoundland Marine Insurance Company, Ltd.," were read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that they be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that they be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in their provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

SIR R. BOND—It is not my intention to occupy very much time in criticising the remarkable document that has been spread to the breeze, in the largest type of the Government press, under the caption "Budget Speech of the Hon. M. P. Cashin," and to a recital of which we were treated on Tuesday last. I would prefer, Sir, to allow a discerning public to read, learn, mark and inwardly digest it without any assistance at my hands. But, Sir, as my silence might be construed by some to mean an acquiescence in the general statement, I shall offer a few observations. The Budget Speech is on similar lines to that which was presented in Committee of Ways and Means on two former occasions since the present Government assumed office. It is customary for a Minister who is responsible for the financial affairs of a country, when dealing with the grave and most important matter of ways and means to meet Supply for the public service, to strictly confine his remarks to that subject, but since the present Government entered into office there has been a very marked departure from that prudent course. The Budget Speech, which should exhibit a calm, dispassionate portrayal of the actual financial position of the Colony for the guidance of those

both at home and abroad who are interested in its finances, has been converted into a party campaign document, in which disparagement of a previous administration is blended with a studied effort to obtain credit for the present Government by the appropriation of the results accruing from the wise administration of their predecessors in office. In the Budget Speech before us will be found the following grossly misleading and gratuitously offensive observations in respect to increased revenue for the year 1909-10. "The moral, if I may use the term, of this is that public confidence in the prospect of a capable and progresive administration of the Colony's business was srengthened by the present Government securing power, and an effective stimulus was thereby imparted to the industrial and commercial operations generally, and the investment of extensive capital in all other industries." And again, the Minister declared, "the Custims receipts for the current year will probably exceed by $100,000 those of last year, which it should be noted were adjudged abnormal, because they represented the rebound from the depression of the previous year, a rebound accelerated by the change of Government, the restoration of public confidence, and the stimulating influence of the new projects set on foot by this administration." Sir, I would ask the Minister of Finance what is meant by the phrase "restoration of public confidence." Does he mean to apply that any act whatsoever of the late Ministry had shaken public confidence and restricted trade and commerce? If he does, then I challenge him to name any such act. What is the truth in respect to the administration of the late Government of which I had the honor to be Prime Ministe.r Just before I took over the Government from the Winter Ministry, on the 11th of March, 1899, the then Finance Minister declared, "it is necessary to solicit aid from some quarter or other in order to carry our heavy responsibilities. In order to reduce taxation we must obtain aid from the Mother Country." Here was a declaration from the lips of the man who, as Finance Minister, must have been aware of the actual condition of the Colony, that the Colony was bankrupt. This then was the position when my Government took charge. What ensued from our administration? Let me briefly review the history of events. The first year we were in power we laid the foundation for that Reserve Fund of half a million dollars, which is now in the Bank of Montreal to meet the stress and storms of the future, and during the eight years following we completed that fund out of surplus revenues. In his Budget Speech, June 8th, 1909, the present Finance Minister most unfairly and incorrectly attributed $317,000 of that fund to Winter Ministry. How, I would ask, could a Ministry which thro the mouth of its Finance Minister had declared the Colony bankrupt put by anything to a reserve account? Of course the statement was absurd as well as incorrect. What is the truth? The Winter Government had bartered away to the Reid-Newfoundland Company, under the plea of Colonial bankruptcy, every tangible asset of the Colony—the railway, telegraphs, docks, etc.—and nearly

every dollar received had gone to meet current expenditure. There was only $58,092.23 remaining, being the balance of the purchase money received from R. G. Reid for the dry dock, and the amount I at once deposited to the credit of a Consolidated Fund Account in the Bank of Montreal, and thus, as I have previously said, laid the foundation of the Reserve Fund of half a million dollars. The whole of that half million reserve is due entirely to deposits made by my Government as follows :

Deposited in 1900	$ 59,092.23
Deposited in 1901	258,603.55
Deposited in 1902	35,629.07
Deposited in 1904	7,835.70
Deposited in 1905	40,000.00
Deposited in 1906	40,000.00
Deposited in 1907	9,830.45
Deposited in 1908	50,000.00
Total	$500,000.00

But, Sir, the inaccuracy of the present Finance Minister's statement in respect to that reserve fund is declared by his own colleague, the Premier, who, in a letter addressed to Messrs. Glyn, Mills, Currie & Co., our London bankers, under date the 24th June last, in connection with the prospectus issued by them for recent railway loan, said that " out of the surplus revenue for the ten years ended 30th June, 1909, $500,000 has been set aside, and is on deposit as a liquid reserve." Now, then, who stated the truth in respect to the resrve fund, the Premier or the Finance Minister? Of course the Premier did, for he was not likely to state anything to deceive the British investor. Then, Sir, the statement of the Minister of Finance, Mr. Cashin, as I have alleged, is most unfair and incorrect. But, Sir, to pass on in my review of the history of events during the administration of the late Government. I point Sir, with pride and pleasure to the fact that during my government's term of office we reduced taxation by the sum of one million four hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. Here are the figures taken from the records of the Customs Department :

1901 :			
Lines and Twines—free	$52,643	....	$ 7,238.40
1901-2 :			
Molasses	Reduced three cents per gal.		
Salt ....:..	Reduced twenty cents per ton.		
Molasses	1,331,788 gals.		$ 40,157.46
Salt	50,600 tons		11,132.00
Lines and Twines..	$60,846		9.366.32
			$ 59,655.78
1902-3 :			
Molasses	1,331,,788 gals.		$ 39,953.64
Salt	48,999 tons		10,779.78
Lines and Twines	$56,102		7,714.02
			$ 58,447.44

1903-4 :		
Flour	Reduced 20 cents per barrel.	
Kero. Oil	Reduced six cents per gallon.	
Molasses	Reduced four cents per gallon.	
Flour	121,311 brls.	$ 30,352.75
Molasses	982,578 gals.	68,789.46
Kero. Oil	244,975 gals.	16,168.35
Molasses	488,338 gals.	14,650.14
Salt	46,716 tons	10,277.52
Lines and Twines	$49,916	6,450.95
		$146,680.17
1904-5 :		
Flour	371,407 brls.	$ 92,851.75
Kero. Oil	84,440 gals.	55,730.40
Molasses	1,436,065 gals.	100,521.55
Salt	70,353 tons	15,477.66
Lines and Twines	$52,944	7,729.80
		$271,864.16
1905-6 :		
Currants and Raisins from Greece reduced three cents per pound.		
Currants and Raisins	841,790 lbs.	$ 27,779.07
Flour	411,781 brls.	102,945.25
Kero. Oil	945,014 gals	62,370.92
Molasses	1,058,036 gals.	74,062.52
Salt	64,149 tons	14,112.78
Lines and Twines	$68,397	9,405.58
		$288,199.60
1906-7 :		
Currants and Raisins	451,756 lbs.	$ 14,907.94
Flour	365,427 brls.	91,356.75
Kero. Oil	945,914 gals.	62,370.92
Molasses	1,239,969 gals.	86,793.83
Salt	48,090 tons	10,579.80
Lines and Twines	$106,289	14,614.73
		$280,627.97
1907-8 :		
Currants and Raisins	890,016 lbs.	$ 29,667.52
Flour	366,234 brls.	91,558.50
Kero. Oil	1,074,571 gals.	70,921.68
Lines and Twines	$90,789	12,483.48
Molasses	1,262,352 gals.	88,364.64
Salt	77,920 tons	17,143.40
		$310,138.22

Total reduction in taxation.

1900-01	$ 7,238.40
1901-2	59,655.78
1902-3	48,447.44
1903-4	146,680.17
1904-5	271,864.16
1905-6	288,189.60
1906-7	280,627.97
1907-8	310,138.22
	$1,422,841.83

Contrast this with the action of the present Government. They have been in office two years. Have they reduced the taxes upon the people. Not one cent, but on the other hand they have piled up burdens in the shape of increased interest charges.

While the late Government made the material reduction in taxation to which I have drawn attention, out of the taxes collected they handed back to the people in excess of the ordinary grants one million, fifty-nine thousand four hundred and twenty-one dollars, as follows :—

For roads	$409,444.41
For marine works	207,204.00
For education ...	444,773.20
	$1,059,421.61

During this term of office the late Government erected thirty-six lighthouses and seven fog alarms, and when they went out of office nine other lighthouses were in course of erection. As a matter of fact they erected as many lighthouses, and nearly double as many fog alarms, as were erected during the whole period of one hundred years preceding. They established the Marconi system of telegraphs on the Labrador coast, and constructed two thousand four hundred and sixty-six miles of telegraph. They gave the public a coastal steam service never equalled in this country, and brought about thereby a reform, a much needed reform, in the bay steam service by the lowering of freight and passenger rates. Here then, Sir, you have a record that has never been equalled in the whole history of this country, and in the light of such a record what possible justification was there for the unseemly and unwarranted reflections of the Minister of Finance on Tuesday last ? Again, Sir, what was the condition of the Colony when the late Government went out of power, say on the 30th of June, 1909 ? The gross public debt was $22,757,-997.85. The gross public debt today is $27,680,230.18. In the statement presented by the Minister of Finance on Tuesday last he gave it as $27,160,230.18, but there has to be added to that amount the amount of loan bill tabled yesterday for $520,000, which brings the gross debt up to the amount I have stated. This means that during the two years that the present Government have been in power they have increased the funded public debt by the sum of four million nine hundred and twenty-two thousand dollars and thirty-three cents. This increase of debt is due almost entirely to the branch lines of railway projected by the present Government. I have already expressed my views in respect to that undertaking, and I am content to leave the responsibility with those who approved. Suffice it to say that if we take the expenditure already made on the Bonavista line. It was stated a few days ago that four-fifths of the construction work was com-

pleted. Accepting that as a correct estimate, then it will take three hundred thousand dollars more to complete the mileage. But to that we have to add the cost of terminal facilities, stations and other equipment, so that, without any exaggeration, more than half the present loan will be eaten up by this one branch line. Assuming that the conditions are equal in respect to the line to Trepassey, then the whole of the present loan will be exhausted on the construction and equipment by these two branches, and there will still be three of the proposed lines to be provided for by another loan. Is it unfair to assume that the remaining three branches will not cost less than the two branches, namely, Bonavista and Trepassey ? If we may fairly assume this, then another four million dollars will be required and added to the public debt, or eight millions in all, by reason of the railway policy of the present Government ; and this will further mean an increasd annual charge of $140,000 upon the people of this Colony for interest, to be carried by about 240,000 people, nearly one million and a quarter dollars per annum. This, to my mind, is an appalling condition of affairs ; it was clearly never contemplated by the present Government, when they entered upon their railway scheme, as the record of their estimate of the cost of construction of these branch lines demonstrates ; and it evidences the utter recklessness with which the public affairs of this country are being administered to-day. Again, the total expenditure on account of the public service in 1909, when the late Government went out of power, was two million nine hundred and thirty-two thousand eight hundred and seventy dollars and ninety-six cents. The total expenditure for 1911-12 will be three million three hundred and thirty-two thousand dollars, an increase of three hundred and ninety-nine thousand one hundred and thirty dollars, or one dollar and sixty cents of population. I leave it to the public to judge as to whether they are receiving a fair return for this expenditure. Now, with regard to the Loan for railway purposes raised in London last year, about which we have had such a flourish of trumpets. On the 8th of Feb., 1910, the Premier, in reply to observations of mine in respect to the proposed loan, said : "When in London the previous summer he had, anticipating the railway contract, interviewed the very highest financiers in England, and he was satisfied that our bonds would realize 90 over and above all expenses incurred in connection with the placing of them on the market." The newspapers supporting the Government have declared over and over again that the Colony's net receipt form the loan is 96. That is not correct. As a matter of fact this loan was not raised on as favorable terms for the Colony as the telegraph loan of 1905. If reference is made to a supplementary statement of the public debt, signed by the Hon W. J. S. Donnelly, bearing date 1st September, 1909, and addressed to the present Minister of Finance, it will be seen that the loan of £390,500 sterling produced after paying all discounts and charges £365,652 6s. 9d., or a net amount of $93.63 per hundred dollars. Now, the Prospectus issued

for the railway loan of £800,000 sterling called for a first payment of six months interest on this amount on the 1st January, 1911, although the proceeds of the loan did not fall due to the Treasury until different periods in the autumn, and therefore the Treasury was called upon to pay £140,000 sterling on the 1st January last, although this interest had not been earned as a special inducement for the flotation of the loan. The net proceeds of this loan on January 31st, 1911, were £745,319 sterling, or $93.16 per hundred dollars. The statement then of the Minister of Finance that the loan for the construction of the branch railway " was raised on terms more favorable than any previous financial transaction in the history of Colony " would appear from the data he has furnished us with to be incorrect. If, then, it was not, so far as this Colony is concerned, " more favorable than any previous transaction," is it contended that it was more favorable as regards the writers ? Surely that cannot be possible, for it is an open secret that they were left with about 80 per cent. of the loan on their hands. The Telegraph Loan of 1905 was subscribed to by the British public twice over, whereas in the case of this railway loan, of which there has been so much boasting, the British public shunned it. But, supposing it had been the success that was claimed, could the Government of to-day honestly lay claim to special merit in the premises ? The Prospectus issued by the underwriters answers that question, for by refernce to it it will be seen that the appeal to the British public was exclusively based upon the financial record of the late Government during their years of office. The merits of that appeal, however, were destroyed by the insistence of the present Government that the underwriters should place the loan on the market at a figure four and a half points higher than similar bonds could be purchased for in London. By this insistence the underwriters have suffered and the Colony has not gained. As regards what is termed in the Budget Speech " the amazing increase of revenue." The Colony has truly reason to be thankful for the manner in which our revenue is keeping up. But is it not a fact that for the large revenues that have been flowing in from normal sources the late Government have to be credited. What has the present Government done to augment the revenues of the Colony. They have secured under agreement with the Bell Island mining companies a royalty on the iron ore shipped from that Island, but the whole of that royalty is hypothecated to foreign bond holders for the railway loan, and the general public get no benefit from it. They have increased the revenue to some extent by the amount expended in wages on the branch railway to Bonavista, but this is an abnormal increase and must cease with the completion of the branch lines. They have increased the revenue by the importation of silver, upon which they make a profit of 52 per cent.; but that is also abnormal, for these importations must cease or serious trouble must ensue for the Colony. We were told by the Receiver General that $350,000 worth of silver was imported by his predecessors in office. I

can say this without fear of contradiction that the whole of the silver coin imported by the late Government was upon the joint request of the three banks in this city, who stated that it was required by the trade, and, further, that that silver was only circulated by those banks as it was required. But what do we find being done by the present Government. Why, sir, in order to swell the revenue we find them importing silver and circulating it through private business firms. This is a far more serious matter than it may appear at first blush. That silver, the whole of the silver in circulation and held by our people in reserve, may at any time be presented for exchange into gold. How are you going to respond ? That is a question for the Finance Minister to consider. But to return to the question of normal revenue. I defy the Government to point to one industry established under their regime, or to any single act of theirs that has tended to increase the normal revenue of the Colony. The large increase in the normal revenue of the Colony, and the large increase in the trade returns of the Colony, must be attributed to the pulp and paper industries established at Grand Falls and Bishop Falls under the late Government and by reason of their far-sighted policy. It will be in the remembrance of this House how I was personally abused and publicly denounced in the halls of this city because of my assuming responsibility in connection with the introduction of these industries. It is ample satisfaction to me, however, to-day to find that the irony of fate compels my political opponents to acknowledge that the prosperity of to-day and the hopes of to-morrow centre very largely indeed in these enterprises. As regards what the Finance Minister has termed the "fiscal outlook for the current year." He says that he is "gratified to be able to say that all indications thus far point to the estimated revenue of $3,256,000 being considerably exceeded." I hope this optimistic forecast may be realized. In the printed report of the Budget Speech the sources of expected revenue are not given, so that I labor under a great disadvantage in dealing with the forecast. While the abnormal from railway expenditure may be anticipated, I cannot assume that the Government will continue to obtain a contribution fromthe sale of silver, that mode of swelling the revenue will surely have to be abandoned. Then, anything approaching the receipts from the Crown Lands Department that we have witnessed during the past two years cannot be anticipated. The gambling in that direction, let us hope for the sake of the reputation of the Colony, is ended. The outlook as regards the sealfishery is not by any means as bright as we could wish, and if it does not improve, then we may look for a shortage in importations for the spring trade. That the earning power of the Colony is on the decrease rather than on the increase is brought home to us by the fact that large numbers of our young men are leaving, and still preparing to leave this country, to seek elsewhere a brighter outlook for the future. It is the very best material, the men of pluck and a little capital who are going. I

am informed by a competent and reliable authority that owing to the failure of the Labrador fishery last year a large number of young men from Conception Bay are prepared to leave for abroad during the present spring. This is a serious matter, and must impress every thoughtful man with the absolute need for extreme caution in the conduct of our public affairs and in respect to the rate of public expenditure. The burden of taxation we are now carrying is well nigh intolerable. Every man in the Colony is to-day under the tariff, paying into the treasury in taxes about one-third of his earnings. The late Government every year made some reduction in taxation, and lightened the burdens of our people as I have shown, but the present Government have made no attempt whatever in that direction. They are squandering the revenues they are wringing from the people ; they are piling up the Colony's indebtedness ; they are sending out of the Colony in interest payable to the parties from whom they have borrowed money which should more properly have gone to reduce taxation. Is it any wonder if our young men of thought and pluck and energy leave here to seek in other lands conditions as to work and cost of living that they cannot find at home. The Government to-day is throwing away amongst their party supporters, under the guise of an agricultural policy forty thousand dollars a year, a sum sufficient to pay the interest on a capital that would enable them to carry out a progressive agricultural policy, and to bring into this country a thrifty farming class who would share with our people the burden under which they are now bending. We are told in the Budget Speech that two hundred thousand dollars per year of the taxes collected is to go towards an Endowment Fund for what the Government terms Old Age Pensions. Did ever a Finance Minister propose such an absurdity before ? I think not. In order to provide an increased pauper do'e of $25 to four hundred old men of 75 years and upwards every taxpayer in the country is called upon to pay practically one dollar per head. Don't you see that this sum of money would be sufficient to carry out a universal scheme of pensions for the benefit of every man and woman above 65 years of age ? Yet you propose to invest this money at four per cent. and bestow the interest in the form of a pauper dole upon a lmited number of people. You are taxing every man to-day in order to accumulate a fund for pensions inwhich thousands of them will never participate. You are providing to relieve future generations at the expense of the over-burdened taxpayer. You are depriving the taxpayer of to-day of a benefit in order that another generation may enjoy that benefit. This is di'ated upon as a marvelous achievement in the Budget whereas it is the most colossal piece of financial absurdity that probably has ever been the act of rational beings. We have heard of "frenzied finance." This is one phase of it. The only proposed alterations in the tariff are in respect to soap, compound lard, and tin and other commodities that are used in the canning of fish. The latter is the most

important change, and it arises out of the Cold Storage Agreement entered into between the Government and some American citizens. It will be remembered that when that Agreement was under the consideration of the House I drew attention to the fact that its terms discriminated against every man in the country who engages in lobsters, salmon, cod and other commodities, inasmuch as the American firm would get in their supplies of tin, solder, labels and other necessaries free of duty, while our own merchants and fishermen would have to pay duty on their supplies. As a result of the debate the Premier promised that all engaged in the canning business would be placed on the same footing by an alteration in the tariff. That promise has not been carried out in the tariff before us. Under this Resolution it is true that tin in sheets and blocks, solder, printed lithograph labels for tins or packages, will be admitted, free of duty when imported directly by those engagd in the business ; but how many of our fishermen who are engaged in the fish canning business can import directly ? Very many of them will not have the means or facilities to do so, and under this tariff you are therefore intensifying the difficulties under which the fishermen will labor by enabling the local rich man and the American Company together to monopolize the whole canning business. If the fisherman goes to the importer for tin or solder in this city to purchase his supplies of those articles then he has to pay a price which includes the rate of duty. How will it be possible then for the fishermen to compete with the American Company and his rich neighbor who get their supplies free of duty ? It is impossible, and by this tariff you drive the struggling fisherman packer out of his business. This will be a great injustice, and I appeal to the Government, in all earnestness, to carry out the promise made to this House before the passage of the American Fishery Agreement.

I have now dealt with what I regard as the most important matters brought before us in the Budget Speech.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—We have been treated to an eloquent address by the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, in his criticism of the financial statement outlined by the Budget Speech. In his opening remarks, he stated that the Budget Speech was merely a political document, and it has taken him one and a half hours to endeavor to prove that contention. I state, without fear of contradiction, that it is a sound and truthful exposition of the Colony's standing. The Rt. hon. gentleman has said that our management of the public affairs has not been a success, and that we have not the confidence of the people. Well, I think, we have the confidence of the country. We are doing our best in the interests of the people, and if we are spending any money, it is to carry out the programme outlined in the Premier's manifesto, and which received the support of the electorate. The late administration lost the confidence of the people because they spent the Colony's money and gave nothing to show for it. Not only did they spend all the revenue, but they

left a deficit of $155,000, which will be acharge on the Colony forever. The Rt. hon. gentleman says that we are spending money lavishly, but the country knows that every cent that we spend is to good advantage. He also told us of a "nest egg" that was left by the late Government, but what he considers to be a "nest egg" is not what I consider one. The monthly statements received from the Bank of Montreal by the late Minister of Finance prove that, for they show that they were not in credit, and that the amount which he claims was a "nest egg" was used by the Colony in each and every month. That is not what I call a "nest egg." The Rt. hon. gentleman also states that he reduced taxation by $1,222,841. That is a very ingenious way to put it ; to add together the whole eight years, and lead the public to think that this amount was taken off their shoulders in a year or two.

SIR R. BOND—I said that this amount was spread over the period during which I held office.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—We are also told, Sir, that we have been in office for two years, and that we have done nothing. I take issue on that point, and I go further, and say that we have done more in two years than the late Govern ment did in eight, for they did nothing but collect the revenue and spend it. If my Rt. hon. friend will look at the programme that was placed before the people two years ago, he will see that nearly every promise then made has since been carried out. We were only in power a few months when we commenced the building of branch railways, and what did that mean ? It meant a lot of work for our people, and nobody will deny that it came as a great boon to many of our fishermen when the Labrador fishery turned out such a failure. I am a firm believer in the railway policy, and I look upon the railway as the best means we have to open up the resources of the Colony. The Rt. hon. gentleman says that he built 36 lighthouses, and 9 fog alarms, and I give him credit for doing so ; but is it not true that we have built nearly the same number since we came into power. We have also erected more telegraph lines ; we have increased the coastal service, and in many other ways we have endeavored to meet the demands of the people. The Rt. Hon. gentleman says that when he went out of office the public debt was only $22,000,000, whereas now it is $27,000,000. The debt would be the same as it was when we came into office if we sat down and did nothing, but that is not our policy. We came here with a mandate from the people, and we have added to the public debt, and we intend to add to it until our people are in a position to better themselves. We are making improvements that will be felt by generations to come, and it is right that they should pay their share towards the obtaining of these improvements. My Rt. hon. friend is alarmed at the number of our young people leaving the Island, but I believe that if they worked here as hard as they do in other countries they would do as well. Quite a number have returned to the Island again, and built up homes in the land of their birth. The Rt. hon. gentleman also said that we should not fig-

ure in our estimates the revenue to be derived from the Department of Agriculture and Mines, but on this point also I take issue with him. Under his Government the revenue from that Department was $50,000, whereas last year it was $251,000. We were ridiculed for the manner in which we collected these revenues, but I maintain that the manner in which the rents were collected was businesslike, and far better than matters were under the late Administration. Applications went to them and were thrown aside for a long time ; in fact, some were approved two years after they were sent in. Now, when a man applies for land he goes to the Crown Lands' Department and files his application, and the application is considered immediately, and within thirty days he has to pay his fees, or the land again reverts to the Government. But under the late Government this was not so. I have a statement showing how applications were considered by them. For instance, R. Bartlett applied for a pieces of land under date of Sept. 7, 1902. The matter was dealt with on June 11th, 1911 ; Muir, Son & Co. applied on June 16, 1903, the matter was decided on January 28th, 1905 ; and so on right down the list. A year was the shortest time that it took them to consider any application. But, as I stated before, Mr. Chairman, under the present Government the matter is immediately dealt with, and, if the application is approved, the fees are collected as soon as they are due. The Rt. hon. gentleman is horrified that we should take from the surplus of 1909-10 the sum of $200,000, as the basis of a scheme to pay Old Age Pensions to the fishermen of this Colony. I state here this evening, in my opinion this is one of the finest acts that could be done by this or any other Government. No serious attempt was ever made to carry out this scheme until the present Government came into power. The Rt. hon. gentleman was tinkering with it for three years, and, under the pretence of dealing with the matter, he appointed a commission of sympathetic men from Water Street to go into this pension scheme. You have heard the names of these men, and know what sympathy they had for the fishermen of this Colony. That commission was appointed purely for political purposes, and, as I have told him before, to throw dust in the eyes of the people. That was why they were appointed, and why they never reported. How could his Government inaugurate an Old Age Pension Scheme. They were not able to pay their own bills. We find that at the end of the financial year they owed $150,000 and had no money to pay it. They were overdrawn $150,000 at the Bank of Montreal when we came in. What better way could we invest that $200,000 than putting it at interest and paying that interest of $8,000 to the old and infirm fishermen by granting them a penion of $50 a year. We were told the other night that we should bring down a scheme to pay $50 or $100 a year to every man over 70 or 75 years of age in the Island. Well, now, Sir, that is nonsense. Why should you pay a pension to a man who has sufficient means to live upon ? It is the intention of the Government to try and pension every old

fisherman in this country who is in want to-day. The Rt. hon. gentleman this afternoon stated that it is merely pauper relief under the guise of a pension. Well, you can call it what you like. The man who receives this $50 cares very little what the Rt. hon. gentleman calls it. The present Government have made enquiries through the proper sources, and have found that there are twelve or fifteen hundred old men to-day throughout this Colony who are in want, and it is the intention, before long, to grant each of these a pension of $50 a year. As Sir Edward stated in the House a few days ago, half a loaf is better than no bread, and if you can't relieve the twelve or fifteen hundred at once, there is no reason why you should not relieve as many as possible. If a steamer were going down with two hundred on board, it would be better to save fifty, and let the rest drown, than to let them all drown together. No, Sir, this thing has been promised by the present Government, and I think the fishermen all over the Colony are intelligent enough to see the progress made in the right direction by this Government. No matter what you call this $50 a year, they will appreciate it as a move in the right direction, and as coming from the right source. The Rt. hon. gentleman this afternon stated that he had thirty years' experience in this House, and he insinuated that never for this space of time has he seen so much recklessness. He asks us to be cautious. I do not think that there is any need for the Rt. hon. gentleman to warn us. We are going on to carry out the policy we promised the people of this Colony we would carry out. After we are through, we are going back to lay our case before them again, and ask them to decide whether we have done right or not. There is one matér more that I omitted, Mr. Chairman, and that is the silver question. He said that we should be very careful in the importation of silver. Now, the amount of silver imported by the Government is $100,000. As I stated the other day, in answer to a question from the other side of the House, the amount of silver imported by our predecessors was $350,000. From the argument of the Rt. hon. gentleman this afternoon, one would imagine that while it was right for them to import $350,000 worth of silver, it was wrong for us to import $100,000. Then he asks, how are we going to respond to the demand if all this silver comes back on it. My answer is, give them a cheque for it. I think you will find in the banks to-day only about $80,000 altogether. Then the Rt hon gentleman criticised our selling this silver to the Reid-Newfoundland Company. Was not the Reid-Newfoundland Company's money as good as the Bank of Montreal's or anybody else's ? They wanted $30,000 or $40,000 to pay labor on the branch line of railway, and they paid a cheque into the Treasury, which was deposited in the Bank of Montreal. There is nothing wrong about that.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and passed the resolutions without amendment, and recom-

mended the introduction of a bill to give effect thereto.

Ordered : that this report be received, and that leave be granted for the introduction of the bill to give effect thereto.

Ordered : that this report be received, and that leave be granted for the introduction of the said Bill.

Whereupon the bill entitled "An Act to further amend 'The Revenue Act, 1906,'" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, before the vote goes thro there are two or three points I should like to make reference to which the leader of the Opposition referred to this evening in his speech on the Budget. I followed the hon. member through all the various points which he made, and I think that when he peruses his speech he will find that it is not as a whole germane to the issue before the Chair. But there are two or three matters to which he referred and to which I now crave permission to make reference, as before recess I was not in a position to do so, not having with me the documents to which I now propose to refer. In the first place he made reference to the recent loan, and I am sorry that, even if what he said were true, and all he said was absolutely incorrect, he has not considered it a matter which does not call for needless or unnecessary publication. He may say in reply to me that in a matter affecting the Colony and its finances, no statement can be objected to on the grounds of publication. That I agree with is sound as a general proposition. He apparently thought it important to make the statement that only 80 per cent. of the loan of July last year had been subscribed by the public. That may or may not be the fact, I have no knowledge of it. At the same time I am not interested neither is the Colony, whether it is true or not, nor have I any concern with what amount of the loan was subscribed by the public. I dealt entirely and exclusively with our bankers and brokers, and they were the best judges as to whether they would underwrite the loan at the figure they have paid us. I have not asked them what amount was subscribed. It is sufficient for me and the Colony that we have obtained 96 clear for the Colony out of every one hundred dollars underwritten. I mean by that subject to the payment of charges always paid by this and every other Colony in the past. The hon. member went on to point out that the loan he raised in 1905, known as the Telegraph Loan, that he got $93.60 for every $100.00. Then he went on to point out that by reason of the Colony's having had to pay a half year's interest on the present loan that that will have to be deducted and in that way show a reduction. Now, if he will look at the correspondence, he will find that the agreement made with the bankers was for $96.00 clear. I handed this agreement to the hon. gentleman only a few evenings ago.

Further, the bankers say in their letter it is the highest figure ever obtained by the Colony. And if he will look at the statement furnished by Glynn, Mills, Currie & Co., he will see that the Hon Minister of Finance and Customs has received 95¾ up to date. And if he will add 95¾ to the difference between 1½, and what we are going to pay in the way of certain fees which the Colony always pays and which they paid in 1905, you will see that the Colony is getting more than 96, and in addition to that there is the compound interest which we are now receiving at the Bank of Montreal and Bank of Nova Scotia, credited to this loan, which at the end of three or four years you will find will mean to the Colony more than 96 clear. The agreement is contained in a letter which I have already tabled, written by Coates, Son & Co., the financial agents of the Colony, in which they say : That the Colony is to receive 96 clear, and that it is the highest figure ever obtaned by the Colony. That is the statement of Coates, Son & Co., the London brokers, who, through Messrs. Glynn, Mills, Currie & Co., obtained the loan of last summer for the Colony, referred to by the Rt. hon. Leader of the Opposition. Now out of this 96 there is a small amount to be paid these people for their fees, which is not covered by the 1½ allowed them. The correspondence tabled shows that the loan was given to the public at 97½, of which we were to get 96, leaving them 1½, as the agreement shows, for their expenses. But in addition to that 1½ there are certain fees to be paid which were paid in 1903, and which are referred to in a letter which I tabled with the other correspondence, and was written to me on July 30, 1909. I was then negotiating this loan. In other words, a little less than two per cent. is the amount charged us under the agreement, really not more than 1¾, because that is the amount we have received. The amount to date paid to the Colony is 95¾. So that the statement made here by the hon. member is the very opposite to what the facts bear out. He drew attention also to the interest that the Colony paid for the six months. I want to point out that that is the same course as has been followed in previous loans and the loan of 1905, with this differenece in favor of the present loan, that in the loan of 1905 we did not get any allotments until late in December, and they bore interest for months before, while the loan of last summer the last allotment was made on Nov. 15, and we had allotments as early as August. I cannot conceive, Sir, I cannot understand, what object any person can have in endeavoring to reflect upon the financial credit of the Colony. We should all be united in dealing with a matter of this kind, whatever points we may differ upon on, whatever matters there may be on which we do not see eye to eye, the reputation of the financial character of the Colony ought to be as dear to us as our own reputation. Unfortunately this is not our experience. When the Resolutions came before this House a year ago dealing with railway construction, we were told that we were not going to get 90. You will find that in the debates of the day and in the editorial statements of the Opposition press, and the Rt.

hon. the Leader of the Opposition thought it of sufficient importance to telegraph Coates, Son & Co. to find out what the bonds were selling at. He read a telegram here in the House saying that they were selling at 92, and when I went across to England I was up against that. I had to face the statement, statements not official, it is true, but statements made by the Leader of the Opposition, of a man who has held the highest offices of the Colony. And if I did not get 95 or 92 or 90, it would not be a wonder upon the part of some people considering what I had to face, and I repeat, Sir, that no matter what may be the policy of the Opposition on ordinary questions, the condition of the Colony ought to be as far as possible legitimately sustained. I say I do not understand the object of this policy. I can understand their opposing on principle to the policy of railway construction or old age pensions or any other question of Government policy, but when it comes to raising a loan on the Colony's credit we ought to do what is possible to assist it instead of proclaiming from the housetops that we won't get this and we won't get that for our bonds. I say I do not understand it, sir. It shows industry, it shows energy, but they are industry and energy worthy of a nobler cause. I cannot understand how any person professing to be a statesman can descend to such a policy. I am not here to-night to defend what may have been said in the press by anyone else in relation to this loan, but only to put in the documents, table the agreement by which the bankers of the Colony agreed to pay us 96, and if that 96 is not paid, then it is a matter for the Financial Minister to take the necessary steps. But, Sir, it has been paid to the cent as the account shows. We are told that our friends are injured, our bankers are injured, our financial brokers are injured, that I made them pay too high a figure for our bonds, all because I made a good bargain, because I made them give me what I wanted. I hear that, Mr. Chairman, for the first time. They never grumbled to me, they have never objected to me. I told them what I wanted. I told them what the other colonies were getting in the market, and I said that under these statements we ought to get 97½. They ought to be put on the market at 97½ right by our very door, side by side with the other colonies, and I told them also that we wanted 96 clear. They could put it on the market at any amount they liked, as far as we were concerned we wanted 96. I knew and felt we could get it, if not from them then from someone else. The hon. member went on to point out, in fact he prefaced his remarks by saying that the speech of the Finance Minister was a remarkable speech. It was printed in large capitals and spread to the breeze that we had converted it into a party document, and that the whole speech was an attempt to rob the hon. members on that side of the House of the credit of their eight years administration. I do not think it necessary for me to make any reference to these remarks. They have been more than answered by my friend the Minister of Finance, but I would like to point out to the hon. member that

if we have turned this into a party document, in this respect we have followed the example set by his Minister of Finance. If he will look at the Budget Speech of 1908, he will find that that was a party document if there ever was one. Surely he has not forgotten the speech of 1908. It was the manifesto of the party. It was delivered in the House on Feb. 11, 1908: "A History of our own Times," it was printed in large capitals, spread to the breeze, published in the party organs, printed and published at the public expense, and then franked by the Minister as a public document all over the Island. If any one is interested in this matter he can get copies of it and see. Not a review of oneyear, but of every year and every year multiplied.

Now Mr. Chairman, every principle of this Government contained in to-day's speech was justified in that speech of 1908. We have been told by the Rt. hon. the Leader of the Opposition that we should not tax the public one cent more than is required by the public service. That is a principle laid down by Mr. Gladstone and followed in the speech of 1908, where the principle is laid down that it is the business of the Government to give back to the people not in ordinary grants but in permanent work every cent collected, over and above what is required for the public services. That is the practice followed by the late administration of which I was a member. We collected nearly a million dollars more than was required for the public services during the eight years. What did we do with it? Did we pay it back to the people or return it in any way? I do not think so. If Mr. Gladstone's principle is sound it was not carried out by the late administration. The $800,000 collected during the eight years was paid back in public works, in court houses, gaols, telegraph lines, and every other public work in the Colony. I consider that a sound principle, that is why I defended it then and why I practice it now. And I do so for this reason, that although we are building permanent works for the advantage of posterity, we are also creating liabilities in the present generation which will have to be borne by posterity. We are only doing to-day with the surplus what was done by the late administration. We have only to look at the surplus every year from 1900-1909, and with the exception of one or two years, there was a surplus every year amounting in all to nearly one million dollars. Every dollar of that, with the exception of a few small amounts deposited to the credit of the "nest egg" was spent, according to the late Minister of Finance, and given back to the people in public works, roads, bridges and lighthouses, and every kind of permanent public work. Reference was made here to-day to this "nest egg." Surely the Rt. hon. gentleman's memory is failing him. Does he not remember that aright. Of the "nest egg" now in the Bank of Montreal $316,000 was contributed out of the fund derived from his predecessors. If he forgets that, I do not. If you read the Budget of Mr. Cowan, the Budget of 1900, you will see that Mr. Cowan points out that $316,000 was received from the "obnoxious 10 per cent.

tax." It is a matter of history that the Finance Minister of the day, Mr. Morine, put on that 10 per cent. tax on the general revenue, and left behind him $316,000, which, according to Mr. Cowan, was the fruits of the "obnoxious 10 per cent. tax." Now it was in 1899 that was the beginning of the "nest egg" in the Bank of Montreal. If this is doubted, I can call for statements from Mr. Paddon. I will call him up to give the history of the "nest egg." It commenced in 1899. The first deposit was in

1899 ....$ 58,000.00
1900 .... 258,000.00

being the $316,000 left behind by the Winter-Morine administration, and in the following years, 1901, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, the various amounts referred to were added to it, making in all $500,000. I have no objection to the creation of that "nest egg." It is a nice sum to have put by for a rainy day. But is not that a tax on the present generation in the interests of those coming after us, if that principle is seriously contended for. What did we do with that one million dollars ? Where did it go ? Was it handed back to those who subscribed it ? Or is it to-day invested in permanent works in the Colony ? Here is a statement copied from the Auditor General's Report :

$178,000 went to roads and bridges, lighthouses got $45,000, prmanent buildings ; harbor improvements, $10,000 ; Carbonear government building, another permanent building, $7,500 ; extension of the Marconi system, $14,000 ; postal telegraphs, $10,000 ; outport courthouses, $5,000; outports, $30,000 ; construction of new musenm, $50,000 ; extension of General Hospital, $30,000 ; encouragement of herring fishery, $2,000 ; and general election of 1908, $40,000. It is all gone in permanent works, and we are told here seriously that we ought to reduce taxation instead of constructing works out of surplus. I think that those on the other side of the House are satisfied even if for no other reason than that we are imitating the policy they imitated when on this side. The hon. member pointed out that during the eight years he was in office taxation was reduced. That is perfectly right. I was a member of that administration that reduced taxation. It was reduced while I was there. The hon. member smiles. Is it not true ? That is not generous, because he knows very well that when I was in that administration I generally had a finger in the pie. And if education was increased $100,000, I can tell friends of the hon. member who will bear me out when I say that I had to do with one increase of $60,000. The hon. member is glad to be able to point to the fact that during his term of eight years there was an increase in the Education vote of $100,000. But I had a great deal to do with one increase of $60,000, when I was acting Premier of the Colony during the absence of the hon. member. Now I have been in office for two years and I have not reduced taxation, but I have increased the wages of every man in the country and helped to bring up the price of fish and in that way there have been outside goods bought and a larger revenue without increased taxation. The Rt. hon. member treated us to a tale of woe. Everything is looking dull. We are going to

have a backward sealfishery and a lot more evils. The young men are fleeing from the country, and will remain out of the country until the Rt. hon member comes back to office. If my memory serves me right, in the papers of 1908 there was a picture of a monument, sacred to the memory of the thousands of young Newfoundlanders who left their native land under the regime of the Rt. hon. member. They are still leaving the country, but it is not the fault of the policy of this Government. Our policy is to help them at home, not send them abroad. They are coming back to the country, and if the hon. member will read an interview given by Mr. John Browning to the Sydney papers, and published in our local papers, he will find that the very opposite to what he has stated. Mr. John Browning is a prominent manufacturer, and he says that Newfoundland needs all her men, that with the pulp mills, and the opening up of new industries contemplated, there will be work for all. That was the opinion of Mr. John Browning, a few days ago, given to one of the papers on his way to Canada. They are leaving the country, says the hon. member. Why should they leave the country now any more than during the term of the hon. member ? When he was in office as many as 20,000 were carried over by the Bruce. It is not the fault of this Government if they are leaving the country, and why then should it be laid at our doors. The last two years we had a failure of the Labrador fishery. It was not our fault, but the act of God, but our policy enabled thousands of men to remain in the country, and earn enough to feed themselves and their families. We are endeavoring to do something for the people of this Colony, and mere criticism will not affect us. If the Rt. hon. member thinks by merely calling the Old Age Pension policy a pauper's dole, he is going to lessen its importance, he is very much mistaken. He might just as well try to sweep back the tide flowing through the Narrows as to affect our policy. He terms it a pauper's dole. It is a first-class debenture, Sir, and I am amazed that the Rt. hon. member should have criticized this measure the way he has ; but I am too old a politician not to know that the reason he is doing it is because the Rt. hon. member is suffering from the regret that he has not done it himself. The Rt. hon. member is feeling sore because we are carrying out the policy which we are pledged to carry out. He lost his great opportunity, and, of course, he is now regretful and sore. The Rt. hon. member is always ready to propose some scheme in substitution for anything we propose. We had an example of that this evening, when the Rt. hon. gentleman said that instead of spending $20,000 on agriculture we should spend it on immigration. We should spend $20,000 a year on immigrants. We do not intend to this. It is far better to spend the money among our own people than to spend it to bring people in here, merely to stay a year or so, and go away to Canada or the United States. We have laid down a policy in relation to agriculture, and we are following that policy out, and it is not fair to be criticized and judged at the very threshhold of our

undertaking. We have just sown the seed. We have done to-day what ought to have been done 50 years ago. When we took office we found a department called a agricultural department. There was not an officer connected with it who would claim to know a turnip from a head of cabbage. The department never claimed to know anything about agriculture, so we had to begin right down at the bottom. We are doing to-day what ought to have been done 50 years ago. Our policy is criticised, and we are told that instead of spending $20,000 among our own people we should spend it among foreigners, paying their passage here, but it is a very remarkable coincidence that the Rt. hon. member when he was in power never spent one dollar on immigrants, but now he is full of suggestions for us. Again, the Rt. hon. member was alarmed about the silver imported and if a stranger were present or read his remarks he would think from the tenor that we were doing something which would injure the credit of the Colony, something that was unnecessary and had never been done before. He told us that we might have a run on silver, and then where would we be ? We do not expect a run, but if there is a run we are able to meet it. We have done nothing more than the Rt. hon. member did himself. When he was in office he imported $150,000 worth of silver, and if you look at the Auditor General's report it will be seen that he condemned the administration of that day because they imported it merely for revenue purposes. We did not import one cent for revenue purposes. We did it at the request of the banks, who told us that they wanted that sum of money, $100,000, for change and circulation. It will not be the case, as in a previous administration, when the public officials were paid their salary in 5 cent pieces. We have imported $100,000 worth of silver, and any member of the public who is prepared to pay gold for it can get any amount of it from the Finance Department. It does not make any difference to the Government who wants it. If the Reids, Ayre & Sons, or any firm, are prepared to pay gold, they can get it. We imported it for that purpose, and not for any other purpose. The Rt. hon. member also referred to the fact that the public debt of this Colony has been increased $4,900,000 since this Government came in power. Well, we will assume for the sake of argument that these figures are correct. It includes various sums that had to be raised for the public services of the Colony. Four millions for the railway loan of last year. Other amounts are loans sanctioned by this Legislature. During our very first months in office we had to raise $350,000 to pay the liabilities of the late Government, of which one hundred and sixty thousand was a deficit on current account, a debt left us by the hon. member. If you will look at the Loan Bill for 1909 you will see that last year we raised a loan of $100,000 for educational buildings, $100,000 for lighthouses, $50,000 for a dredge and other minor amounts, $150,000 for a Poor Asylum, all of which were cheerfully voted by the Legislature, and this year we ask for a vote of $100,000 for the General Hospital. Then we are

told that we have done something wrong because we have increased the public debt. We have added, it is true, four millions, but if we have necessary public works to represent every cent of it, and did it without increasing taxation, where is the objection? The right hon. gentleman raised five million dollars when he was in office, by that I do not mean to say that that whole amount was due to undue expenditure during his term of office, but it was partly due to liabilities which he incurred. Loans to get back the lands given to Reid, and to pay the Telegraph Award. But all I contend for is this, that we have the same right in this Legislature. To raise money to develop the industries in this country, as the hon. member had to go to London to raise money to pay the debts of the Colony. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; and I think that when our term of office expires, and when we go to the country we will be able to show more assets for any increase in the public debt than the right hon. member had when he left office. Again, the hon. member lays claim to the credit of producing the surplus revenue. None other may lay claim to having brought about any prosperity to the country. Everything is due to his policy. In fact, the country is mortgaged to him for all time. He referred to the Harmsworths and to the abuse and villification which he had to suffer on account of them. Well, others have been villified for the same as he has been. I had as much to do with the bringing here of that enterprise as any member, and if he was attacked, so was I. I got into trouble in more ways than one. The press of that day went out of its way to say that I was Harmsworth's solicitor, that I was in the pay of the Harmsworths, and that I would not have taken the interest I did if I was not being paid for it. I got as much out of the Harmsworths as the right hon. gentleman, and that was nothing. I was the first one in this country to meet Mr. Beeton, who brought the industry here. There were negotiations between him and the Government. Then there was a moment when they practically failed and the matter was all but abandoned, but it was revived, and if the correspondence is asked for it will show that we were all pulling together, and if there is any credit or discredit, we all share alike, and if any advantage I can show I had as much to do with their coming here as any one else in the country. I mention these matters, sir, not that they require an answer, because they do not deal with the Budget Speech. No attempt has been made to answer the Budget. There is nothing in the Budget about Old Age Pensions or silver that would require any observation. Nothing about our young men leaving the country. There has been no criticism of the Budget. It is a financial document and should have been dealt with on its merits, but the right hon. member tries to show that some wrong has been done, that a condition of things is existing which should not exist.—Statements which, if true, would have the effect of damaging the country. The right hon. member tells us of men leaving the country. It is not a statement made in haste, but a clear, calm

judicial pronouncement, and if it is true and becomes known, it will have a damaging effect. We are encouraging the introduction of new industries. To hear that the young men are fleeing and that the land is being devastated is not going to have a beneficial effect. It is not the character I should like to see the hon. member playing, a Cassandra, a prophet of evil, a Jeremiah pouring out his lamentations, complaining of everything in which for eight years he himself excelled. The revenue doubled during his tenure of office. It was $1,500,000 in 1899, and when he left office it was $3,000,000, and all that large revenue was expended by him, and you would want a microscope to find anything of a permanent character, anything that would lead to the earning of a dollar during this whole eight years. We have been told over and over again about the thirty or forty lighthouses that were erected, but there was not a mile of railway built, not a man settled on an acre of land. There was no railway and no agricultural policy. The young men began to flee from the land in 1905 and 1906, but they are not doing it now, because they have faith in the new men who are at its helm, they know that the men who administer the Government to-day believe in its future. Our policy is to keep them home. To keep them from going to Nova Scotia or Sydney to work in the mines. We want what Mr. Browning wants, enough work in the country for every man in it and for every Newfoundlander outside it; we want to help and assist those who are willing to invest capital in the country. I am satisfied that what we are doing is the best course to adopt and our policy differs from that which the right hon. gentleman pursued during the eight years that he was in power, in that ours is a creative policy—the policy of construction, whereas his government was content to allow things to drift along as they were. In 1900, when the hon. member first took office the public debt of the Colony was $17,000,000 and when the late Government went out of office it was $22,370,000. The interest on the public debt when the late Government assumed office was $680,000 and they increased it by $190,000; civil government increased $42,000 during their term of office; administration of justice, 37,000; education, $104,000; public charities $61,000; lighthouses $17,000; marine and fisheries, $51,000; postoffice $149,000; customs, $65,000. In all, they increased the public expenditure $822,000 during their term of office, or over $100,000 a year. Not alone was the revenue sufficient to pay for all the public service, but that Government was able to put aside a large sum to be added to the "nest egg" to the credit of the Colony. We are not adding to it at present for there is no special necessity for our doing so, but we are paying back to the people the whole of the surplus in education grants, in Old Age Pensions, in roads and bridges and marine works, in lighthouses and well ventilated and well built schools for the children all over the country, and we are not afraid that when we go to the country—the tribunal and court that will judge what we have done in a fair and impartial man-

ner—everything that we have done and are doing now will be sustained by their judgment.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed certain resolutions.

Ordered that this report be received.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon| Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the ratification of certain contracts of coastal mail service."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Bill without amendment.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled, "An Act for the raising by the sale of debenture bonds a loan for the public service of the Colony" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice of motion.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively : An Act to amend the law relating to the Encouragement of Agriculture ; an Act to amend the Motor Car Act, 1906, and an Act respecting certain retiring allowances, without amendment.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, March 24th, at four of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, March 24.

The House met at four p. m., pursuant to adjournment.

MR. DEVEREUX — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Spencer's Cove asking for the sum of $500 to complete a road. I hope and trust that the petitioners will have the gratification of receiving this sum of money. I give the petition my unqualified support and ask that it be received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. CLIFT—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Rattling Brook, Southern Arm, asking for a sum of money for the purpose of repairing the road at that place. I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition, and I hope that it may be possible that the Department of Public Works will see its way clear to grant the petition.

Ordered : that these petitions be received and referred to the departmens to which they relate.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain resolutions, which were read a first time as follows :

Supplemental Supply,
1910-11 ....$617,988.05
Additional Estimates,
1911-12 ....$ 59,169.00

The said resolutions being read a second time, it was moved that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Law in relation to the sale of intoxicating liquors," was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the ratification of certain contracts for coastal mail services," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had passed the following resolutions :

RESOLVED : That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending June 30th, 1911, the sum of $617,-988.05 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of the Colony.

RESOLVED : That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending June 30th, 1912, the sum of $1,-883,715.84 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the Colony.

RESOLVED : That notwithstanding anything in any law to the contrary, it shall be lawful for the Governor in Council, in case of the districts or neighborhoods having local boards of councils, to authorize the payment at any time after the 30th June, 1911, to such local boards or councils, to authorize the voted in respect of such districts or neighborhoods, for public charities and for roads, bridges and ferries, in schedule B, and all such monies when paid them aforesaid may be expended by such boards or councils for such local needs and requirements as the boards or councils may determine.

RESOLVED : The monies hereby appropriated sha'l be paid by the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs in discharge of such warrants as may from time to time be drawn by the Governor for the purpose.

RESOLVED : that a Bill to give effect to these resolutions be introduced.

Ordered : That this report be received and that leave be granted for the introduction of the said Bill.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act for the granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the Finan-

cial years, ending respectively, the 30th day of June, 1911-12, and for other purposes relating to the public service," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled, "An Act for the raising by the sale of debenture bonds a loan for the public service of the Colony."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Bill without amendment.

Ordered that this report be received and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled, "An Act further to amend the Revenue Act, 1905," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend the law relating to the storage of inflammable oils," was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Mr. Clapp gave notice of question.

Hon. Prime Minister gave notice of motion.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I beg to make a formal motion for adjournment, in order to bring to the notice of the House a matter that requires immediate attention. I refer to the present condition of the road to Pouch Cove, which is in a very bad state, and on which in consequence there have been several accidents lately, some of them rather serious. I bring the matter to the notice of the Minister so that something might be done to have it remedied. There is a great deal of traffic on the road, especially on Mondays and Saturdays, and it is certain that the road has never been in a worse state than it is at the present time. Up to lately it might have been useless work clearing the gulches because of subsequent falls of snow, but now that the winter is almost over something should be done at once, as the gulches are getting deeper and more dangerous every day. I trust that something will be done in the matter at once.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —I quite agree with what my learned friend has said as to the traffic between St. John's and the neighboring settlements in the East End, and I may say that I gave the road inspector instructions to put the road in as good a condition as possible. However, it has been very difficult to put the roads in the condition in which we would like them to be, for this has been a very severe winter, and , owing to several very heavy snow storms, it has been imposible to keep them level. I shall do my utmost to carry out the wishes of my hon. friend, but, as I have said, it is very difficult to do so. Already we have spent $200 in levelling gulches.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, March 27, at

three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 27th.

House met at 3 p. m., pursuant to adjournment.

MR. MOULTON—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Burgeo, asking that the time for killing caribou be extended. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I presented to this House about a week ago a petition similar to this one, and was fully discussed by this House, so that there is no need for me to say anything further now.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I ask leave to present a petition from William J. Loder, John T. Smith, and other residents of Snook's Harbor and Apsey Brook, in Smith Sound, asking for a grant to open a road from the new line that was commenced last fall between Snook's Harbor and Elliott's Cove, and to extend from that new line towards South West Brook. Petitioners state that such a road will be of great convenience to the people of Apsey Brook, also the people that travel from Britannia Cove. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Public Works. Later on, when the district grants are available, my colleagues and I will be glad to give this matter consideration.

MR. SQUIRES—I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by my hon. colleague. I also ask leave to present a petition from forty or more inhabitants of the north side of Trinity, asking for the erection of a lighthouse and fog alarm there. I have much pleasure in suporting the petition, and ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I desire to present a number of petitions, forty in all, from various places named in the petitions. The petitions are from the different branches of the Fishermen's Protective Union, and are very largely and influentially signed by the people of these places, and they deal with two very important matters in which the Fishermen's Union and its members have been taking a deep interest for some time, and they are matters on which they have a special right to speak, and which they have a peculiar fitness to deal with.

In the first place they ask for the prohibition of the landing of freight from any steamer or freighter on Sundays, and in the second place they ask that no further saw mills be permitted to be operated within the three-mile limit.

In reference to the second matter they pray that no further saw mills be erected within the three-mile limit except on timber limits, that no hand logging from forests unburnt along the coast line be permitted in future, and that all mills using logs cut on the three-mile limit be limited in their output. They ask this in order that a supply of timber may be secured for the fishermen, for the present system is clearing out the timber. They also pray that the Legislature will pass a law prohibiting the rhinding of trees.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that these matters are well worthy the consideration of the House for, as I have said, they are

brought forward in this petition by members of the Fishermen's Union in forty different settlements, and the Union is comprised of men who are banded together for the purpose of taking an intelligent interest in matters that come up from time to time in the public affairs of the Colony. It is a matter of congratulation that the Legislature has the advantage and opportunity of hearing on matters of such importance from such a reliable source and I know that the Government will be only too glad to do all in their power to remedy the evils that are complained of in the petition.

As regards the landing of freight on Sunday, that is, I understand, a sore and a grievance felt to a considerable extent in many of the outports where the steamer calls on Sunday, and where in consequence the usual quiet observance of the Sabbath Day is very often interfered with. Of course there may be some who have not the strong views on this matter that others have, but I think that all will agree that it is in the interest of all to observe Sunday in such a way as not to interfere with the rights of others. That is the great test of the observance of the Sabbath Day, that without curtailing the liberty of anybody we still respect the feelings of others. I do not remember the time in St. John's when ships unloaded on Sunday, and in this city Sunday is in every sense a day of rest. Apart from the religious aspect it is necessary from a physical standpoint to have a day of rest, for the body requires it.

Where there is no difference of opinion as to the keeping of Sunday, I think we ought to go as far as possible in preventing open violation of the Sabbath. The unloading of freight is only for a very short time in some places and not much notice is taken of it, but when the winches are kept going for hours in a small settlement it is a source of very great annoyance to the people. We had this difficulty at Grand Bank one year ago and we made an arrangement by which boats that left Placentia arrived there on a week day, and arrived on Sunday at a place where very little freight was landed. Grand Bank handles considerable freght and conseqently it annoyed the people very much to hear the winches going while they were at church.

Concerning the other matter, the cutting of timber in the three mile limit and the erection of further mills, I may say that it is at this very time engaging the attention of the Government, for already numerous petitions have been received asking to have the mills removed. On the other hand there were others who said it was the only way in which the fishermen could get cheap timber, and they even went so far as to call them the " fishermen's mills." When there is such a great difference of opinion the Government has to move cautiously, but I desire to say, however, that both matters referred to in the petition will receive the best consideration of the Government. I have, therefore, much pleasure in presenting the petition.

MR. CLAPP—I am glad to hear that the petitioners have expressed themselves so strongly against the unloading of ships on Sundays, and to know that the

Prime Minister has taken a move in the matter. It is not fair to the people of the different settlements to hear the winches going while they are devoting themselves to their religious duties simply because it saves time for the owners. It is the duty of the Government to see that it is not compulsory to unload ships on Sunday, and, if impossible to carry out the service properly because of that, then extra steamers should be provided.

MR. CLIFT—Before the petition is disposed of I would like to say that I am heartily in accord with it, and when the Legislation which has been outlined by the Hon. Premier comes down before the House I shall be very glad to give it my support.

MR. SQUIRES—The subject matters of the petitions which have been presented by the Hon. Premier that are of great importance to all those members who have the honor to represent the northern constituencies, are the matter of the landing of freight on Sunday and the matter of the saw mills. In Trinity district there is a difference of opinion in the latter ; one section considers that the small mill owners should be encouraged and that they should be given greater facilities than they have, while in another section there is a feeling against it. The opinion of the district is divided on the question and I trust the Government will have the matter carefully considered in every aspect before anything definite is done. With regard to the unloading of freight on Sundays, I look upon it as an abominal nuisance, and in the instances that have been brought to my notice I have found that it was quite possible to arrange matters in such a way as to get over the difficulty and avoid the trouble that arose owing to the feelings of the people being aroused against the landing of freight on the Sabbath Day. If the present schedule renders it necessary for steamers to call at the bigger places where the winches will have to be used on Sundays, there should be a change made in it so that these places may be called at on some other day. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayers of the petitioners in this matter, and I trust that something will be done to carry them into effect.

HON. PREMIER—I beg to present a petition from L. B. Taylor and about 1,500 other petitioners in relation to the closing of licensed houses in the districts of St. John's East and West. It will be remembered that on last Wednesday I presented a petition in relation to the same subject and on that occasion there was some discussion on the matter. There were something like four thousand signatures to the petition then, but since that time the parties interested in the movement have been active in obtaining further signatures, and consequently there are now some 5,250 signatures to the petition. I am told by those interested that there were some petitions from Bell Island that had not arrived and 304 signatures in town not yet handed in. It is safe to say that probably over 5,500 men have signed the petition. When I spoke of this petition on Wednesday last, I endeavored to put the case fairly from both standpoints, for I have no interest in the matter except to do what is

right to the people, and I was actuated by no other motive than to put the matter right to the House. I pointed out that there was no question whatever that the taking of liquor in excess was bad for any man. That is an evil that all recognize, and it is an evil that has existed in the community for some time, but I think we can say that the evil caused by excess of drinking has abated to a certain extent in recent years owing to the amendments and improvements that have been made from time to time in the liquor laws. The very fact that the Legislature has the control of the traffic is in itself an evidence that liquor selling is not an ordinary business and that it is one that affects the people. There are, of course, people whom it affects very little, for they never knew what it was to drink liquor, while others, through some cause or other, have not found it easy to resist the temptation of the flowing bowl, for they derive from it a great deal of pleasure and conviviality. They pass away their spare time in some saloon, and they think that the exchange of a glass leads to a comradeship and goodfellowship. This is particularly the case with those who have no other means of enjoyment, for the man who has a comfortable home or a club where he can obtain liquor has not the same temptation to go to a public house as the man who has not these advantages. That is one side of the case. The other side is as to how the Legislature is justified in curtailing the sale of liquor along such lines as discriminates against any one particular class. Where are we in connection with the Bill if it becomes law. Well, after all, if 5,500 citizens in both districts of St. John's, who certainly have some right to be heard in the matter, ask to have the hours shortened, and we see no objection to the granting of their request, we should carry their wishes into effect, for by doing so we are only carrying out the principle that the majority must rule. We hold our seats in this Assembly by that very rule, and no member would be here unless he had a majority, no matter how large or how small, over his opponent. We represent the majority of the people, and we are, so to speak, the final court on all questions concerning the people, and the responsibility of deciding them rests with us. We can, therefore, in all fairness, apply these principles to the present question of the early closing of saloons. We may assume that all who have signed the petition are in favor of it, for that is certainly not a wild assumption. While there may be a few who would not vote for it if it were decided by ballot, still we must admit that are many who would vote for it who have not signed the petition. As to those who have signed the petition we can be sure, so let us consider the men who have not signed it. What will be their position if the Bill becomes law. Consider the moderate drinkers, men who take but very little liquor, and these constitute a very large element. These men will not hanker after it nor will they suffer in any way by the shortening of the hours. Then there is the question as to whether it is a deprivation and a curtailment of the rights of our people as citizens. I do not think

it is, for however local option may enable one class to obtain as much as they require and hinder the poorer class from doing so, that is not what we are considering now. Under the present Bill, no matter how a man may be situated, he has all day long in which to obtain any liquor that he may require, and it seems to me that whatever else may be affected by this measure the liberty of the subject is but slightly affected. I am against class legislation in any form, and I have been against it all my life, nor will I vote for any measure that will curtail the rights of the people. I have given the present matter great thought, and it has been part of my duties as a member of this House for twenty-seven years to vote on temperance legislation in every possible form. I have voted on prohibition, local option, and amendments, time after time, to the liquor laws. In the great majority of cases I have supported the amendments, and now I am confronted with the question as to whether I can justify myself in supporting the present amendment. As I have said, I have considered the matter very carefully, and I am prepared to justify publicly and privately the conclusion that I have arrived at, and that is to vote for the Bill.

The several petitions were received and ordered to be referred to the departments to which they relate.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Hon. Prime Minister, it was resolved that the Rules of the House be suspended in relation to all matters now before the House or to come before it this session.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the accompanying Bill, entitled "An Act to amend 10 Ed. VII, Cap. 30, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Preservation of Beavers,'" in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice the said Bill was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Mr. Speaker also informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up, entitled "An Act further to amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1902," with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of the Hon. Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Mr. Speaker also informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up, entitled "An Act to amend 5 Ed. VII, Cap. 17, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Protection of Woods against Fires and for other Purposes,'" without amendment.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 62 and 63 Vic., Cap. 14, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Inspection of Boilers,'" was introduced and

read a first time, and then read a second time, and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House presently.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister Finance and Customs , the Bill, entitled "An Act for Raising by Sale of Debenture Bonds a Loan for the Public Service of the Colony," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—In moving the second reading of this Bill I will simply explain the principal points, and leave the discussion until it goes into Committee. In the first place we are asked to close the public houses at 6 o'clock instead of 9, and provision is made in the same way as last year for the grocers to keep their shops open after 6, though they will be prohibited from delivering any intoxicating liquors after that hour. The other sections of the Bill deals with some matters which came in here in the petition presented by the hon. member for Trinity, Mr. Squires, from the Temperance Committee of the Methodist Church, and I will shortly explain these sections. The House will remember that in 1906 there was a consolidation of the License Acts introduced by the Hon. the Premier, who was then Minister of Justice. From the date of the passing of that Act, no retail license, in addition to those already held, could be granted until the total number of existing licenses in the town or settlement was reduced to a number bearing the proportion of one license to 200 adult male residents within the town or settlement. You will notice that while it seemed to be the intention of the Legislature that the number of licenses should be reduced until they bore the proportion of one licensed house to 200 male residents, no provision was made in the Act by which the Licensing Board could arrive at the number of adult male residents within the town or settlement. Now, we propose in this Bill to overcome that by making the last census the standard by which the Board shall arrive at the number of licenses to be granted. If hon. gentlemen will refer to the official census of 1901, they will find there a statement of the number of males in the Island who are over the age of twenty years, and they will find further that the average increase can be approximately estimated at ten per cent . during the ten years. I have accordingly provided in the Bill now before the House that that be the basis in estimating the population, and the section in this Bill reads as follows :

> The official census of 1901 with the addition of ten per cent. to represent the increase of population since 1901, shall be accepted and acted upon by the Board in ascertaining the total number of licenses to be granted under this section in any town or settlement.

Another section of that Act which is repealed is Section 16, which provides : "No retail license shall be granted to anyone but the occupier of the premises on which the said intoxicating liquors shall be sold, exposed or offered for sale ; but in case of

the insolvency or death of the person licensed, a magistrate or Board may make such order there on as shall suit the circumstances of such case." Now the difficulty of carrying out that section was that it was not at all made clear as to what would happen upon the insolvency or death of the holder of a license. The desire and intention of the Act was that the number should be reduced, and the method of reduction was this : That as holders of licenses either went into insolvency or died, the licenses should lapse. Now, we propose in the section which I have drafted here to proceed upon this principle and make a retail license determine upon the transfer of the property from the holder of the license to any other person. In other words, if any of the present holders of a licensed premises transfers the property to any other person the license ceases. We also make the license cease upon the insolvency of the holder of the license. But I would suggest that thirty days be given to the trustee in insolvency in order to realize upon any liquor which may come into his possession as trustee.

Then, in the case of death of the holder of a license, the Board may grant a new license to the widow of the deceased, or to any child of the deceased who may reside with him or be dependent on him at the time of his death. In other words, the idea is if the business can be continued for the benefit of immediate family of the holder, who were dependent upon it for their support, then it is left to the Board to say whether they will grant these persons licenses, provided that those people are in the country. For instance, a deceased holder of a license may have a son doing well somewhere out of the country, and it would be unfair and contrary to the spirit of the 1906 Act that such son should take over the business and simply put in some person to run the business for him. If it can be of any benefit to the immediate family of the holder then the Magistrate or Board have power to deal with the new application of a license.

Then in the past it seems there was some question about the right of any person to attend meetings of the Licensing Board. The Board as a matter of favor allowed person to come in at their licensing sessions, but this Bill proposes to throw all meetings of of the Licensing Board, at which any application is being considered for the granting of a license, open to the public, and requires the Board to publish one week's notice of licensing session or meeting in two daily newspapers published at St. John's. That will give any person who desires an opportunity to go before the Board and make any objection or otherwise which he may see fit to make. It provides that any person may appear in person, or by counsel, and shall have the right to call witnesses and to be heard in opposition to any application for a license. Then the last section provides that any person who thinks himself aggrieved by any act of the Licensing Board may appeal to the Supreme Court in the same way as ordinary appeals from the judgment of a Magistrate. There is nothing in the Act which has not been affirmed over and over again by this House. I would

suggest that the House allow the Bill to be read a second time, and that any discussion be taken when the Bill goes into Committee.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time.

The House now resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on said Bill.

HON. MIN. JUSTICE — In moving the adoption of the first section of this Bill, I say with all sincerity that I regard this Bill as the most important measure coming before the House during the present session. We have had other important matters here,—very large cold storage enterprises projected and an Old Age Pension scheme projected,—but I believe no other question is so far-reaching in its importance to the people of this country as this humble section which we are now about to consider. The question of the restriction of the sale of liquor, Mr. Chairman, has come prominently before this Colony and this House during recent years, and there seems to be a steady tide setting in in the direction of the restriction of the liquor traffic. Whether that will keep on growing until we obtain prohibition, which is the goal of some temperance advocates, is not necessary to discuss to-day. All that we need to discuss to-day is whether, in the interests of the people of this Colony—the people whom we represent and serve—it is advisable to have the public houses closed at six o'clock in the evening instead of at nine as at present. Now, the petition states that for many years public opinion has been developing along the lines of decreasing the sale of alcoholic liquors, and I propose now to shortly refer back to what has been done by this House within the past five or six years and as far as possible to connect it with the work in which we are engaged to-day. It will be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that in 1905 this question was before the Legislature and a commission was appointed to consider it. That commission was eminently representative ofthe various interests in the country. It was composed of Rev. Dr. Curtis. Rev. Father Kitchen, Rev. Geo. Bolt, Rev. C. V. Cogan, Rev. Dr. Robertson, Rev. W. T. D. Dunn, Rev. J. Thackeray, Col. Williams, S.A., Hons. J. J. Rogerson, E. M. Jackman, Dr. Skelton, John Harris, J. D. Ryan, and A. J. Harvey. I mention the names of these parties to show that those of them who are still with us to-day are still strong supporters of this movement to reduce the hours during which public houses shall be opened, and as for those who have been removed their successors are strong advocates of this measure. Amongst those who were members of that commission and who are still with us, nearly all signed the petition. For instance, Dr. Kitchen signed the petition, Rev. Mr. Bolt signed the petition, Rev. Mr. Cogan has gone away, but his successor, Rev. Mr. Uphill signed the petition, Rev. Mr. Sutherland signed the petition, Rev. Mr. Dunn has gone away, but his successor signed the petition, Rev. Mr. Thackeray signed the petition. Col. Williams of the Salvation Army has gone away, but his successor Col. Rees has signed. So has Staff-Capt. Cave, Hon. Mr. Rogerson is dead. Mr. Jackman has not signed, presumably for

the same reason for which he refused last time, that he is in favor of submitting the question to a poll of the people. Mr. A. J. Harvey has signed. So it appears that most of those gentlemen who then made enquiry into this subject are also supporters of this movement that we are discussing now. At that time the question of shortening the hours occupied a good deal of attention and I find that the commission appealed to Inspector General McCowan, who was probably the best judge of the requirements of the License Act. He advised that the hours of opening should be from 7 to 7. That was in 1905. Since then temperance sentiment has been steadily advancing and last year the Legislature without any further enquiry, limited the hours of opening in the morning altering them from 7 to 9 a. m. And to-day 5,500 citizens ask us to reduce the hours of opening in the evening from 9 to 6. That Bill brought in then was discussed very fully in this House and was referred to a special committee consisting of Sir E. P. Morris, Mr. E. M. Jackman, Mr. Gushue, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Hutchings, Mr. Kent, and Mr. Morine. That committee presented a report signed by every member of the committee except Mr. Morine but every one of the committee signed it with reservations. None of them could agree upon various suggestions made to the committee. Not one of the members agreed to all the suggestions. That report was brought before the House in 1906. Sir Edward Morris brought in the Bill which now appears upon the Statute Book as a consolidation of the license law for that year. That Bill was thoroughly debated and on this very question we have now there was a debate as to whether it was advisable to further restrict the hours of opening. In that debate Mr. Jackman moved an amendment that the House should not decide the question, but that a poll of the people should be taken on it. It was pointed out by Mr. Kent, and Sir Edward Morris, then Minister of Justice, and Mr. Morine that to send a question of detail like that to the voters for their vote would simply be to abdicate the functions of this House as a Legislature and that it was the duty of this House to have an opinion on the subject and to express it. With that statement I most fully concur. It is the duty of every man in this House when a question comes before the House to be prepared to give an opinion on any question that comes before us. And when we have a petition like this with 5,500 signatures gathered in the short space of one week, possibly the most remarkably spontaneous petition that has ever come before this Legislature, I do not think that any legislator can have any doubt in his mind that we should deal with this matter now instead of sending it back to the people, which would cost at least $3,000 and is quite unnecessary.

Following upon that legislation temperance sentiment continued to advance, to the utter surprise of the temperance people themselves ; and the next thing was a Local Option election in Harbor Main. Local Option was carried there by a respectable majority. On account of an informality in the ballot papers it was held void. It was fought

over again next year and was won again by a greater majority. And all this had an effect upon St. John's and those of us who are watching the way things go could hear some of the men in the liquor business saying : "If Harbor Main goes dry we will soon be having it here." And sure enough soon there was a Local Option agitation in St. John's. I believe myself that if that election had been handled properly we would not have been discussing this Bill to-day. If a little more interest and a little more time had been taken we would have had the extra 900 votes required to carry that election. Perhaps it is as well that it was not carried. I think that the fight that was made then stirred up interest in the subject perhaps more than if it had been carried. There were 7,814 voters who voted ; 4647 were against the petition, 3,167 in favor of it, leaving a majority of 1,480. That was a very good foundation for the next movement. To-day that 3,167 has grown into 5,500 signatures, or a majority of all the voters in St. John's East and West. And that is not by any means all that could be got ; these are only what could be got in a week. I believe there are still hundreds of men in outlying settlements who would be quite ready to sign this petition if it could be sent around. I would like to give the committee a few facts in relation to this petition. It is signed by all classes, from the highest man in society to the lowest man in the town. It is signed by every clergyman in the city. I only regret that Bishop Jones, that tower of strength in the temperance cause, is not here to put his shoulder to the wheel. He it was who was one of the moving spirits of that commission in 1906. and if any benefit is to come from the agitation that has been going on I think our good Bishop of the Church of England ought to get his fair share of the credit for the success. You will find in that petition the names of the Total Abstinence and Benefit Society almost to a man. There is no body in this town doing better work than the T. A. & B. Society. Anyone who sees those men and boys turn out for a parade must feel the more confident in the future of St. John's. You will find the professional men, the newspaper man, the mechanic, the laborer, the farmer, the fisherman. Names of every class you will find appended to that petition. If you were to take the trouble, as I did, to talk to the committee who got the signatures they would tell you what a large majority of signatures there were as compared with the refusals. At the Boot and Shoe Factory 60 signed and 20 refused. At the Horwood Lumber Co. there were only three refusals. At the Empire Wood Working Co. 40 signed and three refused. At the Reid-Newfoundland Co. they were almost unanimous. At the Gas Co. 9 signed and three refused. Lester's teamsters a large majority signed. The same at the Firemen's Union. At the 'Longshoremen's Union a large majority signed. At the Star of the Sea Society a large majority. At Smallwood's Boot Factory only 3 refused. At Job's they were unanimous. At Broad Cove, Kilbride and the Goulds the same thing. At Torbay 149 signed and 14 refused. At Pouch Cove it

was 93 to 5 ; at Flat Rock 80 men signed and there were no refusals, and at Petty Harbor 85 men signed. At Freshwater Road and Nagles Hill 96 signed and 4 refused. And so it was in every place. You can see that compared with the number of men who signed, the number of refusals is negligible. In some places they were actually unanimous in favor of the petition. What are we going to do with a petition like that? Could we turn it down ? I should hardly think so. Speaking for myself, as I said before, I think this is the most important question that we have had before us this session and I hope that every member of the House will vote on it according to his convictions. If there is any man who honestly believes that keeping the public houses open until 9 is a benefit then let him vote for it, but I shall be very much surprised if we do not have a practically unanimous vote in the face of that petition with its 5,508 signatures.

Now, sir, I do not propose to go into any of the arguments for or against the Bill at present, for I hope at a later stage to be able to say something further. Sometimes we temperance men are charged with having an animous against the liquor business. We are also called fanatics. Now, personally, it does not matter to me whether every shop on the north side of Water Street is a public house. They do not get any of my money. If everybody was like me they would soon be closed up, for there would be nothing sold. Then why do I worry myself about this question ? I am doing it because I see there is a lot of people who do go into these public houses, and too often. I have a son of my own, and other people have them too, and it is because I want to take it out of their way that I worry about movements like this. That is the feeling that is back of this petition. If you take that petition you will find on it the names of lots of men who often go into the public houses themselves after six o'clock, but they are willing to sacrifice that to take the temptation out of their own way and out of the way of their children growing up. You may say that any man who does not want liquor need not take it. But it is not every man that can keep away from liquor whether he wants it or not. A man gets into the habit of taking it, thinking he can do as he pleases about it, and then cannot break it off. How many unfortunate men has the liquor traffic ruined in Newfoundland every year. You will find the same proportion in other countries. Archbishop Ireland, the great American Archbishop of St. Louis, a man foremost in every good work for the citizens of the United States, above all, a practical man. What does he say about it ? He says : "It is a menace which should be discussed by every clergyman in the United States." Every clergyman in this city has signed this petition here. "It is a business that should be hated by every business man in the community." We have the signatures of hundreds of business men asking us to restrict the hours in this city. "It is the constant dread of every true mother." Does not that touch a chord in the hearts of every one of us ? Would not we think of the mothers, as I have known them, waiting up night

after night for their sons, not knowing whether they will come home sober or drunk ? All over this town to-day, and this district to-day, the mothers are waiting and looking to see what we are going to do here about it. Their prayers are going up that we may accede to the prayer of the petition. If you would give them a vote on this question, as I would without hesitation, there would soon be no trouble about its being put through. Archbishop Ireland goes on to say that it is a business that fills the police courts every day with pitiful scenes. That is a matter I can tell you about, and if anybody who is interested will come to my office, I will give him the daily record of the Police Court which is placed on my desk, and that will show you what harm the drinking traffic does. I have here in my hands the report that came to me this morning, and what does it say ? "Five men taken in over night—a fisherman from Logy Bay taken in for being drunk. A laborer of Carter's Hill, aged 30, taken in for being drunk. A laborer of Water St., drunk, and so on." Five men taken up over night because the public houses were not closed on Saturday night. If this law had been in force, instead of being taken up for being drunk and disorderly by the police, these men would have been home with their wives and families. Archbishop Ireland goes on to say :— "The liquor business is a business that robs our little ones of the necessaries of life, of freedom and education." Is that true ? Does some of the money that ought to go for the children's schooling go into the hands of the licensed publican ? "It sends our boys to rob." Is that true ? That is a question for the people of this town, and I believe that when they are next asked that question they will answer it with no uncertain sound. All we are asked to do to-day is to simply restrict the hours for selling liquor to six in the evening. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I have lived in this city for a little over fifty years. I was born and brought up here, and I expect to die here. I am bringing up my family here, and I support this Bill because I want to leave to my boy a better St. John's than the previous generation, and in any measure that comes before this House, while I have the honor to represent the people, you will always find me at the back of any movement that has for its object the improvement of the welfare of the people. I have therefore much pleasure in giving the Bill my hearty support.

HON. MR. EMERSON—I rise for the purpose of suporting the Bill now before the House. Any doubts which one may have hitherto had on this subject are now set at rest by the large number of names attached to the petition. Notwithstanding the fact that the promoters of this movement had a very limited time at their disposal to ascertain the feeling of the citizens in respect to this early closing, they have succeeded in obtaining over five thousand names who were in favor of it. It was safe to assume then that had these gentlemen a few more days in which to interview the public, a much larger number of names would have been obtained. We must regard this petition in the light of

a mandate from the people of St. John's, and as the principle of the majority ruling is always recognized, there is no other course open but to support the Bill. The Local Option law is in force in every district in the Island outside St. John's, and that condition of affairs was brought about by a majority vote. In the same manner it is for a majority of the voters of St. John's to say whether or not the licensed houses will close at six o'clock or not. They have decided by this petition in favor of making the closing hour 6 o'clock. For these reasons I feel it my duty to give my support to the Bill.

HON. SPEAKER—Mr. Chairman, it would be, perhaps, a pity if this Bill were to go through with all the members following one another with a string of platitudes ; and as I am now in my ordinary seat, I should like to avail of the opportunity of expressing my doubts in respect of this Bill. Sir, I do not oppose the Bill ; I shall vote for it ; but I want to point out to the members of this House some points which, at all events, do not appeal to me. In the first place, I agree with the other members who have just spoken, that, in view of the petition containing so many signatures, it practically amounts to a mandate to the members of this House to vote for it. But there are some statements always made when any temperance petition comes before this House, that are not as convincing as they appear on the fact. In the first place, the Premier has pointed out that our people are not as drunken as people in most other countries—in fact, that our drink bill is quite small, and nearly at the bottom of the list as far as consumption of liquor is concerned. And, as far as my district and constituents are concerned, I want to say that if this Bill s to infer that when they come to this town and that if this Bill is to infer that take a drink after six, they can't behave themselves, then I want to say that such is not the case. There are a great many sealers in my district who come here year after year, and have gone to the ice and come back, and gone home good and quiet and orderly men. I think that this Bill will affect those who are not contemplated by those bringing in the Bill. Any ordinary man, who wants a drink, will take it after six, when his day's work is done, and men coming here from the outports, doing their business and bringing suplies and arranging for the price of fish, require hard heads and to have their wits about them, and if they can't get a drink after six, they will get it in the daytime ; and is it to be supposed that they will have the hard heads which they ought to have when transacting their business ? Do you suppose that the passage of this measure is going to lessen the drinking in this town ? Is it to be supposed that everybody who goes into a public house is a drunkard, or is drinking to excess, and that by taking away his drinks after six o'clock that you are going to reform him ? Another point in regard to this Bill : The man who cannot drink after six o'clock will go into the public house in the daytime and buy his drink, and, if he cannot find any other place to drink it, he will take it home ; and all that has been said about children, mothers, and wives, and

about the protection this will be to them, more or less goes to the wall. It is not along the lines of temperance to allow the man you propose to reform to take his liquor home, and legislation will not make him any soberer. I think two things can be done without legislation, which will be most beneficial, and largely stop the consumption of liquor. In the first place, we have trade unions in this city, and if, instead of signing petitions, they were to make rules that anybody who has been convicted for drunkenness once or twice, would be debarred from membership, it would do more good than all the temperance bills of the last 20 years. The other point, for which I would hold up both hands every time, is to stop "treating." I believe that a hundred times more harm is done by "treating' in public houses than by any other means. The origin of this habit is so far back that none of us can see any reason for it. As far as a Club is concerned, no member may stand a drink for another member, and in any clubs to which I belong that rule is being enforced, and good results are being seen every day. I believe that it is possible to stop treating, and if any legislation with that object in view were brought in, I would vote for it, and do all I could for it. As far as I can see, this Bill is not going to lessen the drinking. What it is going to do, in my opinion, is that the men you are trying to reform, the men from whom you want to try and take the liquor, are going to get as much as they want before six o'clock instead of before nine. I have perused the Bill and fully considered it, and I am going to vote for it. I have no other course. But I would like to add at the same time that while I occupy a seat in this House and see points in a measure which, in my opinion, do not carry out what they are intended to carry out, I for one will avail of the opportunity to point them out.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—I recognize, sir, that this, in the words of the Attorney General, is a most important matter, if not the most important matter that has come before this Legislature during the present session, or in fact for many sessions past. I refrained from expressing my opinion the other day when the petition was presented, when the various speakers on both sides of the House gave expression to their opinion but I intimated that I would vote on this matter when it came up in concrete form before the House as it is now. One the prime movers in this matter, or I presume one of the prime movers called upon me at my office the day upon which this petition was about to be presented, and asked me to give my opinion as to how I would vote, and I had the pleasure of discussing the matter fully with him. I refrained from giving a promise one way or the other, because I intended to give my vote with a free and unbiased mind. I have carefully considered the matter from all sides, the pros and the cons, and to-day I have made up my mind, and I intend to vote for the Bill as it now stands. I do so, not because I am convinced that the measure is absolutely necessary for the moral welfare of St. John's, but because I am of opinion that a great

majority of the people have here expressed their disapproval of the over-consumption of alcoholic spirits. Since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, a period extending over twenty-three years, I have always had the spirit of my convictions, and I have always been on the floors whenever the question of temperance has come up, and exercised my vote according to the best of my belief. I represented Harbor Main for twenty years. In regard to that district the Hon. Minister of Justice said he was more than surprised when Harbor Main adopted local option. I was not surprised, sir. I knew the result, and it was my privilege to associate myself with the prime movers in the matter, and I took my instructions from the rev. gentlemen who worked so hard for that end. I now represent a district that, of their own choice, without any coercion or force, have adopted local option, and I am therefore in a position to exercise my vote upon this measure entirely disassociated from any direct influence one way or the other. I have a right to vote upon all questions that come up here for consideration, but in this case I will be guided in my vote by the position taken by the members of St. John's East and West, who have a right to know what is right or not in the interests of their constituents. If any matter of mportance came up in relation to the district of Placentia and St. Mary's I would consider it an intrusion if the subject were taken hold of and influenced one way or the other by members representing other districts. This Bill is entirely a matter for the districts of St. John's East and West, a matter concerning them alone. In other countries it is purely a municipal matter. In this Colony it is a matter for the State. If it were a municipal matter, we would not have to deal with it. As it does come before us for consideration then we have to exercise our judgment; but in the giving of our vote we should be influenced by the opinion of the representatives of the electoral districts of St. John's. When speaking of the petition, the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Shea, gave expression to the identical opinion that I then held. I was not aware at that time that the petition was so numerously signed. I did not know that there was such a large majority in St. John's interested in this question; but since then the number of signatures has increased by nearly two thousand. And there can be no question but that in an electorate of nine or ten thousand, when a petition is signed by 5500 people, that instrument indicates without a doubt the opinion of the majority. If we allow that 500 have been obtained under misapprehension, under coercion or without considering the subject of the petition or the effect the law would have upon their right,—I do not, sir, wish to insinuate that the signatures were not got honestly or fairly —but admitting that 500 signatures were obtained without the serious consideration of the reasons, there are still 5,000 voters on that petition, and that surely is an indication sufficient to my mind as to what the public opinon is on this question. It may be, sir, that I am not as well

qualified to give a temperance lecture as the Attorney General because all his life he has been connected with temperance organization ; in fact, he has been in practically every temperance movement that has come up; but I hope and trust that every man will be allowed freedom of opinion. I simply wish to give my reason for supporting the measure, and that is because I conceive it to be my duty to vote on this question which has been shown to be endorsed by the majority of the electorate.

MR. SHEA—Mr. Chairman, when this measure came before the House a few days ago in the shape of a petition, I made myself pretty clear as to my position in the matter. I then stated that if I felt satisfied that the majority of the electorate was in favor of this measure it would have my hearty support. I have now made up my mind, and in face of that petition signed by such a number, no other course is open to me but to support the measure, even if I were disinclined to do so. The petition, to my mind, is a mandate from the people, a mandate from 5,500 electors, and assuming that half this number belongs to St. John's East, it is a mandate from my constituents to support this measure. Therefore, as I have said, even if I felt inclined to vote otherwise, I feel bidden by those whom I represent to support the measure. And whether it effects good or evil, I have to take the responsibility and carry out their wishes to the best of my ability.

MR KENT—When this was before the House a few days ago in the form of a petition, I then stated and now repeat that I consider it to be the duty of every good citizen to promote by every means in his power any matter, any legislation, any movement, which has for its object the improvement of the community. It must be a great satisfaction to find that in the city of St. John's there is a large and influential interest taken in the improvement of the community and the direct object of the present movement, to promote temperance among the people, is a movement with which I think everyone in this House, and outside of this House, should be in sympathy. The immediate request that the petition made and embodied in this Bill is that the saloons in St. John's, in fact all over the Colony, shall be closed at six o'clock. Personally, in addition to the evidence of the largely signed petition and the numbers of opinions in favor of the legislation, I believe the legislation is going to do good and for that reason I am going to vote for the first section of the Bill. Now, sir, I do not intend to go into this matter fully. The history of the temperance movement and the success it has attained from time to time has been ably put before you by the Hon. the Premier and the Hon. Minister of Justice, both of whom have spoken in favor of the measure. There is one point in connection with the matter which I might menton. I consider that taking the city of St. John's all round, it will compare very favorably with other cities in any part of the world. I have been in cities both on this side of the Atlantic and on the other, and in none of them is there a greater absence of signs of intoxication than in St. John's.

That, of course, is no argument against the Bill. If we take the young men of the city or of any other city ; when did they learn to drink ? You will find, I think, that it is generally after six o'clock ; and if you ask a man who is now the victim of drink how he came into the habit, he will tell you that he began after hours, and that the habit grew upon him before he became aware of it, and consequently he is to-day what is known as a waster. If we close the public houses after six o'clock these men will not go looking for drink, and consequently, if we do this, we will be taking away a serious source of evil. And I believe some such idea as this actuated those who have signed the petition. Personally, as I say, I intend to support the Bill, and I do so first because I believe in my conscience it is going to do good, and, second, because I have the support of the majority of my constituents.

MR. KENNEDY—Mr. Chairman, being a representative of part of the district that this Bill particularly interests, I rise to give it my support. There were some the other day who were doubtful, but now the addition of nearly 2,000 signatures clearly shows that the wishes of the majority are that this Bill should pass. This is going to be a great step towards local option in a few years at least. It was proved a few years ago that the majority of the people did not want it. Let them have a few years and you will see that you will carry local option or prohibition. I do not think that the time is ripe for it yet, and there will be no great harm in letting it go for a few years. I am an employer of labor and I do not care if a man takes a drink, but it is the wasters who go drinking in the night not the man who works. I am not going to delay the House I only wish to say that I am in favor of it, and that if the temperance people put their shoulders to the wheel they will carry local option in a short time.

MR. BENNETT—When the matter was before the House in the form of a petition, I expressed my appreciation of its deep importance. Since that, sir, I have given the matter very grave consideration, and have endeavored to look upon both sides of the question, and to arrive at a conclusion which would be both creditable to myself and to the community. I appreciate the fact that the large influential additions which have been added to the petition have given it renewed force, and have made it of still greater importance. I stated here, sir, the other day that I was here at the behest of those who sent me, and I felt that I could not ignore a petition which was so largely and influentially signed. It was thought by many of the members of this committee that the proper way to handle this matter would be to refer it back to the people. That principle I contend would be the right one, if the petition were not so numerously signed. But we must accept the petition as we find it, and recognize that the petitioners form a majority of the electorate. I would not be worthy of the position that I hold if I did not pay attention to such a petition. The only thing that I regret is that this petition does not go far enough. I maintain

that if it is wrong to drink after six, it is wrong to drink before six, and I also say that reform is as necessary in the higher walks of life as well as in the working classes. I am only sorry that this does not reach those who are not workers. I said the other evening that I was in favor of moral reform, and as this is considered a moral reform and is supported by the majority of the people I would also support it, although personally not agreeing to its principles I am merely carrying out the dictates of the majority of the electors of the city. I listened with great interest to the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Justice. He has evidently taken a great deal of trouble and has gone to much research in introducing this Bill. But, Sir, I think the time has come when we should face this issue and should not continue to lop off bit by bit, but if this business is to be wiped out—to do so entirely without more ado. I would rather be voting for prohibition to deprive everyone than to be voting to deprive a certain class and let others get all the drink they want. I contended the other evening that the business carried on by the licensed publicans was a legitimate one, and consequently had rights. The country collects taxes from it and uses the money for forwarding education, for use of the public service and the public works of the Colony. The Minister of Justice took exception to my remarks and said that the revenue obtained from liquor went to keep up the extra Poor Asylum, extra police, etc., and that those monies could be dispensed with owing to the saving of expense for Poor House, police, etc. Well that may be true, and may not be true, we all have our private opinion, and I do not think that these services will cost any less than at the present time. In a case like this every man should express his honest opinion. I would not come into this House and say anything that I would not say outside. I maintain that the people should be consistent in a matter of such vital importance to the community. I regret, sir, that even in this Bill, even in this small section there is discrimination. I consider that it favors one man more than another, in the provision made for the licensed grocery stores. These can keep open till nine oclock. I do not think that that that is fair or right. I know something about this town and people, and about this subject, and I contend that if it is made law every public house may become a grocery store and we will want ten policemen instead of one as now. I do not think we should discriminate, we should treat all alike. Last year when the nine o'clock hour was declared there was no difference made. Why make it now, the temptations to break the law would be too great if this were allowed. I agree with the remarks of the hon. member Mr. Shea that it was not expected that other clauses that have been added to this Bill would have been brought in this session. It is unfair to this committee that legislation of this kind should be railroaded through under suspended rules, while many members of this committee would like to give an expression of opinion, but are debarred from doing so.

We come here and find an array of sections. The matter that has been discussed, the matter that has been made an issue by the people of this town, is to close the saloons at six. That was the principal question, and the one we are called upon to decide, if this amendment becomes law, then I trust the reforms contemplated will be realized, and that if any further legislation is contemplated in the near future, that the whole question will be taken up and settled once and for all, whether the importation, manufacture and sale should be abolished altogether. That, Sir, in my opinion, is the only honest way to act.

Year after year this House has to receive petitions on this subject, and people hold up their hands in holy horror at the traffic. It was likened to a mad dog that should be tied up, but my opinion is, Sir, that you may tie up too tight, and it will eat off the string, and get back at you, and the last state would be worse than the first. I appreciate the work that has been done, and I appreciate the honest intention of many temperance reformers, but still let us be careful when putting laws in our statute book, that those laws will be carried out and honored in the observance, and not in the breach, as license laws are in many other places.

MR. MOULTON—I listened with pleasure to the very able way in which the hon. the Premier, a few evenings ago, presented the petition on this subject. He gave us statistics which showed that Newfoundland was nearly at the top of the ladder, but I am afraid, that if it was not for the little liquor drunk in the outports, we would be at the bottom of the ladder, and if it were not for St. John's she would have a still better place, as the rest of the country is dry. I am delighted to see such a great petition, and to see the interest that has been taken by the people of the city, and I think it is only paving the way to have local option in St. John's. If we have local option in St. John's, we have prohibition for the whole Island. Personally, I am opposed to the liquor traffic. I have suffered a lot through it. As a shipper, I have seen the injury it has worked, not only in my own business, but in others as well. I represent a district, Burgeo and LaPoile, which was one of the first districts in the Island to carry local option, and therefore, Sir, I have very much pleasure in giving the Bill now before the Chair my very hearty support.

MR. DOWNEY—When the petition was before the House, I gave my views on the matter, and said that I would support the measure. It has been my good fortune to have been largely brought into contact with artizans, not in any particular portion of the country, but in all parts. I have also been associated with working classes in other countries, and my experience has been that we can compare very favorably indeed with others. We have the reputation of being a moral people, but we have unfortunately a few among us who are not living up to the standards of morality. It is right that in obedience to the dictates of providence, we should do all in our power to help this limited number. A community as well

as an individual will be rewarded by living up to the Christian standard. We have been free from the devastating influences which affect other countries, such as earthquakes, etc., and for this we should be truly thankful, but we should recognize it practically, and we should make some sacrifices for being clear from such perils. If one goes up the street one hears imprecations, the name of God being taken in vain. Can any good be expected to come to this community from those individuals ? Now the intention of the Bill before the House is to curtail drinking. It is the drinking I think after six o'clock which gives rise to such scenes. It is a laudable object, and I think it is one to which we must all subscribe. My line of action is not against any class or creed, but I have no latitude when it becomes a question of conscience, and I am prepared to sacrifice my own feelings. I have no choice, and therefore I support the measure before the Chair. I know that it will be productive of good, and I hope and trust that we may get all the good from it.

MR. GOODISON—Mr. Chairman, before this Bill passes thro Committee, I take the opportunity of saying a word in favor of it, and placing myself on record in support of this Temperance legislation. I am told to-day, Sir, that as an outport representative I should not interfere in this matter. I even seen this suggested in the press. Let me say right here, Sir, that this is a view from which I differ in toto. Any matter which is brought before this House, Sir, is as much the business of one member as another. And why should not a Bill for temperance legislation be my business, Sir. I sit here as the representative of the oldest local option district in the Island. For thirty years and more, Sir, Carbonear has enjoyed the advantages of local option. We do not want, would not have, a saloon in our midst. Shall I, therefore, the representative of such a district, say to these petitions, these 5,500 voters, through whose efforts this Bill has resulted, shall I say to them that they are not entitled to the small concesson they ask to make their own town a better place to live in ? Certainly not, Sir. I support the Bill as a whole, Sir, without reservation. Unlike many of the members who spoke before me, I have not been asked by anyone to support this measure. My hon. friend, the Attorney General, tells us he is prepared at any time to support all temperance legislation. Sir, I wish to place myself on record as being prepared to stand side by side with him as long as I have the honor of a seat in this House in support of any temperance legislation, which comes to us without taint of political expediency. I regard the Act we are now discussing as a very fair and reasonable one, and I shall go further, and support the clauses which deal with the Licensing Board. These clauses simply clear up many points .which are now regarded as bearing an uncertain meaning. I congratulate the temperance people of St John's on the wonderful response they have met with, and I have very much pleasure, Sir, in giving my cordial support to the Bill.

MR. GEAR — What is the meaning of "all licensed houses?" Do I understand it means all bars, private bars, such as the City Club ?

MR. MORISON—No.

MR. GEAR—Then, Sir, I think that this is class legislation. You allow some people to drink till 10.30, but the poor man is debarred after six o'clock. I want it to be understood that I am in favor of the petition. I am a man with seven sons, and I am in favor of all temperance reform, but I am not in favor of passing class legislation in this House, and allowing one man to get liquor up to half-past ten and depriving the poor man of the same privilege.

MR. MORISON — I would point out to the hon. member that the Club License Law is under a different Act, an Act which he voted for in 1906, and if he wishes to have the Club License Law amended, he knows the proper course. If he wishes to bring in such an amendment, I will support it.

MR. HOWLEY—Mr. Chairman, for the past two or three days this temperance petition has been almost the sole topic of conversation around town, and I have heard that a number of men who signed the petition have prayed that the prayer of the petition would be accepted in order to remove from them the temptation of the public house. It seems to me that the same spirit which has actuated the signers outside has actuated the members of the Committee this evening, judging from the whole-souled manner in which they have supported the Bill before the Chair. It is very difficult for one to change his opinions and take a line of conduct from that which he has hitherto pursued. Personally, ever since I have first had the honor of a seat in this House, I have viewed temperance legislation with a certain amount of suspicion. I have always thought it was not the duty of the Legislature to say what a man should eat or drink ; but since this movement has been on the tapis I have tried to look at the question aside from all personal views or leanings, and I thoroughly agree with the necessity and desirability of doing everything in our power to lessen the temptation of drink to those who are unable to withstand it ; but I have been seriously inclined to hesitate as to whether I am doing my duty in going so far as to deprive the man that has been termed the moderate drinker of his rights of citizenship with regard to what and when he shall drink. But, Sir, I have come to a conclusion at last, and whether it be right or wrong, it is my honest opinion, and have determined to suport the Bill.

MR. EARLE—It is my intention to suport the Bill. I had not quite decided as to how I should act, until the Premier presented the second petition to-day, and that decided me. I had an idea that this was a matter purely for St. John's, and not one in which the outport members might interest themselves, but I have changed my mind on this also. I have a pleasing recollection of the local option work in my own district. There was a time when a man could take a drink and it would do him no apparent harm, but that seems to have passed away, and the commotion which

seems inseparable from the younger generation when under the influence makes the adoption of local option something to rejoice in. I think the Bill should commend itself to everybody, and the members have just cause to be thankful that they are given snch a chance of doing good.

MR. BENNETT—I would like to call the attention of the introducer of that Bill to the last part of section 2.

MR. MORISON—That part deals with the man who holds a license, and who is also engaged in selling groceries ; while he must close his liquor premises at six, he need not close his grocery. When the Bill was before the House last year dealing with shortening the hours in the morn ing, it was decided to allow the public houses to open before nine o'clock in order to take in supplies of ice, aerated water, etc., but not to sell liquor, and it was then decided that these houses that had groceries for sale would be allowed to open at eight for the sale of groceries, but not to sell any liquor. If it were left to me, I would have these grocery-liquor stores close at the same hour as what are known as the straight liquor stores. If I have any sympathy in the liquor business, it is for the man who goes into it straight and open, but I have none for the man who uses a liquor business to subsidize a grocery business. I have always thought that he was given an unfair advantage. That was the reason the section was drafted as it is, and if the hon. member will move an amendment that these grocery stores shall close at six, I shall have much pleasure in supporting it.

MR. BENNETT—This afternoon, when speaking on this measure, I intimated that I was going to support the Bill, and I gave my reasons. I then called the attention of the House to what I considered a discriminating clause, which I consider will to a great extent defeat the usefulness of this Bill. I contend that if a man wanted to keep a public house open to-morrow after six o'clock, all he would have to do would be to buy ten or twenty dollars worth of groceries and put them in his window and keep open till nine o'clock. Now, I do not think it is right for this Legislature to discriminate. I am surprised that the Hon. Minister of Justice has not seen fit to make the amendment I suggested and I would put myself on record as being in favor of having this clause amended.

MR. MORISON—I agree with every word of the argument of the hon. gentleman. If he wishes to have this amendment made, he is long enough in the House to know the way to do it. If he will make the motion now, I will second it, and we can take the sense of the Committee on it.

MR. BENNETT—The Hon. Minister of Justice evidently challenges my sincerity. I will now make the motion.

MR. MORISON—I do not challenge the hon. member's sincerity. I second the motion.

The motion was adopted.

MR. HOWLEY—Mr. Chairman, the principal on which I object to the provision is the same as that of the hon. member for St. John's West. I have no desire to urge any objection, except this, that if the principal is to be applied it ought to be applied in

toto. The section of the Act expressly provides that "nothing herein contained shall prevent the holder of a retail license from accepting delivery at the licensed premises of goods or supplies required in connection with his business between the hours of 8 a.m. and 9 a.m." That applies not only to licensed grocers, but to those premises which sell liquor alone. It goes further and provides that "the proprietor of any licensed premises in which groceries or provisions are sold shall be permitted to open such premises at 8 a.m., but shall not deliver any intoxicating liquors before 9 a.m." In other words, he can open one hour before the man who has a liquor business alone. According to the hon. member the same objection applies to the grocery store opening and being open before 9 a.m. It discriminates in favor of the combination business. If it is wrong to have a man with a double business open after 6 p.m., it is wrong to have him open before 9 a.m. The principle must be extended to both opening and closing.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is quite right. There is no question that if we stop the grocer from keeping open after 6 p.m., we must stop him from opening before 9 a.m. If Mr. Howley will move the objection I will second it, and we can take the opinion of the Committee.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—The point raised by the hon. member for Placentia was fully discussed and disposed of when this Bill was before the House last year. The objection at that time was not on account of any sympathy felt for those running a combination business ; but it was thought right that they should be allowed to take in their ice and ship their goods by train or steamer, as the case may be, to distant parts of the Island. Now, as to whether outport representatives should speak on this subject. I am one of those who represent a Local Option district, and I am very pleased that I can cast my vote again in favor of this Temperance Bill. But I think we should look into the thing properly, and take up every point that might occur. We must not discriminate in anyone's favor, and I agree with the hon. member for St. John's West that the last 2 1-3 half lines of sec. 33 be stricken out, namely : "And shall be permitted to keep open such premises until 9 a.m." There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that by closing the saloons at 6 p.m. you will remove a temptation in the way of many. As far as I am concerned, personally, this Bill does not make much difference to me. I am representing a Local Option district. But I think I am in this position, that I have a vote, and that if my vote is useless, this is no place for me. It does not matter to me whether it applies to St. John's or Bonavista or any other district. I have a voice and a seat, and I will do what I think is right ; I am not here to represent any particular faction, but to do my best for the Colony. It has been stated by one of the members that if the matter appertained entirely to his district he would feel annoyed if the rest of the House voiced their sentiments on it. But I find that when there is any legislation in connec-

tion with my district the whole House is ready enough to speak to it. It is needless for me to add to what has already been said. It is only for me to place myself on record as being fully in sympathy with the amendment moved by the member for St. John's West.

MR. HOWLEY—Mr. Chairman, I do not see why, if the Committee considered themselves justified in removing the discrimination after 6 o'clock they should not exercise the same authority in respect to the hours of opening. I move that all the words from "and provided further . . . to the end of the section be stricken out.

MR. BENNETT— I second that motion.

The section was adopted.

MR. F. J. MORRIS — Mr. Chairman, referring to section 16, sub-section 2, I would like to point out to the Minister of Justice the provisions relating to a temporary license. Does that mean that the holder of a license must be declared insolvent.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE— Yes. The trustee gets a temporary license to enable him to sell off the stock of liquor.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Again, referring to the next sub-section (a). Suppose the child referred to is a minor. Who would you assign his interest in the business to ? You must assign it to some executor or guardian. You cannot give the license to a child.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE— The license would expire.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Is not that a great hardship on the child. Is it not very arbitrary ? The boy cannot get it because he is not of age. And the executor or administrator or guardian cannot get it.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE— The intention was to leave it to the Licensing Board when a holder of a license died and left a widow or children dependent, to grant the license to the widow or a child over 21 if any such. But the intention of the Act of 1906 is to reduce the number of licenses in the city. It was considered that if the holder of a license died and left, say, a daughter married in St. John's, and comfortably off, the Board would not be bound to allow the business to be continued for her benefit. I can see there is something in what my hon. friend has suggested. If a license holder died and left only a couple of small children under age, the question is whether it is not better for those children that the business should be realized to the best advantage. How could they carry it on ? The trustee will not take the responsibility under all the pains and penalties of the License Act. I do not think the provision will work a hardship, and if you try to alter it it will make the defects worse. I do not wish to spoil the property of any holder of a license. Nobody does. But it seems to me that if you propose to avoid this you run into other difficulties.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—I merely wish to point out that the section is valueless to the children of deceased holders. A boy under age cannot get the license himself. This section makes no provision as to who is to protect his interests. What is the use of the section then ? If he was over 21 he might have some other employment. It is in the very case

where the children need the business that it cannot be left for their benefit. You are taking it from them, though you appear to give it to them. I think it is worth consideration. Then, in the earlier part of the sub-section, you give a temporary license for a month only. Suppose it is a retail license, which cannot sell more than two gallons at a time, and the stock is large. How can the trustee dispose of the stock in that time.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—The Board will give him a license long enough to realize.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—But it must be done within the month.

HON. MINISTER JUSTICE—They will give him a license to sell in any way. In order to meet the other case suggested by the hon. member, I beg to move the addition at the end of that section 2, (a) of the words, "should the deceased leave a child or children under 21 years of age, the Board may grant a license to their guardian or trustee."

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, regarding sub-section (a) which provides that in the case of a holder of a license leaving a widow or children the license may be continued in favor of the widow or children as the case may be. I think there are many cases that should come within that clause. For instance, a person holds a license in St. John's to carry on the ordinary liquor business, and has sisters or a mother or others dependent upon him, I think the protection should be extended to these who are dependent upon the holder of the license at his death, and not be restricted to the widow and children. I think that sisters and mothers and other relatives living with and dependent upon the holders are entitled to the protection afforded by that section. I would suggest that after the word "child" the words "or other relative" be inserted.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and passed the Bill with some amendment.

Ordered, that this report be received and that the Bill be read a third time presently.

The said Bill was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bills entitled "An Act further to amend the Revenue Act, 1903," and "An Act to amend the Law respecting the Storage of Inflammable Oils," and adopted the same without amendment, and they were then read a third time and passed, and were ordered to be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurence of that body in their provisions.

The Bill entitled "An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money towards defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively the thirtieth day of June, One thousand nine hundred and eleven, and the thirtieth day of June, One thousand nine hundred and twelve, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service," was read a second time, referred to Committee of the Whole, and adopted without amendment, read a third

time and passed ; and it was ordered that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in relation to the construction and operation of a Marine Railway Dock at Harbor Grace.

HON. PREMIER—The object of these resolutions, as the outline title shows, is to guarantee 5 p.c. on certain capital stock of the Marine Railway Docks Co., Ltd., amounting to $50,000. I am instructed that the amount is likely to be met with about $30,000, which will limit our liability to $1,500. I may say that this guarantee was given by the Government in April, 1910. We guaranteed 5 p.c. for ten years on the capital. By these resolutions it is now proposed to extend that term to fifteen years, as the people interested found that they were unable to get people to subscribe money on so short a term. The object of the resolution is to enable a dock of modern type to be built for Labrador schooners and that class that are too small to go into the large dock at St. John's and which are unable to get docking facilities. I have figures here that may be of interest to the Committee, and which to my mind makes it practically impossible for the Government to be called upon to give anything. These figures deal with schooners up to 200 tons. There are 1,220 craft to avail of this dock to the north, all passing the dock going to or from St. John's, aggregating about 55,000 tons, and insured to the value of about 1¼ million. Local insurance companies compel schooners to go on dock every year, and it is very difficult to get in the larger dock, as they are workng overtime to enable them to get thro the work. A conservative estimate for Conception Bay alone is 220 vessels, 75 p.c. of which will go on that dock. The charge of $20 for the first day alone gives the substantial earning of $3,500 a year or ten per cent. of the invested capital. There is already a dock in Harbor Grace, built on the antiquated system, and drawn by a horse, which has docked 90 vessels in the last six years, and whose earning has been over $2,500, and they cannot handle 50 per cent of the work in the spring season, and it is nearly worn out. What is also very much in favor of the undertaking, and likely to turn to its success, are the people who are connected with it. They are Mr. Tapp, of Harbor Grace ; Mr. McRae, of Harbor Grace ; Mr. Travers, of Harbor Grace ; Mr. Goodison, of Carbonear ; Mr. Hiscock, of Brigus ; Mr. Munn, of Harbor Grace ; Mr. Thompson and Mr. Guilfoyle, of Harbor Grace, and others. All practical men. The intention of these people is to get the people in the outharbors not only to bring their docking there, but also to take small shares in this company, and take an interest in the dock. Up to the present time some $20,000 has been subscribed, and I am informed that it will not take more than a couple of months to get the rest. You will remember that there are many precedents for this kind of thing. In 1884 we built a dock that cost $650,000, and something like $20,000 interest was paid on that. Afterwards we sold that

for less than half what it cost, namely $300,000, and it is now about $12,000 for interest, a perpetual charge on the Colony for which there is no return. Now here, if we are ever called upon to pay the total liability of 5 p. c. on $50,000, the total amount will only be $2,500. In other words, we are going to subsidize a local industry. It is a good industry in itself, and the work and labor that it will give would in itself more than repay the total amount of the liability. But, as I say, I do not see how we can be called upon to pay a cent. With these few words of explanaton I beg to move the resolutions.

The said resolutions were adopted with some amendment, and the Bill to give effect thereto was then introduced, read a first and second time, referred to Committee of the Whole, and adopted without amendment, read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

The Bills entitled respectively "An Act to amend 62 and 63 Vic. Cap. 14, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Inspection of Boilers,'" and "An Act to amend 10 Ed. VII.,Cap. 30, entitled 'An Act respecting the Preservation of Beavers,'" were referred to Committee of the Whole and adopted without amendment, read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that they be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in their provisions.

The amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act further to amend 'The St. John's Municipal Act, 1903,'" were read a second time and concurred in.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act respecting Pilots and Pilotage for the Port of St. John's," with an amendment in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly. The said amendment was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the other Bills sent up.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 28th, at 5 of the clock in the afternoon.

TUESDAY, March 28th.

House met at 5 p. m., pursuant to adjournment.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Rev. J. J. Coady, A. H. Chisholm, M.D., Robert Fowlow, and other inhabitants of Harbor Main, praying that they be allowèd to keep sporting dogs in the sporting season. It is a great hardship to them to be hindered in that way, while people from St. John's and other parts of the country are allowed to bring their dogs into the district to shoot. This is owing to the operation of the Sheep Act. It is suggested that keeping these dogs might be permitted on condition of the owners being responsible

for any damage they might do. I beg that this petition be referred to the Department to which it belongs.

MR. SQUIRES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from New Harbor and Dildo on certain magisterial matters. I ask that it be referred to the Department of Justice.

MR. EARLE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Little Cove, in my district, asking for a telephone service ; also a petition from Tilting asking for a sum of $100 to make a road ; also a petition from the Chairman of the Road Board and others of Carmanville, asking for money to purchase timber and material for a landing place at that town ; also two similar petitions from Musgrave Harbor, Doting Cove, and Joe Batt's Arm, asking for the Government to erect public wharves at Joe Batt's Arm, Fogo and Seldom-Come-By. They also ask for some arrangement whereby the Fogota and Clyde could connect at Fogo and Change Islands. I have also a petition from the Fishermen's Protective Union at Fogo. They wish to call the attention of the Government to the inconvenience of having the post office away from the central part of the harbor. At present it is a long ways away from where the steamer lands the mails. I do not understand why when the new Court House was erected, the post office and telegraph office were not placed there, but the offices were taken up by the Customs. The intention was well understood to place them there. I hope the Government will put this right, and put the post office where it was intended to be.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from W. B. Jennings, and others, of Moreton's Harbor, on the subject of regulations for the conduct of the herring fishery at that place ; also a petition from J. E. Simmons, and others, of Harry's Harbor, on the subject of Sunday observance; also several other petitions. One from Boyd's Cove, for telephone connection and steam service ; from Herring Neck, for $100 for a wharf ; $800 to complete a wharf at Moreton's Harbor ; from Farmer's Arm for $200 for a bridge. They also ask for a bi-weekly steam service next winter. I may say that these petitions were sent to me by the President of the Fishermen's Union, and he asked me to present them, which I now do. I ask that they be referred to the Departments to which they relate.

HON. MR. CROSBIE — Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Lower Island Cove in connection with the setting of bultows. I beg that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries ; also a petition from Azariah King and others of Grates Cove, asking for a sum of $100 to build a road to the main line ; also from Peter Royle and others of Job's Cove, asking for money to build a road. I beg that these petitions be referred to the Departments to which they relate.

MR. WHITEWAY—Mr Speaker, I beg to support the petitions presented by my hon. colleague for Bay de Verde.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES — Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Jamestown, asking for a sum of $100 to complete repairs

to a road. I ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Lark Harbor, Battle Harbor and Little Harbor, asking for a small sum of money to construct a road from that settlement. I beg that this be referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. DEVEREUX — Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Gasquets, asking for a sum of money to build a wharf and breakwater at that place, which is very necessary. Also a petition from Long Island, Placentia, asking for a telegraph connection between Harbor Buffett and Haystack. There are 1,000 people on this island, and a telegraph connection at this point would be beneficial to more than 2,000. I beg that this be referred to the Department to which they relate.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE —I beg to present a petition from 70 fishermen of Caplin Bay, asking for the right to use trawls on the fishing grounds between Hangman's Bight and Stone Island, from June 15th to the end of the fish season ; also from 100 people of Bay Bulls, asking for money for a public wharf. I ask that these petitions be referred to the Departments to which they relate.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petitons presented by my hon. colleague, the Minister of Finance.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from 45 people of Caplin Bay, asking for $500 to build a public wharf there In October last in a storm they came near losing all the boats in the harbor ; and some protection is badly needed. I ask that this be referred to the Department to which it belongs.

MR. WHITEWAY — Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from a number of inhabitants of Blow-Me-Down and Flat Rock and vicinity, asking for the sum of $150 to complete a road, which is unfinished. It is begun at both ends, and it would be a great advantage to those people in their trade with Carbonear.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from James Seymour and others of Round Harbor, Bryant's Harbor, and West Country Cove, asking that it be made a port of call for the steamer Prospero. The nearest port of ca'l at present is Paquet, and it is seven miles from Round Harbor. I have presented a number of petitions on the subject of ports of call to this House. I do not blame the Captain of the Prospero, for he has so many ports of call that he has to hurry. Unless the Government intend to issue tenders for a small steamer to run on White Bay, I do not see what is to be done. The people have often petitioned the Government, but nothing has been done. Last session two steamers were asked for and given the people of Fogo and Fortune Bay. If a small steamer were put on White Bay it would relieve the Prospero a good deal. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

Ordered : that these petitions be received and referred to the departments to which they relate.

Hon. Colonial Secretary laid upon the table of the House the

Report of the Commission of Public Health for 1910.

The amendment made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up, entitled, "An Act respecting Pilots and Pilotage for the Port of St. John's," was read a second time and concurred in.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 'The Newfoundland Medical Act, 1896'" was read a second time, referred to Committee of the Whole House, and adopted without amendment, read a third time and passed; and it was ordered that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up, entitled, "An Act further to amend 'The Crown Lands Act, 1903,'" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

The said amendments were read a first and second time and concurred in without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up, entitled, "An Act in relation to the construction and operation of a Marine Railway Dock at Harbor Grace," with an amendment in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

The said amendment was read a first and second time and concurred in.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received messages from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the several remaining Bills sent up without amendment.

The Hon. Prime Minister informed the House that His Excellency would prorogue the present Session of the Legislature on to-morrow at three of the clock in the afternoon.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 29th, at half past two of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 29th.

The House met at half past two of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

At three of the clock the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar of the House with a message from His Excellency the Governor, commanding the attendance of the House in the Council Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker and the House attended upon His Excellency in the Council Chamber.

His Excellency was then pleased to make the following speech to both branches of the Legislature:

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly:

I am gratified to be able to relieve you from your sessional duties so speedily, and congratu-

late you on the business-like promptitude with which you have disposed of the measures for your consideration.

I trust that the expectations with regard to the several important measures relating to the establishment of new industries in the Colony will be more than realized, and that they may prove but the forerunners of others with a similar purpose.

The enactment confirming the contract for a cold storage enterprise is one fraught with great possibilities in the way of ensuring a better return to the fishermen of this Colony for the fruits of their labor ; while the other measures which deal with industrial undertakings should stimulate the diversifying of such enterprises amongst us.

The appropriation which you have made for the payment of Old Age Pensions should prove a welcome boon to a very deserving class in this Colony, and I sincerely trust that the financial circumstances of the Colony may long continue to be such as will admit of the augmentation of this amount from year to year, until every meritorious case shall have been dealt with, a hope which I feel sure you and the country in general will very heartily re-echo.

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly :

I thank you for the supplies voted for the public service, and note with satisfaction that it has been found possible to substantially augument the appropriations for the various services without any increase in taxation.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council :

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly :

It is pleasing to observe, as an evidence of the growing fraternal spirit between the Motherland and the Overseas Possessions, that representatives of the Colonial Legislature have been invited by members of the British Parliament to visit England as their guests during the Coronation period. It is equally pleasant, and should be a matter of no small pride as well, to Newfoundland, that His Majesty's Government has requested that a contingent of the Newfoundland Naval Reserve should also be represented by a detachment, who will be guests of His Majesty's Government during their stay in England.

In relieving you from your legislative duties, I would extend to you my sincere wishes for the prosperity of the Colony and your personal well-being.

After which the Honourable the President of the Legislative Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor, said :

" Gentlemen :

" It is the pleasure of His Ex-
" cellency the Governor that this
" General Assembly be prorogued
" until Thursday, the 29th day of
" June next, to be then and here
" holden. And this General As-
" sembly stands prorogued ac-
" cordingly."

INDEX

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY—

Motion for, 18.
Committee on, 42.
Draft, 50.
Presentation of, 70.
Governor's Reply, 70.

ADDRESS—

To His Majesty King George, 9, 16.
To His Excellency the Governor, 17.

AGRICULTURE, ENCOURAGEMENT OF, RESOLUTIONS, 312, 329, 339, 348.

AGRICULTURE, ENCOURAGEMENT OF, BILL, 397, 431, 446, 487.

AGRICULTURE AND MINES, MINISTER OF—

On Potato Canker Bill, 105, 123, 129.
On Crown Lands Act, 105, 328, 407.
On Sale of Seeds Bill, 215, 293.
On Manufacture of Peat, Resolutions, 216.
On Supply, 271.
On Agriculture, Encouragement of, Resolutions, 312, 359, 368, 370.
On Fire Patrol, Resolutions, 489.
On Temperance Bill, 602.

BENNETT, MR.—

On Cold Storage Resolutions, 144.
On Dunfield, Rev. Canon, Resolutions, 337.
On Motor Car Bill, 341, 342, 343.
On Municipal Bill, 437.
On Western Union Telegraph Resolutions, 501.
On Pilots and Pilotage Bill, 505.
On Temperance Bill, 601.

BOILERS, INSPECTION OF, BILL, 584, 606.

BOND, RT. HON. SIR ROBERT—

On Address to King George, 16.
On Address to Governor, 17.
On Motion for Address in Reply, 29.
On Cold Storage Resolutions, 71, 78, 79, 80, 112, 114, 137, 149, 156, 183, 187.
On Peat and Fuel Resolutions, 83, 84, 85, 86 , 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96.
On Explosives Bill, 97, 98, 99, 100.
On Smelting of Copper Resolutions, 105, 128.
On Supply, 200, 220, 230, 233, 254, 260, 271, 281, 282, 284.
On Deportation of Esquimaux Bill, 206.
On Coronation Celebration, 243.
On Crown Lands Bill, 295, 398.
On Education Resolutions, 306, 310.
On Education Bill, 311.
On Agriculture, Encouragement of, 349, 383.
On Davey Resolutions, 433.
On Old Age Pension Resolutions, 467.
On Fire Patrol Resolutions, 490, 492.
On Ways and Means, 555.

COLD STORAGE RESOLUTIONS, 42, 70, 106, 133.

COLD STORAGE BILL, 48, 190, 200, 204, 210, 348.

CROWN LANDS BILL, 105, 293, 324, 339, 398, 442, 487.

CLIFT, MR.—

On Cold Storage Resolutions, 53, 112, 143.
On Peat and Fuel Resolutions, 57.
On Explosives Resolutions, 59.
On Potato Canker Bill, 128.
On Supply, 271, 274, 281, 282, 287, 291.
On Crown Lands Bill, 328, 426.

CROSBIE, HON. J. C.—

On Cold Storage Resolutions, 138, 156, 157.

CLAPP, MR.—

On Supply, 275, 276, 286.

COLONIAL SECRETARY, HON.—

On Supply, 282, 284, 285, 288.

DIRECT U. S. CABLE CO. RESOLUTIONS, 503.

DIRECT U. S. CABLE CO. BILL, 503, 510, 542, 552.

DUNFIELD, REV. CANON, RESOLUTIONS, 336.

DAVEY RESOLUTIONS, 433.

DOCK, MARINE, HARBOR GRACE, RESOLUTIONS, 605.

DOCK, MARINE, HARBOR GRACE, BILL, 606.

DOWNEY, MR.—

On Cold Storage Resolutions, 108.
On Temperance Bill, 398.

DEVEREUX, MR.—

On Cold Storage Resolutions, 159.
On Agriculture, Encouragement of, 388.
On Old Age Pensions Resolutions, 478.

DWYER, MR.—

On Potato Canker Bill, 129.
On Cold Storage Resolutions, 168.
On Agriculture, Encouragement of, 355, 372, 392.

EXPLOSIVES RESOLUTIONS, 43, 58.

EXPLOSIVES BILL, 48, 60, 70, 81, 97, 106, 329, 339.

ESQUIMAUX, DEPORTATION OF, BILL, 105, 204, 215, 220, 487.

EDUCATION RESOLUTIONS, 304.

EDUCATION BILL, 336, 345, 348.

EARLE, MR.—

On Cold Storage Bill, 118, 163.
On Supply, 271, 285.
On Temperance Bill, 600.

EMERSON, HON. C. H.—

On Motor Vehicles Bill, 444.
On Temperance Bill, 591.
On Forest Fires Bill, 200, 487, 495, 499.
On Fire Patrol Resolutions, 489.
On Fire Patrol Bill, 495, 500, 509, 542.

FINANCE, MINISTER OF—

On Explosives Bill, 97.
On Cold Storage Resolutions, 115, 163.
On Cold Storage Bill, 210.
On Supply, 194, 213, 226, 253, 271, 272, 291.
On Agriculture, Encouragement of, 392.
On Ways and Means, 512, 564.
On Loan, Public, Resolutions, 552.
On Loan, Public, Bill, 553.

GAME AND INLAND FISHERIES BILL, 509, 542, 552, 555.

GEAR, MR.—

On Supply, 270.
On Temperance Bill, 600.

GOODISON, MR.—

Moves Address in Reply, 18.
On Temperance Bill, 599.

GRANT, MR.—

On Supply, 291.

HOWLEY, MR.—

Seconds Motion for Address in Reply, 27.
On Temperance Bill, 600

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, 49.

INFLAMMABLE OILS BILL, 55, 579, 604.

JUSTICE, MINISTER OF—

On Deportation of Esquimaux Bill, 105, 204, 215.
On Cold Storage Resolutions, 169, 177.
On Supply, 259, 260.
On Crown Lands Bill, 325, 327, 409, 420, 423, 429.
On Western Union Telegraph Resolutions, 500.
On Pilots and Pilotage Bill, 503.
On Temperance Bill, 585.

KENT, MR.—

On Peat and Fuel Resolutions, 90, 91.
On Explosives Bill, 100, 332, 339, 340.
On Cold Storage Resolutions, 175, 177.
On Cold Storage Bill, 212, 213.
On Supply, 213, 250, 272, 276, 277, 279, 283.
On Peat, Manufacture of, Resolutions, 217.

On Agriculture, Encouragement of, Resolutions, 319, 329, 360.
On Crown Lands Bill, 324, 327, 339, 415, 422, 425.
On Dunfield, Rev. Canon, Resolutions, 337.
On Motor Car Bill, 342, 344, 444.
On Temperance Bill, 595.

KENNEDY, MR.—
On Temperance Bill, 596.

LOAN, PUBLIC, RESOLUTIONS, 552.

LOAN, PUBLIC, BILL, 552, 577, 579, 585.

MARINE INSURANCE BILL, 489, 509, 542, 553.

MOTOR VEHICLES BILL, 220, 442, 487.

MUNICIPAL BILL, 220, 332, 431, 437.

MEDICAL BILL, 555, 609.

MARINE AND FISHERIES, MINISTER OF—
On Cold Storage Resolutions, 139.
On Pilots and Pilotage Bill, 504.

MORRIS, MR. F. J.—
On Marine Insurance Bill, 509.

MOULTON, MR.—
On Supply, 284.
On Temperance Bill, 598.

NEWFOUNDLAND PRODUCE COMPANY RESOLUTIONS, 540.

NEWFOUNDLAND PRODUCE COMPANY BILL, 542, 553, 577.

OLD AGE PENSIONS RESOLUTIONS, 447.

OLD AGE PENSIONS BILL, 486, 495, 499, 509.

PRIME MINISTER, THE—
On Address to King George, 9.
On Address to Governor, 17.
On Peat and Fuel Resolutions, 43, 53, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96.
On Peat and Fuel Bill, 48, 106.
On Cold Storage Resolutions, 53, 61, 75, 79, 80, 112, 133, 168, 187.
On Explosives Resolutions, 58.
On Explosives Bill, 98, 99, 100, 106, 329, 340.
On Smelting of Copper Resolutions, 103.
On Smelting of Copper Bill, 105, 128.

On Supply, 214, 233, 271, 273, 275, 277, 282, 285, 286, 288, 292.
On Coronation Celebration, 241.
On Education Resolutions, 304, 308, 311.
On Agriculture, Encouragement of, Resolutions, 357, 374, 386.
On Municipal Bill, 334, 437.
On Dunfield, Rev. Canon, Resolutions, 336.
On Motor Car Bill, 341, 342, 343, 344, 442.
On Davey Resolutions, 432.
On Old Age Pensions Resolutions, 447, 480.
On Fire Patrol Resolutions, 490, 493.
On Pilots and Pilotage Bill, 505.
On Newfoundland Produce Company Resolutions, 540.
On Harbor Grace Dock, 605.

PETITIONS—

Colonial Secretary, Hon., 44, 126, 244, 264, 345, 488, 495, 554, 580.
Emerson, Hon. C. H., 44, 48, 102, 126, 202, 207, 247, 436, 508.
Clift, Mr., 44, 52, 81, 122, 125, 126, 191, 202, 207, 266, 298, 346, 397, 511, 554, 577, 607.
Earle, Mr., 48, 81, 201, 247, 322, 398, 434, 499, 507, 553, 607.
Winsor, Mr., 49, 81, 122, 322.
Agriculture and Mines, Minister of, 50, 207, 248, 296, 321, 345, 346, 397, 436, 446, 508, 553, 607.
Parsons, Mr., 50, 202, 244, 264, 296, 322.
Downey, Mr., 321, 446, 508, 553, 608.
Howley, Mr., 51, 121, 543.
Goodison, Mr., 101, 190, 207, 397, 446.
Public Works, Minister of, 101, 296, 436, 511, 607.
Morris, Mr. F. J., 125, 434, 435.
Bond, Rt. Hon. Sir R., 130, 248, 346.
Justice, Minister of, 131, 201, 248, 263, 264.
Dwyer Mr., 132.
Marine and Fisheries, Minister of, 191, 296, 434.
Grant, Mr., 218, 265.
Seymour, Mr., 244, 321, 434.
Kent, Mr., 245, 506, 508, 511, 554.
Clapp, Mr., 245, 507, 554, 608.
Moulton, Mr., 298, 397, 496.
Squires, Mr., 299, 543, 607.
Murphy, Mr., 397.
Prime Minister, The, 431, 543, 580.
Moore, Mr., 508, 607.
Devereux, Mr., 508, 553, 577, 608.
Finance, Minister of, 607.
Crosbie, Hon. J. C., 607.
Whiteway, Mr., 608.

PEAT AND FUEL RESOLUTIONS, 43, 82.

PEAT AND FUEL BILL, 49, 97, 106, 123, 127.

POTATO CANKER BILL, 105, 123, 128, 133.

PEAT, MANUFACTURE OF, RESOLUTIONS, 215.

PEAT, MANUFACTURE OF, BILL, 218, 295, 320, 324, 553.

PILOTS AND PILOTAGE BILL, 436, 495, 503, 509.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL, 604.

PRESERVATION OF BEAVERS BILL, 606.

PUBLIC WORKS, MINISTER OF—

On Supply, 232.
On Motor Vehicles Bill, 443.

QUESTIONS—

Bond, Rt. Hon. Sir R., 43, 46, 49, 102, 132, 191, 192, 193, 219, 267, 268, 301.
Kent, Mr., 47, 48, 49, 82, 102, 123, 193, 208, 209, 249, 302, 347, 348.
Clift Mr., 70, 82, 103, 127, 133, 193, 208, 209, 219, 249, 338, 436.
Clapp, Mr., 127, 203, 220, 268, 348.
Gear, Mr., 203, 209.
Earle, Mr., 269, 302.
Roberts, Mr., 269, 270, 302, 323, 436.

QUORUM, ADJOURNMENT FOR WANT OF, 129.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL, 431, 446, 487.

REVENUE BILL, 568, 579, 604.

ROBERTS, MR.—

On Supply, 286, 287, 289, 290.
On Municipal Bill, 334.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE—

Opening, 3.
Closing, 609.

SELECT COMMITTEES—

On Address in Reply, 42.
On Marine Insurance Bill, 510.

SUPPLY, 60, 133, 194, 213, 219, 220, 249, 267, 270, 303, 568, 578.

SMELTING OF COPPER RESOLUTIONS, 103.

SMELTING OF COPPER BILL 123, 128, 133.

SEEDS, SALE OF, BILL, 215, 292, 320.

SUSPENSION OF RULES, 584.

SPEAKER, HIS HONOR THE—

On Explosives Bill, 343.
On Temperance Bill, 592.

SHEA, MR.—

On Pilots and Pilotage Bill, 504.
On Temperance Bill, 595.

SQUIRES, MR.—

On Motor Vehicles Bill, 342.

TEMPERANCE BILL, 585, 604.

WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH RESOLUTIONS, 500.

WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH BILL, 502, 510, 542. 553.

WAYS AND MEANS, 512, 578.

WINSOR, MR.—

On Cold Storage, Resolutions, 106.
On Supply, 288, 291.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

DURING THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

1911.

"PLAINDEALER" PRINT
ST. JOHN'S. NEWFOUNDLAND.
1912.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

DURING THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

IN THE YEAR

1911.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

SESSION 1911.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 8th.

According to Proclamation the Legislative Council met to-day at three o'clock.

His Excellency the Governor having taken his position on the Throne ordered the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, through the President of the Council, to inform the members of the House of Assembly, that it was His Excellency's pleasure that they attend him immediately in this House. After they had entered His Excellency gave the Address which is printed in first part of this volume.

The members of the House of Assembly then withdrew and His Excellency was pleased to retire.

Hon. the President reported the Speech from the Throne and it was read by the Clerk.

Hon. the President read a message from the House of Assembly informing them that that House had passed the accompanying Resolutions of sympathy to the Royal Family, (see first part of this volume), and reqesting the concurrence of the Council therein.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—It is fitting that our first official act upon the opening of this Legislature should mark our sense of duty in respect of the sad event which occurred on the 6th day of May last, and which stirred, not only the Empire to which we are proud to belong, but the whole world. The death of King Edward VII. was made doubly sad by its suddenness and was felt by millions who had never even seen the King —as a personal loss. It was my privilege to be in London at the time of the death of our late Sovereign, and I can never forget the intense feeling manifested, and yet how difficult it was for any of us to believe that it was reality and not a disturbing dream. How quickly was there wide-spread and thrilling evidence that an event quite beyond the ordinary had happened, for the great city of London, from centre to circumference, in even a few hours was draped in the symbols of grief. As one passed along the great thoroughfares on that bright May morning, following the death of King Edward, the conspicuous buildings were attractive, not by their magnificent architecture, but by the drapings of purple and black

cloth, while the display in windows of shops showed nothing but mourning goods ; and on the following day among the vast multitudes of people met, on the streets, in public halls, and in churches, though thousands of them did not own allegiance to Britain's King, difficult, indeed, was it to find one person—male or female—who did not display the recognized emblem of mourning, and among the very poorest no matter how great the sacrifice, they strove to procure their "bit of black." It was generally acknowledged that King Edward VII. was beloved by his subjects, but how deep was their affection, his people did not themselves know until they found the teardrops falling and felt that someone had passed away from their own lives. When the body was removed from Buckingham Palace to Westminster Hall and the public were offered an opportunity of passing around the bier many quite elderly people even spent the night standing unprotected from rain showers in the streets so that they might hold their place and get into the hall during the following forenoon. The column, four deep, was at times during the three days of the lying in state, several miles long, and those taking their place at the end, as they were compelled by the police regulations to do, could not reach the hall for many hours. Not even the casket was visible, but the privilege of passing around it was sought by thousands every hour. And what a termination to all this mourning was that evidenced on that memorable Friday, May 20th, when all that was mortal of Britain's departed King was conveyed through London and on to its final resting place in Saint George's Chapel, Windsor. The countless multitudes of people that thronged the route and occupied every point of vantage, waiting for hours, patient and subdued, the assembling of nine reigning monarchs, thirty princes and dukes of blood royal, and scores of the highest officials of various nations, as well as the noblest of our own Empire, forming altogether a procession such as was perhaps never before witnessed and will live in the memory of all who witnessed it. These unequalled marks of respect and loyalty must have comforted in no small degree the members of the Royal Household. King Edward VII., the most conspicuous and the most beloved personality in the world during his all too short reign, will be held in affectionate and grateful memory for all time. The fealty of the Empire in which we claim our full share was spontaneously accorded to King Edward's son and successor upon his accession to the Throne and it affords his loyal subjects throughout his wide dominions unqualified satisfaction that the new reign is being marked by the evident desire and intention of our present Sovereign, King George V. to follow the constitutional preceedings manifested by his revered father. May he enjoy a long and peaceful reign over a loyal and united empire. I beg to move the adoption of the address.

Hon. John Harvey—In rising to second the address of condolence which has been moved by Hon. Mr. Bishop my words shall be brief. Though the demise of

our late Sovereign occurred more than eight months ago, and though the anxieties that were then felt by all men, anxieties as to how the ship of state was to be guided through the time of coming stress, lacking the master hand, though that anxiety had been allayed by the absolute confidence in which his successor has already inspired, yet the sense of personal loss is with the nation still. Our Sovereign whose death and whose career so stirred the mighty heart of this wonderful modern world, was one of the greatest figures of all time. It is impossible for us to-day in the near glamour of his personality to measure the limits of his influence or to know the confines of his work. But there is one thing that we of the Colonies do know, we know how much we owe to him of our hope and of our confidence in the future destiny of this proud Empire. Let us be thankful for the hereditary principle which with all its abuses has at any rate given us the sense of that thing we call sentiment, the strength of which is so often questioned, but which, nevertheless, holds the force that alone can mould our race to the vision of our hopes. For, of this principal is born and is maintained that personal sentiment, that individual yet universal loyalty, to which no republic, however prosperous and mighty, can ever generate in its people, and without which the ultimate dream of Empire, so far as it concerns the English race, must wake only to ashes. Let us then without more speech pass this address, knowing well the inspiration of the past, full of confidence in the present, and with a vision of great destiny for the future.

The resolutions were then put and carried unanimously.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop it was ordered that the resolutions be sent to His Excellency the Governor and that he be requested to forward same to His Majesty the King.

Hon. John Harris—In moving for the appointment of a select committee to draft a reply to the gracious speech with which His Excellency the Governor opened the present session of the Legislature, I would say that the speech is a lengthy one, and touches on a greater variety of subjects than is usual in such state documents. As I have only a brief opportunity of making myself conversant with the subjects referred to in His Excellency's utterance, I hope the House will in its usual generosity overlook my shortcomings in dealing with it. A first place in the speech is naturally given to the loss sustained by the Empire of which we form a part, by the death of our well-beloved sovereign, King Edward the Seventh. During his brief reign His late Majesty, as His Excellency points out, bore the unstinted admiration of the whole civilized world, especially through his successful efforts to promote international peace. This Colony, I think, has much to be grateful for to His late Majesty. Altho the Colony is a small and unimportant one, I believe from certain facts that have been related to me that His Majesty took a personal interest in it, and the settlement of the French Treaties Coast question was to a great extent the result of his efforts.

It is only proper that this Legislature should have passed the address that has just been before this House. It indicates the sentiment of this House and of the people of Newfoundland, both with regard to the memory of the illustrious dead and our loyalty to the present Sovereign, His Majesty King George V. The next paragraph in the speech gives the House the pleasing information that it is the intention of the Government to erect in connection with the General Hospital in this city a Home for Nurses, to bear the name of His late Majesty. This will be a lasting monument to one, as the Speech points out, who was as distinguished in the realms of humanitarism as those of statesmanship. The necessity of this proposed home is very urgent. At present, I understand, there is no home for the nurses employed at the General Hospital. They number 30, and are sometimes huddled four and five in a room. They have no proper dining or lecture room, and in fact may be said to have no accommodation at all. The room they are now taking up in the hospital can be utilized for wards for about 25 children. The proposed building is intended to be large enough to accommodate 40 nurses. Every one in the Colony who reads is, no doubt, famliar with the fact that the dispute so long existing between this Colony and the neighboring republic was submitted to the Hague Tribunal for settlement some time ago. The Colonial Government is to be congratulated on the satisfactory finding of the court of arbitration. To the surprise of everyone the decision appears to have given satisfaction all round. Applying the reason of a layman to the question, I think that, notwithstanding the fact that this small Colony was competing against the influential and wealthy republic, the arbitrators' decision was an absolutely impartial one. It is unfortunate that the award did not ensure finality as to one or two of the issues involved. It is satisfactory to find however that instead of resorting to the expensive and tedious method suggested by the arbitrators for the settlement of these questions, a conference of the interested countries was called, and held in Washington, to simplify the means of deciding those unsettled questions. The Prime Minister of this Colony represented us at the conference, and reached an agreement by which these questions can be settled without delay and expense to us. It will be interesting to read this agreement when presented to us. The opening paragraph in His Excellency's speech, as well as the one that I shall now refer to, emphasizes the fact that the well-being of the Colony has been more than maintained the past year, this, too, notwithstanding a shortage in the catch of codfish along the Labrador, a shortage that perhaps has never been equalled in the history of this fishery. The buoyancy in the financial and commercial affairs of the Colony is a subject for congratulation, and points with certainty to a change from the old state of affairs to the new conditions of activity to be observed all around us. That these conditions may continue, and the prosperity of the Colony advance each year, is, I am sure, the wish

of us all. Again, touching on the Labrador fishery. What the future of this fishery is to be it is difficult at present to give an opinion. It is quite certain it has not paid the cost of the outfit for many years. This certainly cannot continue. The removal of the French bounties would, of course, place the venture on a sound commercial basis again, but it is very doubtful if any person living to-day will see this much wished for event come to pass. It is pleasing to be told that the seal, herring and lobster fisheries have been prosecuted the past year with encouraging results. The whale fishery, now being prosecuted by seven or eight steam whalers, has shown in some instances favorable results the past year. Taking into account the present high price of the products of this fishery, we are justified, I think, in looking forward to a successful issue of operations for the present year.

The Speech deals at length both with the loan for construction of the branch railways and the satisfactory progress of the work itself. The Government are to be specially congratulated on the outcome of these operations. Certain prophecies were made in this chamber last year with regard to the said loan, which have not been borne out by the facts. General criticism of the Government's railway policy was also heard from several hon memebers who are not present in the House. I hope and believe as the years pass by that the wisdom of the Government in respect particularly to this railway policy will be fully justified. In passing, I would refer to the legislation about to be enacted with regard to our loan on the London market. I am not possessed of sufficient financial knowledge to say much on the subject. I understand, however, that inscribed stock is very often quoted on the London market at four or five points above the ordinary debenture bonds, whereas, if we conform to the London requirements, all our loans may be placed on one basis, and a large market found for our bonds.

I now come to the paragraph in His Excellency's speech which perhaps will call for some difference of opinion amongst hon. members of this House. This is to the Old Age Pension Scheme. If perhaps the exact words of the Speech are quoted, viz.: "pensions for the aged poor," the scheme will lose some of its possible objectionable features. We ought to suspend our criticism of the steps to be taken to provide assistance for the aged poor until the measure decided on by the Government comes before us. I have hardly any doubt but it will be one that shall commend itself to every hon. member of this House.

The paragraph with reference to the educational advantages which the Government hopes to extend to every child in the Colony, I shall leave to the hon. gentleman who has undertaken the duty of seconding the motion for a select committee. He will deal with it, as well as with the other paragraphs in the speech, in a much more able manner than I could hope to. This much I will, however, say, that if the Government can even approximately carry out in this respect what they aim for, they will re-

ceive the endorsement of every one in the community.

The extension of telegraphs to remote portions of the island, as well as making provisions for steamers to ply between St. John's and Fogo district, on Fortune Bay and along Northern Labrador, are works that must be of great advantage to the country at large, and particularly to the districts mentioned. The wireless stations to be established at points north for the benefit of the sealing fleet and along the Labrador coast will, I feel sure, be of great advantage to both the sealers and Labrador fishermen.

The paragraphs in His Excellency's speech touching the estab lishment of a Cold Storage enterprise on an extensive scale, the manufacture of peat and explosives, the possibility of inducing capitalists to add to the number of paper and pulp mills to operate in Newfoundland, certainly gives promise of a great industrial boom in the Colony in the near future. The active interest taken by the Government in an endeavor to increase our agricultural resources is highly commendable. In connection with this subject, it would be impossible to omit a reference to the splendid display of the products of the land shown at the exhibition held last fall in St. John's, at which, I think, every district competed for the prizes offered by the Government. The Manufacturers' Association co-operated with the Government by holding at the same time an exhibition of local manufactures. This was also a great success and demonstrated conclusively the rapid strides made in manufactures within the Colony within the past 15 or 20 years.

The fact that the Colony's foreign trade for the last fiscal year was the largest in its history, and that there is reason to believe that a still better showing will be made for the period ending 30th June next, would seem to justify the Government in assuming the optimistic spirit pervading the Speech. Another important change referred to in His Excellency's Speech is that of a daily instead of a tri-weekly service between Port aux Basques and St. John's. It is to be hoped that the negotiations in progress with this end in view may have a successful termination.

His Excellency informs the House of Assembly that the revenue for the past fiscal year was the largest in the history of the Colony. This is distinctly good, but what is better is that it was not all spent. As a matter of fact the excess over expenditure was larger than any surplus previously realized. The gratifying intelligence is also conveyed to us that the revenue for the first half of the current year was larger than for any corresponding period in any fiscal year heretofore, and also that it was in excess of expenditure for same period.

The coronation of their Majesties King George and Queen Mary takes place at London on the 27th June. I am quite certain it will be satisfactory to this House to know that due preparations will be made for adequate local observance of this auspicious event.

In conclusion, I think it would be unfair to myself and unfair to the Government if I did not con-

gratulate them on the satisfactory condition of the Colony's affairs, brought about to a large extent by the policy of the Government, as outlined in their pre-election manifesto. A special word of appreciation is due, I think, to the Prime Minister for the amount of energy and ability whch he has displayed since presiding over the destinies of the Colony.

Hon. Mr. Robinson—It seems to be eminently fitting that the first work undertaken by this honourable House at the first session held under the reign of the new Sovereign, George V, should be to do what has just been done, namely, to pass an Address expressive of our sympathy and condolence in the great loss which the nation, and I might say all nations, have sustained in the death of Edward VII. In the passing of King Edward the whole world lost a great man. His death is therefore an international as well as a national loss. It is also fitting that we should express confidence and hope in the prosperity and success of the reign of his son, who now adds lustre to the Throne. His has been a goodly heritage received from his immediate ancestors. The world has not forgotten Queen Victoria the Good, the well-beloved. Her illustrious son, father of our King George V, will go down in the annals of fame as Edward the Peacemaker. And may we not with justice refer to George V as the King of the Homes and the Hearts of the People. The whiter the raiment the more easily it is soiled, the higher a target the more easily it is reached, and within the last few days we have heard with sorrow and have read with disgust of attacks, baseless and malicious, made on the character and home-life of our King. In justice to nation and family he declined to remain under the stigma inflicted by his foul-mouthed enemies. The punishment meted out to the tool, representative of the arch-slanderer in Paris, may not have been commensurate with the crime, but what the nation most desired has been attained, the complete vindication of the Sovereign. This has been achieved by the process of law, the foul charges proven to have been made without a vestige of foundation. As the defedant the King placed himself on the same plane as any of his subjects, appealing to the courts not as a King, but as a husband and father. "What is a King? A man condemned to bear the public burdens of the nation's care." Such was the experience of Edward 7, and such must prove the experience of his son, but when to public burdens are added slanders as painful in their effect to the virtuous monarch as to the virtuous citizen, the burden becomes intolerable, and happy is the nation whose laws, equally just to peasant and to prince, may be with confidence appealed to by all. It is appropriate that in connection with the late King Edward, whose visit to our shores nearly half a century ago is matter of history, and, amongst our older citizens, of cherished memory, we are to have a memorial monument erected in the form a Nurses' Home. It is a worthy object, and one not alone appropriate to the Peacemaker, but to the Victorian age, in which he spent so many long and useful

years. Yesterday the world celebrated the centennial of the greatest novelist of the nineteenth century. I refer to Charles Dickens. All who are acquainted with the works of this illustrious creator—and who are not ?—will remember the type of nurse of those far off days—the "Betsy Frigs" and "Sairey Gamps !" Exaggerated types maybe, but by no means merely fictitious characters ; more or less, and often rather more than less, true to life. Nothing, perhaps, has more marked the growth in humanitarian endeavor than the changes which have taken place in nursing. Nursing in the days of Dickens is as a trade, often grotesque and repellant. Nursing to-day is a profession, and is attracting to its ranks the noblest, best and purest of our womanhood. In caring for the nurses, we are caring for their patients. I observe with some regret that there is no reference in the Speech to another matter which is of very grave importance, and that is to the erection of the new Poor Asylum, for which provision was made at the last session of this Legislature. I am glad, however, to be told that the matter is receiving careful attention. Some difficulties in connection with an adequate water supply at the site selected have arisen, and other minor obstacles have presented themselves, but before long this most necessary building will be erected, and the sooner the better for the well-being of the inmates and the health of the public generally. I would urge the Government to push the matter forward with all possible despatch. We want nurses, physicians and Board of Health, but first and foremost we must eradicate all those causes which tend to the spread of the disease, and amongst those causes the present Poor Asylum takes a prominent place.

As for the arbitration that has taken place at the Hague, it is gratifying to know that everybody is pleased. The United States claims the victory, Canada claims it also, and so does Newfoundland. When all are pleased all should be well, and yet, despite the mutual satisfaction displayed, I am unabie to read much of gain to this Colony in the Hague award. We stand to-day much where we were before the proceedings commenced, except that we are faced with a heavy bill for expenses, which must be met. Connected herewith is the recent conference at Washington where something has been done. Britain and America, or Canada and Newfoundland, with the United States, have agreed to make some temporary arrangements, not so productive of immediate good as might be wished, but at least saving a vast expenditure. A reciprocity agreement has become effected between Ministers at Washington and Ottawa. So far as Newfoundland is concerned, in view of the present position of affairs, it may be well employing a Scotch expression, to "ca' canny."

It is gratifying to know that mineral development in this country is on the increase, but here, too, caution is imperative. There are said to be necessary evils, and promoters are necessary. In these days it is impossible to float any great undertaking without a financial agent well acquainted with modern condi-

tions. This must be done to a large extent by professionals. But what we need most is operators, not promoters, and we are fortunate in having some of these in our midst. Promotion and speculation are inevitable preliminaries. It is from operation and development that ensue progress and prosperity.

The financial showing made by the Colony in the recent loan is a tribute to the ability of the Premier of this Colony, and also to its financial standing and high credit in the London market. Last session the successful floating of this loan appeared problematical to some members of this honourable House. It is very gratifying then to know that this loan has been satisfactorily raised in London at a figure higher than had been previously obtained. In reference to this inscribed stock, to which my hon. friend, the mover of the address referred, I am reminded by the Hon. Mr. Harvey that the reason this inscribed stock is so much higher than other local stock, is because trustees are permitted to invest in them. That privilege does not apply to debenture bonds, but there may be another reason for divergence in quotations. Some of our loans are practically held by close corporations. They may appear large to us, but are comparatively small matters to the leading London financial houses, who are in a position to make the market as they deem it should be. Happily for us market-rigging is little known in British financial circles, but what little there is does not tend to establish equilibrium in prices. When the branch railways policy was discussed last year there was considerable discussion as to the cost, and we were told that the burden to the Colony would be unbearable. In reply, the Leader of the Government in this House stated that no extra taxation would be levied. It is pleasing to know that what was then said has since been verified. No new tax has been put upon us, and we have had a large increase in revenue. From Bell Island alone during the eight months in which the tax of seven and a half cents per ton on exported ore has been in operation, we have realized over $84,000.

The question of Old Age Pensions is, of course, a vexed one. It has puzzled the best energies and brains of statesmen the wide world over. Of late years we have been face to face with this problem in Newfoundland. The Government has given the matter very careful consideration, and has evolved a policy that is both safe and sane, and within the means of the Colony. I am aware that many hold the opinion that pensions for aged poor may tend to make people thriftless and neglectful of making due preparation for their old age, but I am not convinced that that would apply to any extent. We hear little as to the thriftlessness of the official classes, to whom pensions come as part payment for services rendered. There are many who, after toiling a life time, find themselves unable to do more than find sufficient for daily requirements, and some times not even that. This very moderate measure, which I trust may be followed up until a substantial endowment fund is provided for our aged and infirm, is not an extravagant one, and merits approval from all. No ex-

tra taxation is asked. It is an honest effort to lighten the burdens of the aged without fastening upon them the stigma of the pauper. In the first year $200,000 of the surplus revenue will be set aside, and it is hoped that next year a similar amount will be added. With a continuance of present prosperity and progress, the fund should continue to grow until at least $1,000,000 have accumulated, and all the worthy, aged, infirm and feeble in need are given help in their declining days. Nor will the widows and orphans be forgotten. The transference of many from the pauper to the pension list should leave a larger balance in the hands of the Commissioner of Public Charities, which with advantage will be devoted to the assistance of widows and orphans, often who are more helpless than the fishermen themselves.

The further extension of the telegraph system is a public need. It is gratifying to know that already the northern district of the island has been brought into touch with other parts. The district of St. Barbe, in the past, has been unwisely ignored. The conditions which have hitherto existed in this remote district have been the cause of much inconvenience and hardship to its business and the people in general. Many of these inconveniences would have been removed if telegraph extension had been more general. There are still other places where the benefits of the system would be invaluable. I am ready to admit that during the past eight years the establishment of offices in some places has not been justifiable, and there is no reason why every little settlement should have a telegraph office, especially when an office is within reasonable distance ; still it is an incontrovertable fact that there are places within a hundred miles of us, such as Flat Island and Oderin, in Placentia Bay, with large and industrious populations, that are as much isolated as places on Northern Labrador. I believe that it is the intention of the Government that these places shall be brought in touch with the rest of the world, and hope such is the case. Isolation is impossible in this present century if success and development are desired and expected. I am also pleased to note that it is the intention of the Government to increase the educational grant, for the purpose of supplying education in those settlements which are at present without it. Of this subject I have more to say at a later date. There are some sixty places in the island where it is as impossible to get an education as it is in the wilds of Africa. There are also sixty-five schools open only six months in the year, and how this condition of affairs is to be met is a question that has occupied attention for a number of years. I trust that the problem will soon be solved. I have glanced recently over the annual reports, and I have noticed that the total grant for education amounts to $317,000, a handsome sum indeed. That the Assembly may add to it ,as the Government purposes, we hail with pleasure. There is, however, unnecessary waste in our educational system. I find that out of this sum of $317,123.66, no less than $22,000 for what should easily be done for considerably less. We have

the annual reports costing $1,000, and I venture to say that for practical purposes their publication is not worth the paper they are printed on. Inspection costs $9,000, how much more I cannot say. The C. H E. costs $7,500. I am not saying that good work has not been done. It is the Inspectorial System and the Education Council, not the Inspectors or Councillors, that I take issue with. An extravagance that I am astonished to find is that no less than $5,249.27 was last year disbursed by the educational boards under the heading of "travelling expenses and incidentals." In the $5,249.27 are included payments to numerous secretaries, an expenditure unnecessary and not a fair burden on the education grants. The work of secretaries should be entirely of an honorary character, and the money paid them utilized to greater advantage. There are scores of young men who would esteem it a privilege to engage in such work without personal profit. I may say that in one denomination there is only one paid secretary, and this. I believe, in the shape of pension to an old-time teacher. I say, in all sincerity, that what one denomination does, all can do. By all means let us have our educational funds increased, but let us see that the expenditure is made judiciously. Let not extravagance obtain in one place or in one part of the system, when thrift might mean an advantage to some other locality. It should be the aim and object of all to see that every penny voted for education is properly expended, and that we get the best available returns from it. The moneys voted should be expended in a way that general benefit would accrue. While due attention is given to larger centres, which have colleges and high schools, it must not be forgotten that smaller localities have equal claims, a fact the Government fully recognizes. When the Bill dealing with the proposed appropriation comes before the Council I may have something further to say on this matter.

I am pleased to note that cold storage in Newfoundland is about to become a fact accomplished. For many years it has been an expectation, but now it is to be a realization. Thirteen years ago the first Cold Storage Bill was introduced, and since then others have followed, but with unsatisfactory results. Now comes a welcome change. Under the proposed arrangements it is understood that the Government will grant certain concessions to a party of operators, not speculators, and cold storage plants will be established in various parts of the island, as well as factories for the converting of fish offal into fertilizer, which will be a happy means of relievng a situation that has long existed, and will open up opportunities to the fishermen that they have long hoped for. With cold storage established on a proper basis, there is no gainsaying that it will not only be a benefit to the fishermen, but to the Colony generally.

Coming to the lumber industry, it is pleasing to note that the Government is about to make a permanent arrangement to have our timber lands properly patrolled and protected against fire. This is certainly a wise program. Last year, it will be remembered, the Government had a conference

with the leading timber men, and a temporary arrangement was made for this purpose, and with great success. Over the area patrolled not a single fire occurred, or, if there was one, it was so insignificant that it was quickly suppressed. The protection meant the saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars to the owners and to the country.

It is gratifying to learn that an agreement is about to be entered into by the Government for a daily cross-country service. I do not know the nature of the Bill to be introduced, but such a service is needed, and will be appreciated by the business public. The establishment of a daily service suggests a change from the narrow to the standard gauge, a change which, however distant, must come, if our local railway is to meet the daily increasing demands.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I congratulate the Premier and his Government on the beneficial and progressive policy outlined in last year's Speech from the Throne and the benefits which have already resulted therefrom. All aimed at may not have been realized, but realization is rapidly drawing near. The hope of all will be that the outcome of this session's legislature may tend to the prosperity and success of Newfoundland. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion that a committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to His Excellency.

Hon. President presented to the House a certified copy of minute of Honourable the Executive Council appointing the Commission of Internal Economy for the session of 1911. The Commission consists of—Hon. Sir E. D. Shea, John Harris, Dr. Skelton, His Hon. the Speaker, Hons. Sir E. P. Morris, and D. Morison.

Hon. the President read a communication from His Excellency the Governor informing the Council that the following members had been granted leave of absence from the session's legislation :—Honourables James S. Pitts, G. Knowling, S. Milley, J. Anderson, W. C. Job, and M. G. Winter.

Hon. the President read a letter from Hon. Dr. Skelton saying that he was prevented from attending the opening of the House through illness.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Council adjourned at 5.55, to meet again Friday, the 10th inst., at 4.30 p.m.

FRIDAY, February 10.

Pursuant to adjournment the House met at 4.30 p.m.

Hon. John Harris begged leave to present the following report of the Select Committee appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and to move that it be read a first time.

"To His Excellency Sir Ralph Champneys Williams, K. C. M.G., Governor of Newfoundland.

"May it please Your Excellency :

"We, the Legislative Council of Newfoundland, in legislative session assembled, beg to thank Your Excellency for the gracious speech you have addressed to both Houses of the Legislature.

"We shall earnestly deliberate upon the several important matters contained in Your Excellency's speech."

The Address was read a second time and passed without comment.

On motion of Hon. John Harris it was ordered that the Address be engrossed and presented to His Excellency by a deputation of the whole House.

Hon. R. K. Bishop tabled copies of the oral argument in connection with the recent Fisheries Arbitration at the Hague.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House adjourned until Tuesday next at 11.30.

TUESDAY, February 13.

Pursuant to adjournment the House met at 11.30 a.m.

Hon. the President informed the House that the following communication had been received from His Excellency the Governor :

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council :

I have to thank you for your Address of Sympathy to His Majesty the King on the death of His Majesty King Edward the Seventh.

Its substance has been sent by telegraph to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, for His Majesty's information, and the Address itself will be forwarded at the earliest possible date.

I am confident that in no part of the Empire is that sympathy more real than in his ancient Colony, and that the two branches of the Legislature give utterance to the wishes of all in Newfoundland in thus expressing their loyal and grateful acknowledgement of the wise rule of our late King.

RALPH WILLIAMS,
Governor.

Hon. R. K. Bishop laid on the table of the House statement of the Newfoundland Savings Bank to December 31st, 1910.

Hon. the President announced that His Excellency the Governor would receive the deputation to present the Address in Reply at 12 o'clock. The House then proceeded to Government House.

At 12.30 the House returned, and Hon. the President reported that His Excellency had been pleased to receive the Address in Reply, and to return an answer thereto in the following words :

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council :

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which your present session was opened, and for the assurances which it contains.

(Sgd.) RALPH WILLIAMS.
Governor.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House adjourned until Friday next at 4.30.

FRIDAY, February 17.

Pursuant to adjournment the House met at 4.30

Hon. President announced that he had received a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the accompanying bill, entitled, "An Act to Encourage the Manufacture of Explosives," and requested the concurrence of the Council in the same.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the bill was read a first time and

ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House then adjourned until Tuesday next at 4.30 p.m.

TUESDAY, February 20.

Pursuant to adjournment the House met at 4.30 p.m. In the absence of the President, Hon. James Angel occupied the Chair.

Hon. R. K. Bishop rose to move the second reading of the Explosives Manufacture Bill. The Bill calls for a little explanation. The British Canadian Explosives Co., I am informed, which has been formed in England, proposes to erect and equip in the vicinity of Cape Broyle, works for the manufacture of high-grade explosives. An agreement has been arrived at between the Government and this company, and the Bill before us is to give the sanction of the Legislature thereto, and by the usual procedure ratify it. The terms which the Government give to all new industries are conceded to this company, namely the free admission of machinery and plant, a free grant of unoccupied Crown lands for a site, and water power, if such be available, of sufficient size for power and lighting purposes in connection with the operation of the plant. Some additional concessions are allowed this company, such as a grant of timber land for the purpose of securing timber for making boxes or other requirements that might be needed in their business, as well as the free admission of the materials to be used in the manufacture of their explosives. It will, I think, be conceded that no concessions are made, or more privileges given under the Bill, other than any company bringing capital to the country and engaging in a new enterprise might reasonably demand. As long as the company operates its manufacturing plant they will have the privilege of shipping box shucks free for the purpose of business elsewhere; but it will be noticed this privilege is confined to box shucks, and in my opinion is very unlikely to be availed of. The free admission of the ingredients used in their manufacture costs the Colony nothing, for these commodities are not used there, and therefore no revenue is forfeited. The company undertakes to employ local labor. I believe every member of this House fully realizes how important to this country are our local manufacturing industries, and is desirous of seeing their number increase. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was read a second time, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop was ordered to be committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Hon. the President read a communcation from the Legislature to the effect that they had passed a Bill entitled "An Act to Encourage the Manufacture of Peat," and asked for the Council's concurrence in the same.

Hon. R. K. Bishop moved that the Bill be read a first time. The motion was carried, and it was ordered accordingly.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be read a second time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House adjourned until Thursday next at 4.30 p.m.

THURSDAY, February 23.

The House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment, the President in the Chair.

Hon. R. K. Bishop moved the House into Committee on the Manufacture of Explosives Bill.

Hon. J. D. Ryan took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. John Harvey — Before adopting section 2 of this Bill I would like to ask the honourable introducer if a license to cut timber over the three-mile limit, known as the fishermen's limit, is to be granted this company. This limit should be properly safeguarded in the interests of the fishermen, and I would like to know if the Government intend making this provision. To me it appears as if there were some discrepancy in the Bill, or that it reads carelessly. Under the Contract the Government agrees to give a license to the manufacturers to cut and export box shucks. I think that if such be granted the company should be taxed on this export as is any other operating timber concern in the Colony.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—In answer to the hon. gentleman, I might say that the rights of the fishermen along the three-mile limit are already protected by law. As to the cutting and exporting of box shucks, this will only apply to what is needed for their regular business. Personally, I do not think the company will ever export any shucks.

Hon. D. J. Greene—I would like to ask the introducer of the Bill if any application for any area or areas of land on the peninsula of Avalon has been made by this company, or has any agreement been arrived at to grant them any special areas.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—No application for any areas has been made up to the present.

Hon. D. J. Greene—Has the company expressed any desire to get any special areas.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—Not that I am aware of.

Hon. D. J. Greene—Mr. Chairman, I am very much opposed to this Bill, and would consider it most impolite for the Legislature to pass it in its present form. It has been said that this company is only being granted concession that would be given others. But those companies do not come here from purely philanthropic motives. They come simply through a desire for profit and to obtain as much of the latter as possible. I do not intend to criticise the motive of the Government, for it appears that every succeeding Government tries to outdo the other in granting concessions to such companies. The old common law that an alien cannot hold property does not apply here—it is the other way about. The alien can hold whatever he likes, while the Newfoundlander, on the other hand, is tied up. If you want to get franchises you must first go outside the three-mile limit and then come back again and look for them. I would like to know how many such franchises were granted to local companies. What reception would be given the bakers, the coopers, or others, if they were to ask for the favors which it is proposed to give this company. Would the coopers, the bakers, or butterine factory, be granted free timber to make boxes and barrels. Not at all. The establishing of this com-

pany does not mean anything, certainly nothing in comparison with the franchises given them. It is not a company that will give extensive labor, the whole import of explosives into this Colony only amounts to between $15,000 and $18,000, and the company is not bound to manufacture beyond the local demand. They will not be like other companies, they wi'l have no rivals, they will be entirely exclusive. Take into consideration what they are to get. Free sites, all the articles they use in the manufacture of their explosives duty free, except what they can purchase in Newfoundland, and what they will get here will be very small, as we do not produce anything that they would require. But, not satisfied with these concessions, they ask for timber areas and the right to export timber, without becoming subject to any taxes. Take the words in section 2, clause 4, they are too broad ; they say one or more areas, that might mean one or a thousand, possibly the latter. Therefore, in my opinion, that is most objectionable. The right to export wood partly manufactured for the purpose of making boxes for others of their factories abroad appears more objectionable. The hon. member, Mr. Bishop, says they will not do this ; that it is not likely that they will manufacture wood for purposes of sending abroad for other factories. Then, if they do not intend this, why have they asked for it ? It is to be presumed that they know their own business best, and when they ask for the power they certainly intend to use it. The hon. member says that the areas will be limited to enough for carrying on their factories. There is no such provision contained within the four corners of this agreement. Once the area has been secured by them, they can cut as must as they like. But the most objectionable altogether is this. That the Government shall grant to the company on ungranted lands one or more timber areas, and they shall grant it free ; and here I may point out again is the confusion that appears on the face of the Bill : that whereas it is stated that the areas shall be free, it goes on to say they are subject to the provisions of the Crown Lands Act. The two things are inconsistent. One must stand, or the other. Either the company must pay stumpage or so much an acre, to comply with the provisions of the Act, or get them free. If, on the other hand, the first part of section 2 is read by itself, then they are not subject to the provisions of the Crown Lands Act. Going on a little further, then, the hon. Mr. Harvey has limited himself to asking, and hon. Mr. Bishop to answering that the three-mile reservation would not be granted by the Government. But there is another and larger area of ungranted land which the Crown and the Government have for many years been reserving, and that is the areas within the Peninsula of Avalon. Now, I understand, and I would not have asked the question except that I have been informed, upon very good authority, indeed, that this company have intimated their intention to apply for land on that peninsula under this agreement when this Act is passed, and when the section now before the Chair becomes law, the Government

cannot refuse to grant to them from ungranted Crown land areas over the Peninsula of Avalon, areas extending from St. Mary's Bay, on the one hand, over from Placentia to Renews on the other, and embracing that piece of land which was the subject of much controversy some years ago when it was applied for by Dr. Tait and others, and which was recalled after a great deal of trouble. This land has been tacitly reserved by the Government from being granted to anybody. As late as 1910 the Reid Nfld. Co. were refused these lands in their grants as part of the subsidy for the new lines of railway, and now they are to be thrown open, and if selected by this company must be granted to them. Why should this company be placed on any better footing than anybody else? Why not let them go to the Crown Lands office and take up tracts in the usual way wherever possible for the Government to grant? But why should they be subject to exceptional favor? I, therefore, intend to move an amendment to the second section after the words "which may be at his disposal" down to the "licenses to cut timber," by adding the words "but not within the boundaries of the Peninsula of Avalon." If it is the intention—and I think the hon. introducer of the Bill will find out on inquiry at the Crown Lands office that a great number of applications have been refused by the present Government and others before it, and it has been an unwritten policy to reserve this land—if that is the intention, they ought to safeguard it by putting in these words. If they do not so safeguard this they will be unable to say "no." If the Government grants this territory, and should this company have the exclusive right not alone to cut the timber, but prevent anybody else from coming in, a very great injury would be done to the small wood cutter, and to the fishermen of Trinity Bay, St. Mary's Bay, and Placentia Bay. I move the insertion of these words as stated above. I do not like the Bill, and I do not think we should give these people these concessions, but I hope it will be made clear to the House that it is not intended to give away the timber limits on the Peninsula of Avalon.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—I do not think the hon member who has just sat down was very happy in the argument he has put forward as a reason why this Bill should be amended, the argument that certain sectons of the Peninsula of Avalon where people are using timber growing on it may be granted under this Bill to the company. The hon. gentleman has stated that the Government as late as 1910 refused to grant this land, consequently the Government can refuse it to this company as well. The hon. gentleman must know that this land has been specially reserved, not alone by the present Government, but by the former Government as well, and consequently where the land has been specially set apart, the Government could not, very consistently at least, grant that limit to this company.

Hon. D. J. Greene—There is nothing whatever in the Statute Book enabling the Government to retain this land.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—The hon. gentleman is right in what he says, but he does not go far

enough, and has not read the Act very carefully, because the Government has the power to set apart and reserve any portion of the lands of this country for any purpose whatsoever. This land is reserved.

Hon. D. J. Greene—Not at all.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—I beg your pardon. In other sections of the country reservations have been made, and the Government has refused to accede to applications for it.

Hon. D. J. Greene—If I applied to-morrow for a license to cut timber on the Peninsula of Avalon the Government can say "no" without giving any reason. But I say again, the Peninsula of Avalon has not been reserved except by inherent right, but the Government is parting with that right under section 2 of this agreement.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—The Government may refuse to give it. It is not obligatory upon the Government to grant any particular section to this company. They can refuse it to this company as well as any other individual. Suppose, for argument sake, the Government did agree to give them any part of the lands on the Peninsula of Avalon, 640 acres would supply all their wants. They can only use the timber for the purpose of the industry carried on in this country. That is clear from the agreement itself. The agreement says "subject to the provisions of the Crown Lands Act, one or more areas of sufficient size to supply lumber for boxes, packages, and other requirements of the said industry." The main point of my learned and hon. friend's contention is that the areas on the Peninsula of Avalon should not be granted to this company. He need have no fear upon that question. The Government is fully alive to the interest of the people on the Peninsula of Avalon, and they have reserved this land as late as 1910 according to my learned friend's statement, and will still refuse to grant the land to any other person. The Government is not bound to grant these timber areas to this company or any other person or persons. My learned friend is opposed to the proposal, and says that the various Governments are vieing with one another in granting concessions to aliens. There is nothing to prevent the people of this country from engaging in the manufacture of explosives. They will get the same concessions and privileges which will be given to this company. The hon. gentleman asks what franchises have been granted here? Why, is not every consumer here taxed in order to support the industries here? The boots and shoes, the butterine, biscuits and tobacco, are not all these industries protected? Is not the consumer taxed for the purpose of having these articles manufactured here; and that is the policy to go upon. But when other countries give these privileges we must do so, and we are not giving them anything like the concessions which other companies have here today. Here we have water powers tumbling down the hill sides all over the country, not turning a wheel, and would it not be an advantage to have these turning some wheel of machinery, and giving employment to the people, and helping to build up the country, and develop its resources. This company is not here alone

for the purpose of supplying the local demand, that would not pay it, and they will enter into competition with factories in other parts of the world, and if we can, by reasonable and fair means, induce people to come into this country and invest their money in the establishing of industries here, then, I say, by all means, give them all that is fair and reasonable. We have given away much more than that, we gave away to Harmsworth millions, not only in timber, but minerals, and the soil itself. Now, when we give something much smaller, the hon. gentleman objects. This industry will be a schoolhouse, as it were, in that settlement, where people will be educated, prepared for the battle of life, and we are thus doing a good thing.

Hon. D. J. Greene—The hon. gentleman must not cite the Harmsworth deal against me, as I opposed it.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—I am not citing it against the hon. gentleman. If we want to establish factories in this country, and it is necessary that reasonable and fair privileges should be given them, I have no doubt that they will get them from this or any other Government.

Hon. Jas. Angel—I have not given this Bill much thought or consideration, but after hearing the debate I am reminded of some things which the hon. gentleman who has just sat down stated in this House last year. In the first place, I think there is a good deal of reason for Hon. Mr. Greene's remarks in reference to the Peninsula of Avalon. I agree with him to a great extent that perhaps the Peninsula of Avalon should be reserved for the fishermen and the people who may now use the timber in that part of the country. The hon. gentleman on my left (Hon. Mr. Gibbs) has said that the Government need not grant it, but there is nothing in the agreement to prevent them from doing so. I am reminded of what the hon. gentleman said last year when I spoke of the importation of articles with regard to the construction of rolling stock for the new railway. Now I know that no provision has been made and nothing done to prevent the material being used for other purposes. All that is necessary is for one of the employees to make affidavit that the article was for construction purposes, and it may afterwards be used for ordinary work. I do not say that this is done, or that it would be done, but there is nothing to prevent it, and there is nothing here to prevent the Government giving away the timber on the Peninsula of Avalon. I think it a very wise provision to make. Another thing occurs to me, and that is that these people might make application simply for the purpose of exporting packages by asking for the right to cut timber, make packages and export them in shucks. The manufacture of explosives might only be a side issue. It might be a method of the company to get in the thin edge of the wedge, and perhaps they are only introducing the manufacturing of explosives just for the purpose of making and exporting their packages.

I am reminded of another remark of the hon. gentleman on my left that everyone is taxed to support the manufacturing industries of the country. I submit that there is one industry that is

certainly operated without protection. It is simply absurd to put the industry of the manufacture of boots and shoes on an equality with the manufacture of explosives. Every man, woman and child must wear boots and shoes. The same applies to the manufacture of soap. But with reference to the manufacture of steam engine boilers, the manufacture of these important works is of necessity limited. It must be confined to less than half the population, while the whole 250,-000 in the Island have an interest in boots and shoes and other things. There are a hundred and one other things manufactured in this country on a similar comparison. It is true that in the case of those industries established here at Bell Island and at Grand Falls, and the concessions made to them of getting in their construction machinery duty free, have worked detrimentally to this important class of work to which I refer. I think, myself, those things are worth consideration. No provision has been made, as far as I know, that the Peninsula of Avalon shall be reserved , or at least the timber limits on that section of country. I would, therefore, beg to support the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Greene that the Peninsula of Avalon be reserved. I do not see anything to prevent the Government giving them the grants if they so desired.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—Although I am in sympathy with the amendment that has been moved by the Hon. Mr. Greene, I am satisfied with the assurances made by the hon. introducer of the Bill that there would be no such grants given and that no grants would be given upon the fishermen's three-mile privilege. If only one square mile or so is required, I think it would not seriously deplete the timber of Avalon Peninsula. I do not know, after all, that there is anything sacred about the timber on Avalon. When I see industries being started as will justify the Government in granting such, I do not know any justifiable cause for withholding it. If this company can get all the material it requires from one square mile, as Hon. Mr. Gibbs suggested, I don't see any reason why the Government could not give them that. I would not, however, give this company such an area as would allow them to engage in a timber industry under these provisions. Even to let them export it in the form of shucks without paying taxes would be entirely unjustifiable.

Hon. Mr. Angel—I am forcibly reminded of a business at Whitbourne some years ago. I have a very vivid recollection of being engaged in railway construction first when the line went through. The timber round about that section then seemed to be unlimited, but in two years the whole supply was cut out. There is a very small mill there, and the only mill that would be in use in that section of country. If one has to pay the labor of getting the timber out he will not manufacture at all. He manufactures in a small way, and that is the way nearly all the timber would be manufactured on the Peninsula of Avalon. If we grant any large areas it would not be wise, and if the company intend to export shucks they will require more than a mile of timber. I believe the section of timber in this country is limited, and it will, in a short time, be cut out.

Harmsworths have a very large area over which they operate. They are, I am informed, conserving their interests by re-planting, nurturing the growth of smaller timber. If they cut indiscriminately they will certainly come to the end of their timber supply. It is the case in other parts of the country. If we don't give an opportunity to the smaller growth to mature the time will not be long before our timber areas will have become depleted. The company should be debarred from cutting timber areas for the exportation of shucks. It should be kept for local consumption.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—It seems to me that the hon. gentleman who has last spoken has given a complete answer to the very objection. He can hardly believe that the company would cut timber with the object of making a large export business of it. It is not conceivable. Hon. Mr. Angel says that there is no timber on the Peninsula of Avalon to operate in a magnitude possible for the company to export timber products, yet he fears that this company might find some timber on this peninsula. The Hon. Mr. Harvey takes a much more sensible and reasonable view. He says, what is there regarding the Peninsula of Avalon that makes it sacred ? At the same time there is a serious objection to insert words in this Bill as Hon. Mr. Greene suggests, and in my opinion they should be avoided. If such words are inserted in the Bill we are saying to the whole country that we are reserving, absolutely reserving, the timber on the Peninsula of Avalon, and all the rest of the country may ask why not other timber areas be reserved as well as the Peninsula of Avalon. The Government, however, have no idea of conceding any more than a few miles of timber to this company, and it is difficult indeed to find any areas that would not be granted or conceded for the small requirements of the company. The Bill provides for one or more timber areas. To say that they would go into cutting timber for export would be absurd. I repeat that I don't believe that this company could manufacture boxes to such advantage as they could in other countries. In Norway, for instance, they could make them cheaper than in this country. For the reason that I stated, I am not in favor of putting into this Bill the words contained in Hon. Mr. Greene's amendment. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Greene) that the rights of the people of the Peninsula of Avalon will be properly safeguarded. I am exceedingly sorry that Hon. Mr. Angel should refer to a matter very serious, and if specifically charged to anybody would incur a law penalty. Possibly the hon. gentleman did not consider the seriousness of his words. If what he stated were true, he ought to make a specific charge.

Hon. D. J. Greene—I have no desire in this matter to press any amendment, although I think it would be beneficial to adopt it. I oppose the Bill because I think there is danger in it, and I have given several reasons for my opinion. It would be churlish on my part to press the amendment, since the hon. gentleman has said that an area of only two miles should be required.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—The hon. gentleman will pardon me, but I

did not say, specifically, two miles, but a few miles.

The Committee rose, and reported the Bill passed without amendment. On motion of Hon. J. D. Ryan the report was received.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg to move the second reading of the Peat Bill. This Bill is an important one, and I have no doubt hon. members who have been examining it regard the Agreement which has been arrived at between the Government and The International Carbonizing Co., Limited, worthy of their careful consideration. When it is remembered how important to any country is a coal supply within its own borders, and that up to the present time no coal, in workable quantity, has been discovered in this Island, the probability of our being able to produce from our peat bogs a fuel, which, under modern treatment, can be produced of a highly satisfactory quality, and at a moderate price, is a matter of very great interest to us all. It will be observed that by this carbonizing process the treatment of peat to be successful and profitable must be conducted on a very extensive scale. This is shown by the company agreeing to expend at least $125,000 in the erection and equipment of each factory, such factories to have capacity for an annual output of at least 20,000 tons of wet carbonized peat. It will be noticed also that one such factory must be erected and equipped within three years of the passing of this Act or the company forfeits all rights acquired. It is, I think, significant that the company consents to the payment of a royalty to the extent of ten cents per ton upon its output, and if they find, upon investigation of some of our peat areas, a sufficient depth of workable bogs to warrant the establishment of factories, the direct contribution to the revenue of the Colony will be considerable. It will be found, as the Bill is being considered in Committee, that, while liberal concessions are being made to the company, the interests of the public have been carefully safeguarded. The successful establishment of this business cannot fail to be of immense advantage to this country and to our people generally. The success of the establishing of this industry will mean the employment of a large number of our people. In addition, we may reasonably expect to be provided with a cheaper fuel for manufacturing purposes. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion carried.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. President read communications from the Assembly that they had passed the two following Bills : "For the Further Encouragement of the Smelting of Copper Ore," and "For the Prevention of the Spread of Potato Canker."

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—I beg leave to present the report of the Licensing Board for the year 1910.

Hon. J. Harris—I beg to submit the report of the Interna-

tional Economy Commission for the session 1911.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House adjourned until Monday next at 4.30 p.m.

MONDAY, February 27.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House met at 4.30.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill to encourage the Manufacture of Explosives was read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message saying that it had received the concurrence of the Council.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—I beg leave to move the House into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill to Encourage the Manufacture of Peat.

Hon. Mr. Ayre appointed to the Chair of the Committee.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—I would say in moving the second reading of this Bill that it is a far-reaching one, and a measure of very great importance to the country. I have obtained some information regarding the processes of the peat manufacture, and purpose to give that information to the House. The process of the manufacture of peat by this company is known as the Skenberg process, the invention of Dr. Martin Skenberg, of Sweden, and is not simply cutting and drying peat, such as we have all seen, but really converts the peat into coal briquettes. Bulk for bulk, it is said to have the heating value of good coal, the briquettes burning with a bright flame, smokeless, and leaving ashes free from clinkers. At a locomotive trial with Skenberg peat coal briquettes it was found entirely satisfactory. The peat can be carbonized as taken from the bog, and the operations carried on expeditiously and continuously all the year round, the peat being ready as a fuel within one hour after being taken from the bog. The Government of Canada attaches great importance to the question of utilizing peat bogs, and the Department of Mines at Ottawa early last year appointed a commission to proceed to the different countries of Europe to enquire into and report upon the various processes for treating peat. The report states that the Skenberg wet carbonizing process is by far the most promising of all known processes for the conversion of peat into coal upon a large scale.

Hon. John Harvey—With regard to the words "water powers" in that clause of Section 11 of the Bill. I was going to ask whether that might include the water powers of the Peninsula of Avalon. Whilst I said, the other day, that I did not consider anything especially sacred about the timber limits of the peninsula, yet I think the water powers of Avalon should be retained for the use of the city of St. John's. The reservation of these water powers is most important. I do not know whether it is necessary to put it into the Act or not. I should like to ask the hon. introducer of the Bill if this process is in practical operation at present.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—In answer to the hon. gentleman's last question, first, so far as I am aware, the process is not now in operation on a large scale, but it has been fully tested in an experimental manner, as the hon. gentleman will see by some matter

which I have placed in his possession. In regard to the water powers referred to in paragraph 11, the Government agrees to grant to the company, free of charge, the use of a sufficient number for its operation. But in this case, as in all others, the Government will have due regard to the public interests. In no case will the Government give inclusive right to all the water powers in a section of the country. If there should be two or three water powers on the river, one company will not get them all.

Hon. Mr. Greene—The Hon. Mr. Harvey's question was as to whether it should go into the Act.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—It is not necessary to put the provision in the Act.

Hon. Mr. Greene—We cannot grant any water powers except it is in addition to and as part of land. There is no such thing as a right to water powers except in addition to some other rights. Now the right of water in this country is different from anywhere else. It has been held absolutely and apart from anything else. A grant of land does not convey any water rights. There is no such thing as water rights or appertaining to or connected with land in this Colony. You have got to get express permission from the Government. I would like to see Section 11 of the contract, shortly worded, contained in the Bill itself.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—The hon. gentleman is not critically correct in his interpretation of the law, because the Governor in Council may grant water powers to individuals or companies for the purpose of operating or carrying on any industry. That industry may be ten or twenty miles away from the place where the power is found on the river. In this instance it is an absolute necessity that special provision be made in the Act for the granting of water power, because if the company makes application to the Governor in Council for the right to use the waters of the river for the purpose of driving machinery it is its business to grant it, but not as an exclusive right.

Hon. Mr. Greene—I am speaking of the water powers that may be granted to this company. There are not sufficient restrictions in the Bill. If I look for water rights I must first have some land to which these water rights appertain. I must show the Government, if I want the waters of Rennie's River, that I have a mill or a factory or something on the land nearby the waters. I cannot get the Government to grant me the waters of Rennie's River to do what I like with it.

Hon. Mr. Angel—Do you mean to say that I cannot use the water running through my land ?

Hon. Mr. Greene—What do you mean by waters passing through your land ?

Hon. Mr. Angel—The way I understood it all along was that you could use the waters on your own land.

Hon. Mr. Greene—You have no right to any waters in Newfoundland unless you get a special lease for them.

Hon. Mr. Angel—I think you will find that you have a right to use the waters running through your own land.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—There can be no doubt the Hon. Mr. Angel is wrong, and the Hon. Mr. Greene is right. I do not, however, agree with the Hon. Mr. Greene that a person could not get the use of water power unless he held lands adjoining. I contend that under the Crown Lands Act the Government could grant water powers to any not using the land or the Government could withhold water rights. The Government will be careful to preserve the rights of the public, and will not grant water powers unless there is good and sufficient reason for so doing. I do not think it is necessary to put any further restriction in the Bill.

Hon. J. D. Ryan—I would like to ask the hon. Leader of the Government, if the Bill is passed in its present form, will the company have any right to operate, or will they be granted bog lands which local people have operated previously, or can they interfere with the regular settlers living near bog lands. I would also like to know if the manufacture of peat, as mentioned by the hon. gentleman, has been carried on anywhere else, and if extensively. I have learned, and know, as a matter of fact, that peat under some such similar process has been manufactured abroad, but with the result that it was worthless and had little or no burning value.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—In reply to the hon. gentleman, I might say that the Bill does not allow the company to operate within half a mile of any settlement, so it is clearly seen that the interests of the settlers are well safeguarded. As to the process of manufacture, I can only say that it is yet in its experimental stage, but an experiment has proven highly satisfactory. The company say that they can manufacture a good article and at a cheap price, and if they fail they will be the losers, and we will be no worse off.

Hon. D. J. Greene—I hope that the company will be successful, as the cost of fuel is a matter that now calls for most serious attention, not only here, but elsewhere. I regret, however, that in his opening remarks the hon. Leader of the Government mentioned that there was nothing yet developed in our coal areas to warrant the expenditure of any monies by any company to work them. That statement coming from him is of very singular importance. Coming from a member of the Cabinet, it would appear that such was the decision the Government had arrived at, after exhausting all their powers to try and find workable coal areas. The Bill of last year was then inoperative, and because coal was not discovered in large quantities the company had not come forward. The statement of the hon. gentleman was bound to have a serious effect, and possibly give a black eye to coal boring in this Colony. Coal boring, however, was struggling along ; the areas were paying heavy rentals yearly, and next year the rentals would jump from $1,500 to $3,000. It is a well known fact that last year an English company had an expert go over the grounds, who took out some samples, and, though his report has not been made public, enough has been made known to say that he reported favorably. It is also known that applications have

been made from New York and Bristol for samples, and Mr. Howley, of the Geological Office, is only waiting for the snow to clear off the ground to get samples for our Festival of Empire exhibit. Under these circumstances the statement of Mr. Bishop is bound to have a very injurious effect when one considers its source.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I am sorry that the hon. gentleman has misconstrued what I said, and I must correct him in so far that I never made use of the words with which he credits me. I did say that no great quantities of coal were discovered that would warrant the company to open up work, but I am sorry that Mr. Greene thinks the Government is getting luke-warm as regards the possibilities of the successful and profitable working of our coal areas. The feeling of the Government in the matter is quite to the contrary, and they are doing, and will do, everything that is possible to assist and foster the coal boring industry. There is nothing in the present Bill to warrant any inference that it will in any way interfere with coal boring. Unfortunately, much money has been wasted in connection with the latter, but the Government has still strong hopes of ultimate success in the matter.

The Bill passed without amendment.

The Committee rose and reported the same to the House, and on motion of Hon. J. B. Ayre the report was adopted.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—Mr. President, in moving the second reading of the Copper Smelting Bill, I might say that a Bill of a like nature was introduced last session, but did not work successfully. It has been pointed out to the Government that if a little more encouragement than given last year were held out, there is every possibility of a smelter being erected, and, as the matter is of a very important nature, the Government has decided to offer a further inducement to this end.

The Bill passed second reading, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop was ordered to be sent to the Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs moved the second reading of the Potato Canker Bill, and it was ordered to be sent to the Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Cold Storage Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House adjourned at 5.35 until Tuesday, 28th inst., at 4.30 p.m.

TUESDAY, February 28.

The House met at 4.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournment, the President in the Chair.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Peat Bill was read a third time and passed. It was ordered that the Bill be returned to the Assembly with a message saying that it had passed without amendment.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Copper Smelting Bill, Hon. J. D. Ryan in the Chair

The Bill went through the Committee stage without amend-

ment, and was so reported by the Chairman.

The report was read, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs moved the House into Committee on the Potatoe Canker Bill, Hon. John Harris in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—Mr. Chairman, I may state that the object of this Bill is to enable the Governor in Council to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to prevent the spread of canker, to adopt such means as may be necessary to stamp it out and also to prevent the importation of potatoes from countries or places where the disease is found. What the causes are which bring about this disease among potatoes remains to-day unanswered. Science has not been able to trace the origin. The first authentic account we have of canker disease among potatoes was in 1890, when the potato crop in Saxony was found to be effected with it. From there it spread practically over the whole of Central Europe, causing suffering and privation among the countless thousands who make a living in the growing and cultivating of the potato. From thence it made its way to England in 1902, and the ravages among potatoes was so great that the Government was called upon to enact a law of a very much more stringent character than the one now before the House. Very large sums of money have been spent in England, and a great deal of attention and study have been given to the stamping out of the disease, and I am pleased to say that good results are accruing from the work of those charged with the carrying out of the Act. No person in this country can positively state how the disease was introduced here. It is certain it was not introduced from Canada or the United States, because the disease is unknown in these countries. Importations of potatoes from time to time have taken place from England and Germany, and it is only reasonable to conclude that the canker found its way from one of these countries, or else it came from St. Pierre, from where a great deal of potatoes have been purchased from time to time. The first we know of potato canker in this country was in the year 1907, when a man belonging to Red Island, Placentia Bay, found his potato crop effected with what he regarded as a very peculiar growth. He sent it to the office of the Montreal Herald, where, upon it being subjected to an examination by a potato expert, it was pronounced canker. How long it was in the country prior to 1907 I am not in a position to say, but this much I do know, that since a knowledge of the disease has been disseminated among the people, it has now been found in very many portions of the country. The annual yield of potatoes in this country is about 600,000 barrels, equal in value to about $820,000. We export none. The whole of that 600,000 barrels enters into food consumption of our people. The potato is very many times more valuable to this country than the herring, and the lobster, and the salmon fisheries. Suppose that salmon and lobster and herring were to desert our shores, it

would cause a good deal of suffering and hardship among our people. In like manner, if the potato canker is allowed to go unchecked, great suffering will ensue, because the potato is of more value to us as a country than the fisheries alluded to, hence, to my mind, the Bill is one of the most important that has come before this body. The subjects for which rules and regulations are to be made are clearly defined in the Bill, and will not militate harshly against anybody in the work of stamping out this disease, All should aid in the work, because it is only through co-operation among the whole people of the country that any law can be successfully carried out. All are interested in the successful enforcement and carrying out of this Bill, and of the rules and regulations to be made thereunder. Everybody, directly and indirectly, will benefit by its enforcement.

The Bill passed the Committee stage without amendment.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Ryan the report of the Committee was received, and on motion of Hon. M. P. Gibbs the Bill was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the second reading of the Cold Storage Bill was deferred until to-morrow.

Hon. R. K. Bishop laid on the table of the House a communication from His Excellency the Governor, enclosing an invitation from the Imperial House of Commons to the Legislative Council to send a representative to attend the Coronation of King George V.

The letter and invitation were read by the Clerk, and it was ordered that the election of a representative take place on to-morrow.

Hon. the President informed the House that the Assembly had passed a Bill dealing with the deportation of Esquimaux and Indians from Labrador, and asked for the Council's concurrence.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

At 5.05 the House adjourned, to meet again at 4 p.m. Thursday.

THURSDAY, March 2.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House met at 4.30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—Mr. President, in reference to the communication from the Imperial Parliament inviting two members of our Legislature to attend the Coronation of our King, I have great pleasure in proposing that you, sir, the President of this Council, be elected to represent the Chamber at the Coronation ceremony in June next.

Hon. Mr. Greene—I have much pleasure in seconding the motion made by the Hon. Mr. Bishop, I think Newfoundland will be most worthily represented by you on this important occasion. I trust you will be able to see your way clear to accept this appointment.

Hon. Sir Edward Shea (President)—Hon. gentlemen, I esteem it a great honor to be proposed by you to represent this Council of the Legislature at the Coronation of His Majesty George V. There are, I feel, difficulties in the way which, by reason of my ad-

vanced years, render it impossible for me to entertain the proposition now before us. We know certain recollections of the accounts given of the last Coronation that one's ambitions might be fairly moved to see such scenes, incidents and demonstrations as will be witnessed on the other side of the water on this auspicious occasion in June next. It will, undoubtedly, be an event that will give life-long memories. I should exceedingly like to undertake the commission, but, for the reason I have given, I am unable to accept the honor, and must, therefore, decline, although it is much against my wish. I beg heartily to thank you for your proposal.

Hon. John Harris—I am sure I voice the sentiments of the whole House when I say we regret very much that the Hon. President does not see his way clear to accept the invitation of the House of Commons to represent this Chamber at the Coronation of His Majesty the King. But since such is the case, it gives me much pleasure to move that Hon. Mr. Bishop , the Government representative in this Chamber, be asked if he would accept the invitation in your stead. I am quite certain that the hon. gentleman will uphold the dignity of this branch of the Legislature. I would, therefore, move that Hon. Mr. Bishop be appointed.

Hon. John Harvey—As the representative of the Government here, by his courtesy to the House, and the kindness he has always displayed here, I am sure Hon. Mr. Bishop would fill the duties required of him faithfully and with dignity. At the opening of the Legislature this session I was peculiarly impressed by the touching way in which he referred to our fealty to His Majesty, in moving the Address, and the graphic description he gave of the funeral obsequies of the late King. The Imperial aspect was presented as well as the personal aspect of the late King's lamented death. I have, therefore, much pleasure in seconding the proposal that Hon. Mr. Bishop be elected by this Council to represent the Council at the Coronation in June.

The motion was put and carried unanimously.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—Mr. President and hon. members, I find it exceedingly difficult to attempt to express my pleasure at the present moment. It was not my wish that this great honor should fall on me. I regret that you, sir, could not accept it. It would be foolish of me to pretend that I do not regard it as an honor. I do not see any reason why I should be selected, as there are others more capable who might have been chosen. I thank you from my heart, and I will endeavour to remember what is expected of me. Of all the numbers that will be gathered upon this great occasion, I assure you that there will be none more appreciative of those who sent them there than myself.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill to Encourage the Smelting of Copper Ore was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent back to the Assembly with a message that it had received the Council's concurrence.

On motion of Hon. M. P. Gibbs the Bill to Prevent the Spread of Potato Canker was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be

sent back to the Assembly with a message that it had received the Council's concurrence.

The next item on the Order Paper was the second reading of the Cold Storage Bill.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—Not since the Bill giving legislative sanction to the great industry now being carried on at Grand Falls was being discussed in this branch of the Legislature have we been called upon to consider a measure so important to the Colony as the Bill now before us. The various manufacturing industries being carried on in this country are becoming more and more important, and the wisdom of encouraging their establishment and assisting them by protective legislation was probably not as fully realized by the public as it should be until November last, when such an admirable display was made of our locally manufactured products at the Exhibition held in the Prince's Rink. Many perhaps had thought up to that time that there are no industries of real importance in connection with this country's trade, except our fisheries, but, Mr. President, had we to depend entirely upon our fisheries, what would be the condition of the people in St. John's to-day? There are unfortunately a great many unemployed persons around us at the present time, but destitution of a most serious nature would be our present experience were it not that many thousands of dollars are being paid out weekly to the operatives of the various factories in this city. The settled policy of the present Government is to encourage, by affording all reasonable assistance and concessions, the further employment of capital in the manufacture of goods suitable for the requirements of our population, and particularly for the development of our natural resources. With a very small population the aggregate cash reserves available for investment is necessarily insufficient for developing the latent resources of our large country, and some inducement must be extended to British or foreign capitalists to investigate our sources of potential wealth before we can expect them to embark their capital upon enterprises in this Island, for while in some respects the country affords attractions, we must all admit there are at the same time counteracting drawbacks. To the present Government, then, nothing is regarded of equal importance, to a distinct development along modern lines for handling, curing and marketing the products of our fisheries. The persons engaged in the export of our annual catch of codfish are but few, and the history of the business shows that the majority of those engaged in it during the past two or three centuries have met commercial failure. Few, indeed, are the fortunes that can be pointed out as the result of marketing Newfoundland codfish. Those engaged in the business, however, have their capital so bound up in it that they are unable, except perhaps now and then in an experimental way, to venture upon an entire departure from the old methods, and the system of curing, preparing and shipping codfish as demanded by the consumers in the United States is unlikely to be entered upon to any appreciable extent by local men and local capital, or,

if at all, not until outsiders have established factories and have demonstrated to us what can be done. The sale of fish through cold storage, or the curing and shipping of fish, other than codfish, is still less likely to be engaged in upon a large scale by our own people. When, then, a few months ago, fish merchants of experience, successful, and at present engaged in the business in a very large way in the United States, came here and made certain proposals to the Government, they were met in a friendly spirit, their proposals receiving careful consideration, and an agreement being arrived at satisfactory to them and fair to us. The business proposed by Messrs. Trefethen and Lord will be very extensive, and will be conducted upon methods differing entirely from our system of curing fish and preparing it for market. It is, of course, well known that the consumers of codfish in the United States do not use dry codfish, such as we ship to Europe and other countries. They pay a good price, but want their fish of soft cure and put up in convenient and attractive packages, which can be furnished them by their grocer as required, just the same as a package of Quaker oats, currants, cocoa or any other commodity of household daily use. Where it is possible to obtain it, they, of course, take by preference "fresh" fish, and through the application of cold storage a great part of the population of the United States, and also of Canada, can now be reached by refrigerator cars, and they get the greater part of their fish food in that way. Up to the present time we have been unable to export any appreciable quantity of our codfish in a fresh condition—but the small quantities of codfish, salmon, etc., shipped from Port aux Basques by the steamer Bruce, indicate that under proper conditions a very good business might be done. The Agreement entered into by the Government with Messrs. Trefethen and Lord is not with men of straw, neither is it with any wild-cat promotion syndicate; but with men who are prominent in the fish business, who do a very large and successful trade, and who know the requirements of the American markets, to which they have been catering for many years past. As the extent of the business which they propose embarking will be very great, a large capital will be necessary, and we have been advised that this capital is fully subscribed, and the erection and equipment of one or probably two stations will be undertaken within the next month or two.

Now, it was not to be expected that any person coming here to establish a large untried business, would do other than request from the Colony concessions, privileges and protection; in fact, realizing that no capitalists would be likely to attempt the business unless some inducements were held out, the late Government entered into agreement with a gentleman named Wright for the erection and equipment of a number of cold storage plants for bait and other fish, and made to him the same guarantee and subsidies as are contained in this Bill. Mr. Wright was not a fish merchant, and was unable to induce any person to avail of his valuable franchise, nor was any other person or company tempt-

ed by the terms given him to seek similar privileges until the present time.

Messrs. Trefethen and Lord, however, anxious as the Government are to see a cold storage business in fish established, were not allowed all the concessions they proposed, and indeed there will be no real difference as far as the revenues of this country are concerned between this and the Wright Cold Storage Bill, excepting that we now look for the prompt establishment of a large business, and through its wage-earning capabilities a considerable addition to our revenue.

There has been alarm apparently in certain quarters because it was thought we had been committed to all that Mr. Trefethen had asked for, and also because the liability of the Colony, in the event of the company being unfortunate, might, it was thought, become a very serious burden.

Even if it be admitted that ambiguity existed in the draft bill in paragraph 5 of Schedule, it was not possible for the liability of the Colony to exceed $25,000, in any one year, when $500,000, or more, had been expended by the company in the erection and equipment of its stations. The Government had not connived with Messrs. Trefethen and Lord to afford them greater protection for their investment, and consequently increased liability upon the Colony, and upon doubt being expressed regardng our real position because of the verbiage employed, an interpreting clause was decided upon by the Government to be added to the Bill, and this has been inserted. This was decided upon before the Bill went to a second reading in the Lower House. The Government made no guarantee of a 5 per cent. dividend, but undertook to pay a sum equal to 5 per cent. upon the cash capital invested in the cold storage plants if the company made a loss, or if a profit less than 5 per cent. then the company would be paid sufficient to bring the profit up to 5 per cent., but we were not to be responsible for more, when their cold storage plants are all completed, than 5 per cent. upon $500,000 in any year, even though their outlay may then be a million dollars more.

Some persons think, or pretend to think, that the wily Americans, as they are called, pulled the wool over the eyes of the Government, but, Mr. President, what was in the minds of Messrs. Trefethen and Lord was not what they might capture through cunning, but what is offered to any person or company who will avail of the Act placed upon the Statute Book in 1904.

That Act reads as follows. Paragraph 6 :—"In consideration "of the foregoing covenants on "the part of the company, the "Government covenants and "agrees to and with the said com-"pany that there shall be paid on "behalf of the Colony, for a per-"iod of years not exceeding 20 "the annual payment to the com-"pany of a sum by which its net "annual profits may be less than "an amount equal to five per "cent. on the value of all build-"ings, plant and machinery erect-"ed and constructed in the Col-"ony for the purpose of the com-"pany, such payment not to ex-"ceed a sum equal to five per "cent. on such value, and in no "case to exceed the sum of twen-

"ty-five thousand dollars in any "one year."

This is what induced Messrs. Trefethen and Lord to come to Newfoundland, and what they clearly understood was being given them. Now, Mr. President, it is well known to every member of this House that no company will come here and embark a large amount of capital upon an untried enterprise unless they are given protection and assistance, and it is most unfair to say, as it has been said, that privileges are given and concessions made to those outsiders which would not be conceded to our own people. To disprove such an assertion, I might mention the fact that Mr. John Clouston, who has been experimenting with fish foods, has been given valuable assistance by this Government, and Messrs. Lake, of Fortune, who have been canning codfish, have been also assisted very materially by free tin and other concessions. These men are not foreigners, and they are not operating upon an extensive scale, yet the Government, being desirious of encouraging all efforts to prepare our fish for export in a new form, readily conceded all their requests, and we all hope their business may be successful and extend. These men have, I think, been assisted in their efforts by Messrs. Harvey & Co., than whom there is no more enterprising firm in this country, and I am sure the Hon. Mr. Harvey, when he gives the House the benefit of his opinion upon this Bill presently, will acknowledge the readiness with which the Government helped and encouraged the enterprise of these small local operators.

It has been stated by the Premier that this new company will not be permitted to compete unfairly with our own people, and where through importations free of duty they can undersell local packers, such imported articles as are free to them, they will be put upon the free list.

Now, while the cold storage company will have the right to put up lobsters in tins, I don't for a moment think that such business will form any part of their operations. They intend to do a business in lobsters, of course, but they know how to turn them to much more profitable account than by putting them in tins. To my mind, therefore, it is quite unnecessary to permit lobster packers to import their tins free of duty for this year, but, if it should transpire that they are being competed with, then it will be quite proper to place them upon an equal footing, and such will be done. The difference, however, between free tin and 10 per cent. duty is but one-eighth of a cent per tin lobsters, or six cents per case. Gasolene engines are already free for fishing boats, and gasolene for fishermen will also be placed upon the free list. Lithographed labels cannot be produced here. Lubricating oil to be used by the cold storage company will be a very small thing anyway, and not worth noticing. Free sites of unimproved Crown lands amount to nothing. If any are available they could be procured under the Crown Lands Act for a few dollars. The company has already bought its location for Bay of Islands instead of seeking a free location from the Crown. Free timber areas, if any can be found,

is not a great concession, for they can take timber for the purposes of their business only. The effect of this Bill upon the Bait Act has been very fully discussed elsewhere, and freely commented upon by the press. Being a very important trade matter, the Council of the Board of Trade decided to take independent opinion, and the question of the bearing, if any, of this Bill upon the Bait Act was submitted to two legal gentlemen, both of whom gave an unequivocal opinion that the provisions of the Bait Act are in no way affected or impaired by this Bill, and the Cold Storage Company will be bound by its conditions precisely the same as all other persons. This will, no doubt, be a satisfaction to those persons who, perhaps not unreasonably, hesitated about accepting the Government's assurances, especially when a contrary opinion has been expressed so emphatically by the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond. It seems to me, Mr. President, the time for which we have been hoping has now arrived, and we shall soon have established here a business which will be one of immense benefit to this country. We shall get such a percentage of our catch of codfish marketed in its green or fresh state as will tend to produce a constantly active demand for our dry cod, and thereby not only will greatly better prices than have prevailed heretofore for fresh fish be available to our fishermen in certain localities at least, but high prices for our "dry fish" will rule even in years when the catch is considerably larger than was that of the past year.

Some people think this new business is calculated to ruin the codfish business as at present conducted, and all connected with it. I do not think so. It will probably compel merchants here to change their plans to some extent, but if this means the betterment of our people through larger returns, and further employment in connection with our fisheries, even though individuals may be affected, it is clearly the duty of the State to assist in providing the greatest good for the greatest number. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. John Harvey—Before beginning the remarks which I propose to make on the Bill now before the House, I wish to thank the hon. introducer of the measure for his courtesy in postponing the second reading at my request. I am very much interested in thesubject, and I have given a great deal of thought to the proposed Bill. I am anxious to support the Bill at least on its second reading. I can quite endorse the remarks of the hon. gentleman in connecting with the generous aid that has been given Messrs. Lake and Clouston, but I cannot agree with him to the same extent in his remarks about local capital. I would remind him of large capital that was invested in the whale fishery some years ago. I think that when there is a reasonable prospect of an investment proving good the money will be forthcoming. Of course, I do not mean such enterprises as pulp manufacture that require such a large plant and more expert knowledge than can be found in the general experience of the people, but I refer to the development of the fisheries, and I repeat that when it can be shown that the returns would warrant

expenditure there are local men who would be only too glad to invest their money.

Nobody who has given any thought to the proposed Bill can fail to recognize the personal effort of Sir Edward Morris to bring about the object aimed at, and no one can fail to admire his energy, the unselfish manner in which he has worked, and his unbounded faith in the country. I sometimes fear he is over-doing it, and that he may be trying to do too much. I cannot forget Sir Edward's personal attitude and that of his Government towards a work in which I am engaged. I refer to the matter of Public Health. The work was recognized in a public way and subsidized, the amount of $4,000 being given to the Committee, of which I am chairman, to be spent absolutely at their own discretion.

The Bill before us has passed the Lower House with a large majority, after a long debate, and for that reason it merits our very careful attention, but even remembering that, and having given the Bill a good deal of thought, I find myself compelled to vote against it. I should like to be able to vote for the second reading, and propose some alterations in Committee, but I find these alterations so serious that they could hardly be made upon the Bill as it stands, and that to meet my views it would be almost necessary to draft a new Bill.

I should just like to refer to the very loose way in which the Contract is worded. I should like to set an exam. paper to the hon. members of this House, and ask them to define, with reference to the context, the meaning of "continuous working," of "smoke houses," and "glue factory." Every business man knows that the phrase continuous working is a very loose one. The hon. introducer knows very well how it can be construed in the case of a mine. It could mean that only five or ten men would be working through the year. The guarantee then means little or nothing. With regard to smoke houses, I have seen one in Bay of Islands that never cost fifty dollars, and I venture to say the combined smoke house and glue factory in Hoylestown didn't cost $500. To my mind the principle of guaranteeing a company profits, without any check or representation on the directorate, is entirely unjustifiable, and I should like to know if there is any precedent for the policy outside of our own legislation. I never knew of it being done before by any Government. It is no uncommon thing to guarantee interest on bonds that are secured by property, and where the Government is represented on the board of control, and where stringent regulations are enforced, as to how profits are to be calculated, but I believe the present proposals are without a precedent, and I think the Colony's meaning, according to the intention of the Government, of the sincerity of which I have no doubt, ought to be properly safeguarded in the Bill. Under the loose verbiage and lack of safeguard in the Act, it is possible for the company to make ten or fifteen per cent. and still claim the subsidy. It is just possible that the company in making up its profits and losses would attempt to deceive or defraud. Take salaries for instance. The salaries of the directors and managers

may be fixed at a very high rate, and there could be no objection. Are any allowances to be made for depreciation ? What about insurance ? Is the company bound under the Bill to keep its property insured, or is it bound to insure its workmen or any shipment of fish that it would be making ? If, for instance, the company failed to insure a cargo of fish, and it was lost, and they charged it up to the profit and loss account, would the Government have to make good the loss ? Would any private business man on Water Street sign such a contract as this for his own firm ? I don't think the hon. introducer of the Bill himself would. Another point is that this is an American company, registered in America, and it is well known how ably the American nation backs up the interests of its own people. It is possible that some complications may arise from this source. A company subsidized by the local government should, if possible, be registered in Newfoundland, or some part of the British Empire, and be absolutely under our own control. Suppose after they start work the Government decides to stop them exporting herring or squid for some cause or other, what follows. As I have mentioned, we all know how the American Government backs up her people, and serious consequences might be incurred. I only mention these details in passing, however, and I do not give it as a reason for my intention to vote against the measure.

We all favor cold storage, but it must be the right kind of cold storage. What we want is to export chilled codfish, that's what all the Governments have wanted, and I am sure that's what our present Government wants, but there is nothing in this Bill calling for Lord and Trefethen to export or freeze a single pound of cod.

I wish to quote the following extract from the Premier's speech on the Bill, for the information of the House.

"Under this agreement the contractors agree to erect a certain number of cold storage plants —five in all, and one each year, each having a capacity in the neighborhood of 1,000,000 lbs. I think the Committee will agree with me that there is little room for such a company in this country if their advent does not increase the present price of fish. It is indeed improbable that they will obtain much fish for their works unless they give our people a higher price than they are now being paid, and if they do that, if they will raise the price only twenty-five cent a quintal, it will mean thousands of dollars extra going into the pockets of those who pay the revenue out of which this company will have to be subsidized $25,000 if they fail to make any dividend.

It might reasonably be asked, what is the object of changing our present methods and means of disposing of our fish, and why did the Legislature make the attempt in 1898, in 1904, and why are they doing it to-day ? The answer is obvious. We have been accustomed all our lives to cure and market our great staple product in one way, and, whilst competition in the markets was small in the days when other foodstuffs, canned, preserved and cold stored, did not seriously compete with us, it made little difference to us in Newfoundland. Of course there

were years, as we all know, of bad fisheries and bad prices, and the people emigrated to other countries. The object of this Bill is to avoid a condition of things which any day may come to this country—a repetition of that which occurred a few years ago, when the fishermen of this country, unable to sell their produce at any price, were forced to take it back to their homes or store it in St. John's. We don't want again to witness the day when cargoes of fish will have to return to Newfoundland because of glutted markets. We want to anticipate and prepare for such a contingency as this."

You see the main object is to relieve the codfish market, and the intention of this Bill is to provide for this, but the Bill before us absolutely fails in this respect, and, even if it did atatin this object, I would still think that this is not the best way of obtaining that object in the general interests of the Colony. I consider this Bill covers too large an area both in time and space, and I think that a charter that covers five locations and fifteen years is dangerous to the best interests of the Colony. There is real danger of handing over the monopoly of the future frozen fish trade of this Colony to Lord and Trefethen. What is wanted is a definite proof that a profitable business can be done in the export of frozen cod. An outward and visible sign that the busiess can be done from here. Then it should be thrown open to competition. Competition without having the situation compromised against British subjects by a fifteen year bounty to a purely foreign company. There is no difficulty in making this experiment directly over a term of years There is a number of ways in which this can be done. Furthermore, I have the most serious doubts whether Lord and Trefethen really themselves intend to take up the export of chilled codfish seriously. There are many difficulties attached to the business, difficulties of quick collection and its cost, dangers of deterioration, transhipments, and prices obtainable at market. I think you will find that most business men in this Colony are skeptical about the export of frozen codfish under this Bill. There are much more profitable and easier lines in sight in the shape of herring and halibut, and there is nothing in the Bill that calls for the handling of a single codfish. If, then, the object which this Bill is intended to attain is a doubtful object after it is attained, and still more as seems probable that object, the increased demand for cod, is not likely to be attained at all, then, I say, that we in this House should give pause before we make it law. It is, of course, vaguely said that other things will be developed. No doubt herring and halibut will be exported in cold storage. Well, I don't think that a subsidy should be paid to any company to export halibut or herrings. All the halibut we can get is now being exported in cold storage, without any subsidy, and more is wanted.

Now, I want to refer to previous cold storage bills brought up here during recent years. The first, in 1898, was a very simple one. It gave the Governor in Council power to guarantee for five years an annual payment sufficient to make profits five per cent. on a paid up capital of £30,-

000. The Government had power to fix terms and conditions as it might deem expedient, i.e, the details of the way in which profits were to be calculated, and to appoint a supervisor or representative to check the methods and operations of the company. A company was formed, but, owing to small capital, failed, and during its short existence made absolutely no attempt to handle codfish. This was because they found the difficulties involved in carrying on the business were, upon investigation, much more serious than appeared at first. The next Bill was passed in the House of Assembly in 1903, after much squabbling and fighting, and was sent up to the House two days before the end of the session, and was rightly thrown out. It was brought up again in 1904, the first year Mr. Milley, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Anderson and myself were appointed to this House. The guarantee of the Government was limited to $25,000, and the company undertook to expend each year a large sum in purchasing fish. They undertook to supply bait fish only to our own fishermen, and guaranteed to erect thirteen bait freezers, constantly stocked with bait, from which the fishermen could be supplied. The contract, whatever the reason may have been, had no results. Mr. President, for the information of the Council, I am going to quote from what Mr. Bishop said at that time, and every word he said then is equally applicable, or more applicable, to this Bill. Mr. Bishop said :

"The ostensible object of the "Bill was to promote the expor- "tation of fresh codfish, and yet "the word codfish did not appear "in the Bill from beginning to "end. There was strong reason "to suppose that it was studious- "ly intended that 'codfish' should "not appear in the Bill. What "was the real intention of the "promoters of this measure? "Was it to export or handle fresh "fish? No! Codfish was the last thing they thought of."

Mr. Bishop referred at length to the possibility of lobsters and salmon.

"An amendment had been put "to the Bill since it was first in- "troduced by which the company "were compelled to expend $130,- "000 a year in fresh, but even "here there was no intention of "fresh codfish. He thought the "Government were justified in "offering a bounty for the ex- "porting of fresh codfish, but he "would maintain that they were "not justified in offering a bounty "for the exportation of lobsters "or fish of any other kind. In the "Speech from the Throne, with "which this session of the Legis- "lature opened, the Government "placed in the mouth of His Ex- "cellency words which were in- "tended to convey the idea that "the measure they were to con- "sider was intended to assist in "maintaining high prices for our "principal export. That being so "this Bill as it stood was a frau- "dulent Bill, for the reason that "there was apparently no at- "tempt made to insist that the "company that was to derive "such large bounties from the "Government should handle one "quintal of codfish. And seeing "the importance of the measure, "he hoped that every hon. mem- "ber of the Chamber would "weigh the matter carefully in "his mind, and give the House

"the benefit of his views before "the Bill went through its sec- "ond reading. He might be ask- "ed what he would propose. "Well, he agreed with and would "support any measure that "would call on the Government "of the Colony to pay a consider- "able sum to any person who "would in a bona fide way export "fresh codfish, and he would sug- "gest that a committee be imme- "diately formed to take the mat- "ter into consideration, and draw "up a measure in different form. "In the Bill as it at present "stands there were many objec- "tioable points, whic,h no doubt, "would be brought to the notice "of the Chamber by speakers "who would follow. These ob- "jectionable points were not one "or two ; the Bill was perme- "ated with them."

"Hon. Mr. Greene agreed with "Mr. Bishop. If we only wanted "cold storage for the purpose of "keeping bait fishes during the "year, he thought we were not "going the right way about it. "Why not encourage Mr. Weeks "at Bay Bulls, Mr. Penney at "Ramea, Mr. Rideout at Rose "Blanche, or Bishop & Monroe "at Port aux Basques. He (Mr. "G.) took it that the words "'cold storage' were only in- "tended to be used throughout "the Bill as an auxiliary to the "export of fresh codfish. It was "not to-day or yesterday that the "objections to this Bill had been "known to the Government. "Hon. Mr. Knowling and Hon. "Mr. Pitts had heard the objec- "tions ringing in their ears over "and over again. Where were "the words 'exportation of fresh "codfish.'"

Mr. Bishop moved as an amendment, on April 6, 1904 :— "At least $100,000 of said amount "$130,000, shall be expended in "the purchase of fresh codfish "which shall be exported in cold "storage."

There voted for the amendment, Hons. Bishop, Rendell, Greene, Baird, Ayre and Harvey, and the amendment was lost.

I submit, Mr. President, that every argument used by Mr. Bishop and Mr. Greene at that time holds good to-day. My opinion, Mr. President, is, that if this Bill becomes a real fact, the real business of the company will be the exporting of frozen herring. As I have said before, they are Americans, and it is a question if they do not get these herrings into the American market free of duty, as products of the American fisheries. I have already referred to how America plays up to her own people. I believe Lord and Trefethen to be substantial and reliable people, even though the style of their published correspondence fills one neither with confidence nor admiration. But they are not coming to Newfoundland for philanthropic purposes, and, if they do get their fish in duty free, it is not to be expected, in the absence of all competition, that they will give the fishermen any of it. They must buy as cheaply as they can. In connection with American methods generally in the fish trade, and with American official complacency on the occasion, I am going to request the attention of the House while I refer briefly to the Bay of Islands herring question, and first of all in this connection I want to refer to the Premier's remarks once

again when he was introducing the measure, for the purpose of showing that it was intended to encourage Lord and Trefethen to export frozen herring from other places in this country.

"I say that if our people are "encouraged, and if these cold "storage plants are installed, and "nothing utilized but caplin, "lobsters, turbot, salmon, eels, "flat-fish, and herring, that is, if "they never touch a codfish, "there are millions of dollars in "the industry, if it is properly "exploited. We have a market, "present and increasing, of 90 "million people in the United "States, and nearly eight mil-"lion in Canada, crying out for "cheap food and fish, and, whilst "the demand is increasing, the "cost of producing the article is "not increasing."

Sir Edward laments the fact that Bay of Islands herring are sold and exported for $1.25 per barrel, and maintains that this Bill will ensure their herring smoked and cured. But will it ? I think not. There is nothing in this Bill which calls for the company to smoke herring. I think it will, instead, have the opposite effect, and the evils which Sir Edward deplores in connection with the Bay of Islands fishery will, in this and in other respects, be extended to Placentia and Fortune Bays, and perhaps elsewhere.

Again, Sir Edward says :— "The Bait Act was the first important vote he gave in the Legislature, and it turned out to be the sheet-anchor of Newfoundland. It was that Act which turned our people from being bait catchers for the French into being independent owners."

If the present Bill became operative, would not the tendency be for our people to again become bait fish catchers for foreigners. There can be little doubt that Lord and Trefethen will engage extensively in the herring business, and it is quite certain that a large quantity of herring will find its way into the vessels of the American banking fleet. I am not dealing with the legal aspect of the Bill when I say this ; I do not dispute the professional opinions that have been given, but I refer purely to the practical business side of it and the way I am sure it will work out. There is no doubt but that our Bait Act is an immensely strong weapon. We are all agreed upon that. But, strong weapon as it is, it has one weak point. That weak point is the Bay of Islands herring fishery. That Bay of Islands herring fishery provides the American bankers and also the shore fishing boats of New England with their bait. The Bay of Islands position is the weak link in the chain. Not only the American, but the Canadian shipments from Bay of Islands tend to weaken our position. The business is in reality not a very reputable one. I should like to read the oath which is taken by the masters of American vessels that take up herring to Gloucester and elsewhere. It is as follows :—

I, Master crew of the fishing schoner do solemnly, sincerely, and truly swear that the now on board of the said schooner lately arrived from a fishing voyage from , was caught by us, the said captain and crew, with

the assistance of men, boats and gear, hired for the purpose, and is the product of the American fisheries, and that no portion of said cargo was purchased or obtained otherwise than by the above means

Sworn to this day of , 1911, before me.

That is the declaration which every schooner master makes when he enters a cargo of herring bought for $1.25 per barrel in Newfoundland waters. Thereupon the owner of the schooner corroborates that declaration with the following one :—

I, , owner or agent of the schooner , do solemnly swear that the above statement of the captain and crew of the said schooner is true to the best of my knowledge and belief, and I further swear that said fish are the products of American fisheries.

I think we are justified in condemning these things in rather strong language. I contend that whatever we do in connection with Bay of Islands, we should not risk the extension of this system to other Bays.

I have read what takes place between the American skipper, owner, and Customs official at Gloucester and elsewhere in connection with these herring. Now let us see where Newfoundland stands when she permits the American under certain stipulations to which he undertakes to conform, to purchase herring freely in her waters. He takes from Newfoundland the following license by which he is in honor bound.

"Permission is hereby granted to the said vessel during the herring fishery season, 19 , to purchase and have on board between Cape Ray and Cape Norman on West Coast of this Colony a supply of **bait fishes for exportation of food purposes** , and in conformity with and subject to Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (Second series)."

Now, I ask if anyone in this House believes that these herring purchased and exported under the understanding that they are to be used exclusively for food purposes are not used for bait ?

If we are desirious of developing the herring fishery I have to say that I am of opinion that this is not the right way to go about it. The development of our herring business can only be obtained as a result of scientific study and experiment, and my personal view is that it can only be done through drift-net fishing.

Is it not a fact to-day American boats are fishing off New England coast with Bay of Islands herring ? That the entire banking fleet will fit out with Bay of Islands herring ? That Canadian fishermen are now fitting out with them ? It is impossible for Newfoundland to follow those herring when they have once left our shores. It is impossible for even the man who takes the license with this undertaking attached to it to control the disposal of the herring after he has reached his destination.

Now are we to extend this system to every Bay in the Island ? Are we to further weaken the Bait Act which we all talk and profess so much about ?

It is not a question of technical breach of the Act. It is a tangible and practical weaken-

ing of the whole policy. From the Premier's speech and from the preamble to this contract itself wherein the Government express the desire to facilitate the lessees in the marketing of frozen fish, it would appear that we are intended to support the export of frozen bait from Placentia and Fortune Bays. Once launched can it be stopped without raising a question of vested interests ? It is thus that American officialdom backs up its own, and this tendency is well exemplified by the new Treasury regulations upon the duty question.

I think the American Government will look kindly upon the products of Lord and Trefethen and if so are we to sit down and see our own people shut out ? The Hague Award, as we know, practically considered, gave us a substantial victory. The United States know it too. But these new Treasury regulations appear to be simply a deliberate attempt to nullify the award and to hold the business, which is legitimately, for their own people still,. In other words, to practically reverse the result. The first clause in the regulations reads as follows, and if it held good, British vessels and British subjects would be doing most of the herring business from Bay of Islands instead of Americans.

"(1) An American fishery, "within the meaning of said "paragraph, is defined as a fish- "ery operated under the Ameri- "can flag by American vessels in "foreign waters, which vessels "have the right, by treaty or "otherwise, to take fish and other "marine products. The product "of such fisheries will be held to "include fish, oil, bone, sponges, "turtles and all other marine "products."

After reading this eminently reasonable definition it is rather disconcerting to read its development by the time it has reached Section 3.

Section 3 is as follows :

"(3) Fish taken from the "water by members of the crew "of an American vessel (who "may be either American citi- "zens or foreigners), or by "foreign fishermen in the pre- "sence of such vessel, and under "the supervision of its master or "crew, and in pursuance of an "employment for that purpose "whether with foreign boats, "nets, gear and tackle, or with "boats, nets, etc., provided for "such purpose by the fishing ves- "sel, and brought by such fishing "vessel to a port of this coun- "try, or transhipped to another "vessel as hereinafter provided, "will be entitled to free entry.

"In other words, the employ- "ment of foreign fishermen "either as members of the crew, "or under the supervision of the "master or crew of an Ameri- "can vessel, is allowed."

These you will understand are the new regulations since the Hague Award, and it is not difficult to see that they are designed to enable Glocester to hold the business.

Now there is another point in this Bill which to me is fully as important as the one I have just been speaking of, namely, the impossibility of following the herring. I cannot understand nor am I surprised that the supporters of the Bill have given no explanation of the point, why it is that the Government during the last three weeks have refused

Captain Corkum the right to export herring for food purposes, and the very next day a Bill is brought into the House to charter two Americans to do it for fifteen years, and to do it in five places instead of one. It is surely an absolute reversal of the whole fishery policy of this country. I think this right should be strictly held in our own hands, and that none but Newfoundlanders, and they only under rigid and temporary licence, should be permitted to export herring in cold storage. A most important factor to be considered in the situation is that at the present time, so far at least as the South Coast is concerned, and until conditions change, we do not want herring exported in cold storage at all. Our people are dependent on herring for bait. It is a singular thing that an American can come down to our coast for herring and our fishermen prefer to sell to him rather than to our own people. During the time that Capt. Corkum was down in Fortune Bay rounding up 800 barrels of herring it was impossible for our own people to get herring for bait. The bankers were trying to buy it. Yet they could not get any. The fishermen at Rose Blanche have been short of bait for some time past, and the same thing obtains every year during the early shore fishery in Placentia Bay. The great question is bait ; people cannot get bait and their fishing entirely depends on that. For that reason I am opposed to letting any foreign company come here and take away from our bays the bait fishes which are so valuable to our own people, so long as they are as scarce as they are now. There are three things which make this policy detrimental :

1st—Our own fishermen are dependent on bait, and this bait is only sufficient for their use.

2nd—We cannot follow the herrings which are taken away from our shores into the American market, and therefore cannot obtain legal proof whether they are used as bait fishes or food fishes, though we know in fact they are used for bait.

3rd—It is certainly a reversal of the time-honored policy of our country towards Americans.

Our very existence depends on our bait fishes. I feel this more in view of the position which may develop between Canada and the United States. Our bait has given us pre-eminence in the North American Atlantic fisheries and it is within the bounds of possibility that we may be one day forced to use it in dealing with our sister Colony. The importance of our bait supply to Canadian fishing interests is shown by the fact that 100 Canadian bankers baited here on squid and 100 more on caplin during the season of 1910. They spent altogether about $30,000 in bait. Canada's attitude in fishery matters to this Colony can hardly be commended. During all the time that we were fighting and beating the French single handed, when she was benefitting as much as we were by our struggle, she kept supplying French fishermen with bait, thus compromising our success, though benefitting by the higher prices that we procured her for her catch. Now we see her after successfully protesting against Newfoundland making an exclusive Fishery Treaty with the United States,

stepping in and deliberately and shrewedly doing that very thing herself. Gentlemen, it is possibly undesirable to discuss Reciprocity at this time and in this place, but I must say this. That as sure as we are sitting in this House, if Canada gets Reciprocity and we are shut out, we shall be ruined. We shall be ruined or forced into Confederation whether we like it or not. Our only weapon of defence and offence will be, as it has been before, complete control of our bait fish. Don't let us compromise them, and I repeat, that in my opinion, we must, if Canada gets Reciprocity, get it too as quick as we can or go into Confederation. I know that many persons of much greater weight than myself however, are not of my way of thinking. I think our vessels will have to register in Canada and our fish exporters will have to move to Halifax. The possibility of either phase of Reciprocity has a distinct bearing upon this Bill. If we get Reciprocity ourselves there seems to me to be no need of this Bill. We shall need no subsidized American company with possible free entry into American markets to export our fish for us. These are my main reasons for opposing the Bill. One little unimportant detail involving a kind of legal conundrum I will submit to the legal members of this House for solution. These gentlemen are to have four factories and a floating factory. This floating factory must be a ship of considerable size and as such must be registered. There is the Merchants' Shipping Act which says no American can be registered as owner of a British ship. There is our own Customs regulations which says no American vessel is allowed to move from one port of the Colony to another, nor to fish, nor even to buy anything. If she is to fish, or buy fish, or even move about she must be English register, and she must be owned by someone else beside Lord and Trefethen, and she cannot then come under this contract. The only vessel they can own would be an American vessel and she can not coast, or fish, or buy fish. So we deduce this. If they own her they can't use, and if they use her they can't own her, or get the subsidy for her, or fulfill their undertaking. What do my legal friends make of the problem ?

Hon. Mr. Greene—They won't get the bounty. That is the intention of the Government.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—Gentlemen I have come to the end of what I intended to say and I fear I have tried your patience. My objections to the Bill might be summarized as follows :

(a) Absence of detail and of clearly defined stipulations, so that the intention of the Legislature that the subsidy shall only be paid in a certain event, is not properly safeguarded. In this respect this Contract is such that no business man would sign it on account of his own firm as it now stands.

(b) The contract is too extensive both in area to be covered and in the term of years of the charter and subsidy.

(c) It is not likely to develop the export of frozen codfish, and it is not the way to develop the herring business.

(d) We have not herring enough to-day for ourselves.

(e) The export of bait fishes, in a form in which they can be afterwards used as bait, should be permitted to none but Newfoundlanders, under licence, at least of all, should it be permitted to American citizens over a long period of years. This appears to me to be a matter of national principle.

(f) The contract, combined with the speeches with which it has been introduced in both Houses, appears to constitute a complete and unexplained reversal of our policy of refusing to issue to foreigners licences to export herring, even for food purposes, from any but the Treaty Coast. We cannot follow these fish after they leave this Colony and there seems to me no possible way to prevent their use for bait purposes afterwards.

(g) If Reciprocity between the United States and Canada alone comes, we must as a first requisite for self-preservation, have our positon in respect to our bait fishes absolutely uncompromising in any way. If we get Reciprocity ourselves, our own people will be able to export frozen herring, and a subsidy to a foreign company will be most detrimental to the Colony's interests.

(h) The contract is not required to develop a halibut export. All the halibut that can be obtained are now being exported without any Government assistance. The contract would only stifle healthy competition.

(i) It would be better that any company to which these or modified concessions are given should be registered either here or under British or Colonial laws.

I regard these reasons as being of such serious import to this Colony to suggest so much of real risk to its welfare, that, desirious as I am of supporting it, I find it utterly impossible in fairness to my own principles, and in view of the trust which a seat in this House carries with it, to do otherwise than vote against its second reading.

Hon. D. J. Greene—I am in favor of cold storage, as is everybody, but the Bill is surrounded with so many objectionable conditions and enactments dissimilar and foreign to cold storage itself that I am constrained to vote against it. I would have been prepared to vote for the second reading and endeavored in committee to have the clauses I object to expunged, but these form such an important and unseparable part of the whole agreement that to concede them would be to destroy the Bill. I therefore consider that this is the proper time and place to record my objections and my vote, at a later period I hope to be able to explain my reasons for my line of action.

The motion for second reading was then put and there voted for it : Hons. Bishop, Harris, Robinson, Gibbs, Ayre and McLaughlan ; against, Hons. Harvey, Greene and Ryan. The motion was carried.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

The second reading of the Esquimaux and Indian Labrador Bill was deferred until to-morrow

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House then adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, at 4 p.m.

FRIDAY, March 3rd.

Pursuant to adjourment the House met at 4 o'clock, Hon. the President in the Chair.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House went into committee on the Cold Storage Bill. Hon. Jas. Angle took the chair of Committee.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—Mr. Chairman, all measures which have for their objects the introduction of newer and more progressive ideas and methods in the field of social and industrial activity usually meet with opposition. We cannot expect to have unanimity of opinion upon all subjects, but what is required when opposition comes from intelligent persons is that they should advance sensible arguments. In this, I must confess, that I have been disappointed in listening to the speech of the Hon. Mr. Harvey. The reasons advanced appear to me to be the best justification for the passing of this Bill. The assertion made by him that local capital can be found to engage in cold storage is not borne out by facts of any kind ; on the contrary, all the evidence is against him in this respect, because we have had cold storage acts upon our Statute Book for the past ten years, and no effort whatever was made to take advantage of them. The fact that local capital, some years ago, could be found to engage in the whaling industry is no justification for the belief that it will now invest in cold storage operations ; on the contrary, the history of whaling has been one of disaster due to wild and reckless speculation, and numbers of our people have lost largely in operations connected with novel enterprises in fishing is the best argument that can be advanced that they will not do so again. The local investor in the whaling industry had, at the time, evidence before him of large profits being made by some companies in the industry, hence his inducement to invest, but with the industry which this Bill has for its object, he has none whatever ; he is unacquainted with the mode and manner of carrying it on or the markets where the products may be sold. The hon. member says that if the industry can show returns, he can get the capital. Surely he does not want the Government to establish the industry out of the country's revenues in order to demonstrate that it will be a dividend paying enterprise. He might as well ask that the Government should, when the manufacture of boots and shoes and rope was first mooted, that the Government should establish and carry on these industries in order that the investor may have demonstrated to him the undoubted and absolute safety of capital which he may invest. I have never heard such an argument advanced before. He then complains that the terms of the Bill are loose ; for instance, that "continuous operation" is not sufficiently defined in the Bill. The schedule to the Bill provides that the lessees agree to maintain the cold storage plants in continuous operation ; if that is not sufficiently clear, then we have the Courts to decide what is meant by continuous operation. Continuous operation would not mean doing so for the purpose of getting the Government subsidy because that would not be a bona

fide operation within the meaning of the Act ; and it is not conceivable that any company or individuals are going to invest money in an enterprise that will not pay a greater dividend than five per cent. By way of endeavoring to substantiate his arguments against the passing of the Bill he instances that there is now a smoke house in Bay of Islands which cost but $50 and that Mr. Clouston has a smoke house and glue factory which cost but $500. My answer to that statement is : If smoke houses and glue factories can be erected with so little capital then the Colony's liability will be very small indeed, because we will only have to pay in the event of loss on operations upon the invested capital. But the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, is not serious in making statements of the kind ; it is not $50 smoke houses which will be erected, but a class which will cost very many times greater than this amount. Another reason advanced is that a guarantee (such as this Bill proposes to give the lessees) without security is not justifiable. What the hon. member means I am at a loss to understand. If he means that a guarantee should be given by the lessees for the carrying out of the contract, then I cannot agree with him, because the Colony is not giving them anything upon which the taxpayer's money will be spent ; on the contrary, it is the contractors who have to spend the money to make the improvement. In the case of the railway a guarantee had to be given because we were parting with something which the taxpayer had been taxed by succeeding Governments to build. The best and safest guarante that we can have under this contract is the establishment of the enterprise and the handling of the produce of our fisheries. The plants to be established under this Bill must mean the investment of at least $1,000,000, that is the guarantee the country requires, not a guarantee of the kind which the hon. member alludes to.

Another contention of his is that in the Bill there is no stipulation as to the amount to be paid the manager and other officials of the company by way of salaries, that because of this the company may charge very large amounts in their books under this heading in order to get the Government guarantee. In this argument the hon. member is not very happy, because, in the first place, the question of loss upon the operations has to be determined by the Government before paying any amount, the books of account of the company can be subjected to an audit, and if the Government finds that managers and others have been paid salaries beyond the value of their services, they will refuse to pay until the amounts of salaries are rectified. It is not a difficult matter for the Government or any individual to find out what is a fair salary to be paid to managers and others connected with enterprises of this kind. I have no doubt but the hon. member could find it out in four hours. It is not conceivable that such can be done or that any Government would permit or be a party to fraud of the sort.

Another argument is that there is nothing in the Act to compel the lessees to insure. Does the hon. member presume that Trefethen and Lord and others are

going into the business of cold storage for sport ! Will they not take the same precautions as the ordinary business man does, and even if they do not insure, what does it matter to the Government, so far as the guarantee is concerned ; the payment, if any, to be paid, is contingent upon the operation of the plants. Surely he cannot by any stretch of imagination suppose that the Colony would have to pay for carelessness, and then again that business people in the United States are insane enough to carry on business in a manner different from others. Does not the history of industrial operations of the United States show the contrary to be the policy, and that system of thoroughness and attention to organization and detail so characteristic of them, will enter into their work and mode of carrying on business here.

Because there is no provision of registration of the company, the hon. member sees further trouble in store for the Colony, because, he says, suppose the Government should decide to stop the export of herring by the company, because of violations of the Bait Act, all sorts of claims would be made against the Colony, and the American Government would support them in ths particular. My answer to him is that the American Government would not be a party in lending its aid to enforce payment of dishonest claims, no self-respecting Government would ; and that the Government of the United States could not do so with much show of justification, because the company would not be operating under an agreement of an international character ; they would be here amenable to our courts ; their contracts are made here and are not the subject of international or treaty rights or obligations. His next argument is that this agreement should provide for the cold storage of codfish only. Early in his speech he ridicules the enterprise by his reference to $50 smoke houses ; now he sees a possibility that there may be something in it ; and now he wants to hedge it around with conditions so as to make it impossible. Personally I would not give a measure my earnest support which made provision for the cold storage of codfish only. We have myriads of fish swarming in the waters around our coast which are very much more valuable than cod. It seems strange that for centuries we have failed to realize this fact, but fact it is nevertheless. All of these can be turned into money. This cannot be done without the employment of labor. Year after year, caplin and other fish swarm our bays, and are used in a great measure, as fertilizers for the land, squid in countless thousands going ashore in the bays and creeks around our shores are carted away and put in manure pits. Does it not look like abusing the gifts which a bountiful Providence has placed within our reach to use them in such a manner. Suppose that instead of allowing them to rot and fester under the sun they were turned into gold, which is the better ; I take it using them for the purpose for which nature hath decreed they should be. How can this be done, only through the agency of cold storage, and this means labor and

money in circulation amongst our people. The company cannot take away a lobster without paying a higher price than the factory is prepared to pay for it. Who gets the benefit of this ? The fisherman, he who produces the greater portion of our wealth.

We want this company to do more than freeze cod, we want it to handle all kinds of fish, whether it be fresh or salt, the more fish buyers there are the higher will be the price paid for fish. For years competition was not keen for fish, but with the advent of Canadians and others among us competition has become keen, and as a result better prices for the catcher. If this company would do no more than handle the produce of the fall and winter fisheries on the West Coast, it would, to say the least, be doing a great deal. The hon. member fears that there will be too many plants established by this company. Evidently his fears justify the suspicion that there is going to be a continuous operation. Why fear the erection of too many plants. The more the better, because it means greater purchasing and marketing of our products ; but, almost in thesame breath, he says, what we want is proof that the cold storage can be successfully carried on, because fish deteriorates in the handling and fish is cheap in the States. Now, the hon. member's arguments are, to say the least, very contradictory. Because, in the first place, if they are going to erect a number of plants, which he seems to anticipate they will, they must certainly be possessed of the knowledge and ability to successfully handle what they will purchase. No company is going to buy or spend money in acquiring that which they cannot dispose of. In the second place, the lessees are specialists in the frozen fish business, have been engaged in it for years, competing with the Gloucester fish firms, and know, notwithstanding the distance they are from the fishing grounds, that frozen fish have for many years ago passed from the experimental stage. In the third, if fish is cheap in the States, for what reason have we been for years knocking at the door of the United States for free fish entry ? Does the hon. member not see what a dilemma his arguments place him in. Fish is not cheap in the States, on the contrary, it is becoming more expensive every day, and the supply is only to those who have the good fortune to live along the seaboard.

In a lengthy, brilliantly written article in the Boston Transcript, Mr. Coburn says :

"By the time the fish, which bring such prices at the wharf, have reached the kitchen, they represent totals on the market man's bill which make the alarmed housewife feel sure the finny tribes of the Atlantic have fallen into the clutch of some grasping octopus of a trust.

"It is not, however, a voracious monopoly, but a voracious populace, and prospective high prices of fish are to be charged. When a steadily decreasing supply meets a steadily increasing demand, what is likely to happen ?

"No housewife, therefore, need be surprised if she has to pay half a dollar for a mackerel which once she could have bought for 15 or 20 cents."

The next argument of the hon. member is that it is not necessary to give a subsidy for the halibut or herring fishery. He forgets that when we attempted to hinder the operations of the big American herring fleet, that inducements were held out to the trade to engage in it, but none could be found. If this argument is good to-day, it must have been more so then. Why does not the trade go into the herring business ? Various bays have been teeming with herring the past year, but none of our local trade can be found to catch and market them. Why should all this wealth, inviting us as it were to make use of it, be not availed of. Does it not show a lack of proper appreciation of the gifts of Providence ? If it is not necessary to subsidize the fishery, then why, I ask again, is it not prosecuted ? The American halibut catchers caught $500,000 worth of halibut last year around our coasts. If we had these plants in operation, the greater portion of halibut, under the operation of this cold storage measure, would be handled by them, and our own people, in all probability, employed in catching it, and the country and trade thereby getting the benefit. We have halibut in galore, but not purchasers. I have seen fishermen fishing for cod, and when they caught a halibut would throw it away. Is not this a disgraceful condition of affairs, but, nevertheless it is true, and still some are opposed to applying a remedy to prevent this waste of wealth.

Look at the waste which goes on in connection with our fisheries. One-third of the fish, and really the most valuable part, is thrown away. The head, tongue, sounds, blood, entrails, and other parts, all of which taken together are of more value than the part cured by the fishermen. Is it not time to stop this waste ? We might increase the productive wealth of our fisheries, at least, fifty per cent. more than they are by applying these agencies which science and civilization have given the world, and when we are either unwilling or unable of ourselves to do so, we should not be so churlish as to prevent others.

The hon. member in his interpretation of the cold storage contract of 1904, is not strictly correct as regards bait stores. There was an obligation on the part of a company taking advantage of the provisions of that Act to maintain bait stores, but if the company could not operate them at a profit, and the Government required them to do so, then the Government would have to make the loss good.

With regard to the attitude of the Hon. Mr. Bishop on the 1904 Act, the Hon. Mr. Harvey fails to draw a distinction between men of straw, seeking the advantages of the Act, and those who are financially able to shoulder the responsibilities. The opposition of Hon. Mr. Bishop was against dealing with men who were promoters only, and not operators. But, suppose Hon. Mr. Bishop was at the time opposed to the principle of cold storage, surely that is no argument why he should be of the same opinion today. The man who never changes his opinions, in other words, the consistent man, is not always wise. The world, if I may use the word, is changing around us every day. Science and invention and development in the

economic and industrial world compel us to change our opinions and ideas of this material world. Changes are rapidly taking place in every walk of life of the most striking character. Since 1904 kingdoms have crumbled, republics have been grounded on their ruins and nations have risen from a semi-barbous state. If the hon. member clings to opinions and ideas formed seven years ago, then he is not of the class of business men I take him to be. With regard to this contention that the real business of the lessees is to handle frozen herring, surely he must see the absurdity of this statement upon the face of it. For what purpose are they going to erect five smoke houses, five fish packing establishments, two glue factories and two fertilizing factories ? Is it to show tourists or themselves to look at ? They must erect them for purposes and objects defined in the schedule of this Bill, and further they must continuously operate them. They cannot operate them without smoking herring in the smoke houses or packing fish in the fish packing establishments. The real reason why they will put up the various factories referred to is because labor is cheaper in Newfoundland, there are no city taxes or rents to be paid, they are where the natural products to supply the factories are. The lessees have been in the fish business for years, they realize how much cheaper it is to carry on their business operation here, and they want to seize the opportunity to cater to a growing demand and not wait until the opportunity passes.

Herring fishing, as it is carried on to-day, scarcely pays. When we take the losses and profit one year with another, I very much fear that the balance will be on the former side. This country is not getting enough out of the herring industry. Every one of the 100,000 barrels caught in Bay of Islands should be smoked and packed there. Our people should have this employment instead of the people in Gloucester, and it is worth an effort on our part to try and bring this about. The lessees may establish themselves on the Treaty Coast and do all which this Bill calls for without exercising or being able to exercise control over them, but, because it is desirable in the interest of this country that some control should be exercised, some effort made to turn to account the vast wealth of the waters around our coasts that the Government has introduced this Bill. Suppose instead of 100,000 barrels of herring caught last year there were 500,000 caught and marketed, what prosperity and happiness would be in many a home to-day.

The hon. member asks what is in this Bill to alter the $1.25 a barrel now paid for herring, rather will it not be extending it to other bays. Competition will alter it by having more purchasers for herring than we have at present, marketing a portion at least, of the catch different from the method now prevailing. Competition means increased demand and this means higher prices for the herring catcher besides giving employment to our people. The argument that smoked fish have to be used quickly else they would deteriorate, but statistics

point to the fact that there is not enough of smoked fish, consequently there cannot be that deterioration which the hon. member foresees. The demand is growing, not abating, prices are rising, not declining ; fish, whereever possible, is entering into the daily bill of fare of people, we have the goods and we must get ready to supply them. If we are not prepared ourselves then we must let others do so. Why deprecate the fact that if this Bill passes it will cause a number of men to go herring catching instead of cod fishing. A similar argument was made use of when the railway development was first entered upon in this country, namely, that it would take a number of men away from the fishery. Time has proved the absurdity of this notion. We want diversity of employment in this country, the more can be found the better for the country. We are spending over $300,000 in education. For what purpose ? To develop the brains and elevate the thoughts of the rising generation. This means that they will not when they leave school work under the same conditions, and for the same small remuneration as their fathers did, and if better conditions and remuneration for labor cannot be found here they will go elsewhere and help to build up the industries and wealth of other lands instead of their own. Is this a desirable condition of affairs ? I trow not. Rather let us seek by our public acts and utterances to instil into the minds of the young that the country has a future for all, and that we will, in order to make that future a reality, increase the field of activities.

It is contended that we cannot follow the herring to market and see the use to which they are applied because the lessees will not have to take licenses. We cannot compel, nor never could, strictly speaking, Americans to take licenses so far as the Treaty Coast is concerned, and could not prevent them from using every herring they might catch for bait. But this company operating under a Newfoundland charter can be prevented from selling the herring or other bait fishes to supply the foreigners. If at any time the Government finds that the industry is being used as a base to put weapons into the hand of rivals, we have the Bait Act on our Statute Book and through its agency we could prevent it, but the hon. member's fears are groundless. It is easy to imagine all kinds of evil can happen, our imaginations at times runs riot, if we let our imaginations control our reason, then, indeed, our lot would be a very unhappy one. The fears of the hon. member that the parties named in this Bill may export boneless codfish into the United States free of duty shows to what an extent his imagination is governing his arguments. If they can get boneless codfish in free of duty, so much the better for this country because that means a market for fish we did not have before. The fish have to be caught and handled here. It means more purchasers, less hard dried fish, employment for our people, and enhanced prices to the catcher and exporter alike. Is not this a state of affairs desired by all.

Another argument is why refuse Capt. Corkum permission to buy herring and give Lord and

Company the right to do so for fifteen years. The hon. member certainly could not have given much thought to the consideration of this measure, because if he did he would realize the utter absurdity of this argument. The one is a bird of passage, who comes to our shores, and for aught we know, wants to purchase the herring to aid in abetting the Gloucester fleet ; he has no interest whatever in Newfoundland, we may never see him again. With the others we have evidence of their financial stability ; that within a few years they will be compelled under this Bill to expend hundreds of thousands of dollars of capital in the country ; their success means success to the country ; their interests are in a large measure bound up in the country's ; and their prosperity must mean increased prices to the fishermen for the fruits of their toil. The hon. member says that we do not want any herring exported in cold storage. According to him it is much better to see them exported as they are, and helping to build up Gloucester, and giving employment to others. How unpatriotic is the policy of the hon. member. Why should we not make every effort to handle the herring in our own country, and get all we can from the industry. Hundreds of barrels of herring are salted and put in to barrels made by our people, and the best price they could, very often, obtain for them was $2.00 a barrel. Mark you, $2.00. They caught the herring, gibed and salted them, made the barrels and packed them, paid the freight to Halifax, and the returns in many cases did not exceed $2.00 a barrel. Why ! Because competitors for them are few. There is no other means of handling the spring herring fishery in St. George's Bay, and the result of their season's operations very often means loss instead of gain. If we had a cold storage plant in this locality, this herring fishery would be made invaluable, because the Halifax buyer would have to come to St. George's Bay, instead of our people going to them. There is a very large trade done in sections of the West Coast with Halifax which might be done here. There is a means towards that end. We cannot expect the fishermen on the coast to trade here when we make no attempt to handle the fish caught by them. Not export any herring in cold storage. Surely, the hon. member cannot be serious when he thus addresses himself to the subject before the House. An argument of this kind is like putting back the hand on the dial of progress. Why, sir, cold storage is what we have been hoping for for years. Has he read of what cold storage has done for other countries ? If he did he must have forgotten the facts. For years in New Zealand, which is a great farming country, the carcasses of sheep and cattle were of no value ; they were simply slaughtered, the former for their wool, and the latter for their hide. The carcasses were thrown into manure pits, except what was consumed locally. One can scarcely believe this when we consider that in this community we are paying 18 and 20 cents a pound for what the New Zealander used to throw away. Some bright mind in New Zealand undertook, with the Government

aid, to handle the meat by means of cold storage. Then, as now, there was opposition to the Government giving aid or subsidy. What has been the result of the cold storage industry in New Zealand. In 1882 cold storage was first applied in the export of meat. In that year the export amounted to 1,707,328 lbs., valued at $931,-115. In 1908 the export was 237,473,936 lbs., valued at $15,-304,872 ; thus, in 26 years, the industry has multiplied nearly 126 times. But, if we stop here, so far as New Zealand is concerned, we would fail to realize the full effect which cold storage has had upon the country. In 1882 the export of wool was 65,322,707, valued at $14,969,059 ; in 1908 it had risen to 171,635,595 pounds, having a value of $36,754,934.

The number of horned in 1882 was 698,637 ; in 1908 it had increased to 1,773,326. The number of sheep in 1882 was 12,985,-685 ; in 1908 had increased 22,-449,053.

The effect of the export of meat in cold storage is even still more marked in the number of acres of land under cultivation as compared with 1882 and 1908. In 1882 the number of acres of land under cultivation was 5,-651,255 ; in 1908, 15,566,308 ; in 1882 the number of holdings over one was 27,352, in 1908, 75,152.

In consequence of the introduction of cold storage the country advanced by leaps and bounds as is still further shown by its Savings Banks deposits. In 1882 balance of deposits was $68,358 ; balances to credit of $7,437,672 ; in 1908, number of deposits, $388,954 ; balances to credit, of $64,858,877.

Here is a record which, to say the least, is wonderful. What brought it about ? Cold storage. Then, as now, I have no doubt, there were doubting Thomases. Another example of what Government aid can do is the butter industry of the country whose marvelous progress I have been relating. For years the industry was being conducted at a loss. The Government resolved to aid and assist it, which they did, with the result that the export butter industry has grown from a few thousand dollars in value to $5,-621,637 in 1908.

The hon. member says that the bait supply is even insufficient for our fisheries. The hon. member when travelling this country could not have been as wide awake as he should, because if he did he must see the awful, nay, criminal, waste and destruction of bait fishes which goes on from one end of the country to the other. Why, there are many places in different bays where the stench from bait fishes which go ashore is so bad that one has to grasp his nasal organ. Scarcity of bait, why in one or two places I have seen enough of decomposed bait fishes on the sea shore to supply the whole of our fishing fleet for more than a year. He thinks it would be a suicidal policy to permit of the export of herring in cold storage because they may be used for bait as the control of bait has enabled us to deplete the Gloucester fleet. Who has said that the lessees are going to cold storage herring for bait ? Nobody has said so, and even if it were true that the lessees had any such intention in entering upon this enterprise we have the Bait Act to

prevent them or any others from using herring for such purpose. It is not correct that the control of bait has enable us to deplete the Gloucester fleet. The reason why the fleet is not so numerous as heretofore is because the expense of building vessels is so great, the outfit costing very much more than formerly, and the very high wages which have to be paid to men to engage in it. These are the factors that are bringing about a depletion in the Gloucester fleet and not our bait control. It is becoming more difficult each year to prosecute the industry because of the attractions which American industrial life hold out and the dangers and hardships connected with the enterprise. The greater number of men prefer work on the land compared with the dangers of the sea. Messrs. Lord and Trefethen know this, realize that it is only a matter of time when the industry will be like the New Bedford whaling ndustry, a thing of the past. Where then can they find the material to catch the fish, and the fish as well, why here, and here they are coming to be on the ground floor, to use a company expression, to be first in the field.

He complains of Canada in the past having protested against reciprocity, and now she makes a Treaty. But why complain! Because, according to him, fish is cheap in the United States, therefore reciprocity would be of no value. The hon. member's complaint about Canada is practically the same as some of the politicians in England. The politicians in England who are complaining of Canada's treaty making were the ones who gave Canada the right to do so. The hon. member's picture of what will happen unless we either participate in the Canadian arrangement with the United States or get Reciprocity is very gloomy indeed. He says either Confederation or the country is going to the wall. I heard the same argument some years ago when the railway contract of 1898 was before the legislature. All sorts of gloomy forebodings were indulged in, and dire disaster predicted, but time since then has ushered in neither one nor the other, on the contrary, even some of those who then painted the picture of adversity to-day admit of the blessings and advantages which the country is reaping from that contract. But I want to inform the hon. member that this country can get along, and has done so, without assistance from either Canada or the United States. We shall go to neither one nor the other as a suppliant. If they want reciprocal trade we are ready to negotiate; if they do not we can well work out our own salvation without their aid. The present Government has the most unbounded confidence in the country's future, and are bending their best energies to make the future full of opportunities for the rising generation. We cannot afford to wait, like Micawber, "for something to turn up," the prizes to-day go those who act quickly. There is no monopoly attempted to be given by this Bill. The hon. member or his friends or the local capital which he refers to, can obtain from the Government, if they are prepared to establish similar industries, concessions identical with those contained in this Bill. Here is

an offer not made for the purpose of advancing this measure thro the Committee stage, but made in all candour and sincerity. History affords us many striking examples of opposition to innovation in industrial pursuits. The people of Lancashire demolished the cotton gins when they were first introduced, because they thought they would decrease the number of workers. The people of Paris smashed the silk looms, and threatened dire destruction on the head of the inventor. But time and the multiplication of industrial wealth in those fields have caused the names of the inventors of those machines, who were once desecrated, to be the true pioneers of human progress. In like manner, I believe that those who now oppose the introduction of cold storage into our fishing pursuits, will live to see the fears which fill their breasts to-day allayed by the success of the industry. For centuries we have been putting up fish in the same manner, travelling the same road, indifferent to the fact of the changes in the tastes and habits of the people, and still some prefer to see a continuation of this. What has been the history of the fishing industry in the country ; has it not been one of disaster to all concerned ; even to-day the profits from the industry are not so great. Why has disaster so often overtaken those who have been engaged in it ? Because we have steadily pursued the same old way, the same old system, and shipped to the same markets to which we have been shipping for years, the result being that we have little or no control over the export price. We forget that fish to-day is put up in such a manner as to attract the eye, that while the hard cure suits one market a different one is required for another. We depend solely upon the Latin races to market the catch of cod, the price which they pay rests largely with them, consequently, if we had a very successful fishery, the price they could pay would be be very much less than is paid to-day. Nature has been very kind to us in the marketing of our fish the past year. Short catches by the Canadian and United States fishermen have sent buyers to our shores purchasing cod. Their competition has increased the prices. This competition we should endeavor to maintain. This we can do if we only rise to the occasion and view this measure from a broad standpoint. At our door are 90,000,000 of the richest people on earth, three-fourths of them never see fish, they want it, they have the wealth to buy it, shall we not sell it to them ! According to the hon. member we should not avail ourselves of that opportunity. Every country and city in the New World that is in a state of development offers facilities and advantages for the investment of capital in some free building sites and immunity from taxation. In Montreal, not very long ago, the city made the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a present of a million dollar site for a station. Canada and New Zealand offer a bonus upon every gallon of crude petroleum raised in their country.

The concessions sought to be given by this Bill the taxpayer will feel very little difficulty in responding to. It will not increase his obligations, but rather increase his earning power by in-

creasing the price of fish. This industry will be unlike any other established here, all others the local consumer has to pay increased prices for the products of them, such as tobacco, oleo, boots and shoes and clothes, all these are protected by a tariff to keep out the imported article, and for the privilege of using the local made article the consumer pays a higher price for it, that is the history of protection the world over. This industry will tax the local consumer, the people of the United States and other places will be the purchasers of its products, and the more purchasers can be found the better for the industry. This is an industry then unlike any other established here. It does not say to our people, yes, we are prepared to invest money in your country, but in return for this it will cost you more to live, some necessary of life is going to be made dearer, but rather the reverse. The establishment of this industry will aid the fishermen to get better prices for fish, to handle more money, and become better acquainted with its purchasing power than he is today. I have seen urged as a reason why this Bill should not pass the most nonsensical argument, for instance, the proposed agreement will be advantageous to some while others wi'l have to share the burden of the $25,000. Is not this the history of every industrial undertaking the world over ? Is it not the history of industrial enterprise here ? The greater number of factories are established in the city, but still we never heard the objection urged before that because the labor connected with the carrying on of the various industries is monopolized by St. John's that the city gets the benefit while others bear the burden.

Then again it has been stated as a reason why this measure should not become law that if the company did pay more to a few fishermen the rest would not benefit, and that the storage plants will not be put up at points of vantage to the fishermen. This is certainly a most ridiculous argument, because you cannot increase the earning power of a section of the community without the whole benefitting. Every industry which increases the earning power of a people benefits the whole people. The only place where factories can be erected must be at places of vantage to fishermen, because the places of vantage to fishermen are the places where the most cod and other products of the fishery are caught and handled. This company is not here to accommodate the fishermen solely, they are here to make money, and they can only make money out of the products of the fisheries. Their incoming will mean that the country will have greater purchasing power in respect of its fishery products. The greater the purchasing power of the country in this particular the higher will be the price paid to the fishermen, so that this company or any other company which may engage in the fish industry or any other industry will do so for the purpose of accommodating fishermen or laborers, but they do so for profit and gain.

It has been argued that we should throw in our lot with the Canadian fishing interests, because if we allow American ships to bring our fish to their own

markets it will not be for our interests. Are not Americans coming to our shores the past seasons and purchasing fish ? Has anybody objected to selling it to them ? On the contrary they are gladly welcome, because by their competition the fisherman is getting a better price than he ever did before. Why should we throw in our lot with Canadian fishing interests ? What has Canada got to give us ? Nothing that would be of very great advantage. We are well able to look after our own interests without seeking the aid of Canada, and when we are not able it will be time enough for us then to throw in our lot with Canadian fishing interests.

The argument has been used in the local press that Lessees in this Bill may employ their own people to catch fish. The contention is best answered by the Schedule to the Bill, section VIII of which provides that the Lessees agree to employ Newfoundland labor in the conduct of their different industries.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, permit me to point out what is not generally known to this House, that the earning power of the people of this country is, at least, one hundred per cent. less than the earning power of the people of the neighboring provinces of Nova Scotia. In consequence of this our people, in very many cases, live amid surroundings, and under conditions, which, to say the least, are neither helpful to themselves nor to the country. We can only remedy this condition of affairs by multiplying the forces of production. Multiplication of the forces of production must mean increased employment, increased employment increased purchasing power. Of ourselves we are unable to engage in the business of cold storage. Shall we then not permit others to do that which we are either unwilling or unable to do ourselves. If we adopt a narrow-minded policy of this kind, neither the iron ore on Bell Island would be mined, nor the copper in Tilt Cove, nor any other of the various industries carried on which have been enterprised by outside capital. Is it not time that we looked at things from a broad and statesmanlike point of view ? The attractions for people in this country to remain in it are not great, the field is very limited, and, in consequence of the paucity of opportunities, the best blood of the country emigrates. If we mean to keep the young, strong and educated here, then we must broaden our field of opportunities. The attractions elsewhere are very great, and unless we have counter attractions at home we will not be able to keep them. Is it not our duty, then, as legislators, to aid in this work by adopting a policy which has for its object the broadening of the field of opportunities for our people and increasing their earning and purchasing power. Individually, today, we do not earn enough. What is the result ? In many cases physical degeneracy and consumption. Are we prepared to allow this to continue when we can to a certain extent apply the remedy ? If we are, then we are recreant in our duties.

I am firmly convinced that this or any other measure which has for its object the multiplication of the forces of production and developing the natural wealth of

the Colony must redound to the good of the country.

I gladly support this Bill, and my only fear is that it may not become a reality. If it does, and the enterprises are carried on, then I have no doubt for the future of this country : we will neither want to go to Canada nor elsewhere seeking for concessions or advantages, but we will be enabled all the better to work out our own destiny.

Hon. John Harris—I must impose on the patience of the House to say a few words in favor of this Bill. After listening to the lengthy, well thought out and researchful speeches made by the Hons. Bishop and Harvey on the subject at present under consideration, my remarks, I fear, will appear quite flippant and unworthy of the occasion. As I have just said, I am an earnest supporter of the measure now before us. If there is any country in the world where the application of modern methods in preparation of exports of food products is important, that country is Newfoundland. We are practically doing the same things and adopting the same methods to-day as were in vogue 100 years ago. If we are to keep abreast of the times and compete successfully with our rivals, who I may say are becoming more aggressive and up-to-date every day, we must sooner or later adopt new methods in the curing and marketing of our fish products. There is at present a great lack of system in the way in which our great staple, the cod-fishery, is carried on. This fish is not bought or sold according to cure or quality. There is to a large extent no standard as regards quality, size or cure of cod-fish. What is taken as merchantable one year is rejected another. This leads to endless confusion and inevitable loss to all concerned, and, to use a homely phrase, we never know where we are. I have not given the details of the measure very much attention. I feel quite sure all the necessary safeguards are contained in it to protect the interests of the Colony. My only fear is that the trifling concessions given to the Company by the Government will not be sufficient to induce them to go into the business. They, however, know their own business best, and must see how to make it a profitable one in directions entirely foreign and unknown to us. One of the principal aims of the Company is to utilize what now goes to waste in connection with our fisheries. I understand the loss to the country in this respect is very large indeed. If this loss can be turned into a profit by the Company it will be of great advantage to them, and of corresponding benefit to us. Any operations such as those outlined in this contract and Bill must be entered into in a big way or they will not succeed. There must be brains, experience and money behind it and a liberal supply of all three. Cold storage has been of incalculable value to Australia, New Zealand, the Argentine Republic, not to speak of the neighboring United States and Canada. Articles such as butter, cheese, eggs, fruit, beef, etc., were formerly subjected to climatic changes during transportation, and the loss to shippers and owners was enormous. Cold storage has changed all this. At the present time the loss caused from this source can be calculated al-

most to a certainty. If the introduction of cold storage will help us in the same as the countries I have mentioned, then I say we should hasten along its introduction here. I can see nothing very serious in the objections raised against this measure. Certainly the Hon. Mr. Harvey made a very good cause out of bad materials. I think, however, he is like the man who looked at the landscape through blue spectacles, everything appeared blue to him. The Bill is not as bad as the hon. gentleman thinks it is. The dire results to follow when it becomes operative I do not think will materialize. I have some interest in this country in the manufacture and sale of food products. Keeping in view the amount of money, experience, and I suppose brains, necessary to hold one's own against competition it surprises me that we manage to hold our own at all as regards our export of articles of food. For this condition of things our merchants have been blamed and have been accused of a lack of enterprise. This charge is unfounded. In many respects they are as enterprising as any merchants in the world. Their operations are varied and sometimes enormous, that is for a small community such as we are, and the amount of anxiety which the handling of the enormous quantity of a perishable food product entrusted to them must sometimes be almost unbearable. Whilst admitting that they possess a full measure of enterprise in their own special operations, I still think they are not sufficiently familiar with modern methods for the carrying on of a business such as must be undertaken by the Company whose business we are discussing. There is an amount of attention to detail necessary to be given to cold storage and tinned goods business in order to make it a success that can only be learned through experience. The firm in which I am a partner represent one of the largest and most up-to-date canning concerns on the American Continent. I am very familiar with their methods. The head of such a concern must be more or less of a genius. He must not only know how to cure and pack attractively, but he must know also how to advertise judiciously and how to find markets for his goods. These qualifications can only be gained by experience. No doubt the firm mentioned in the contract now before us employs such men. They must have them if their venture is to be a success. The want in Newfoundland is up-to-date methods. This want, I hope, will to a great extent be removed by the example which an up to date concern will be to us. If we had steamers running between New York and St. John's to-day fitted out with proper cold storage plants, what a boon it would be for St. John's and the whole of Newfoundland. Cold storage warehouses and cold storage railway cars would be certain to follow, and instead of our being compelled to consume the toughest and most expensive of fresh beef and poultry we would have at reasonable prices the most toothsome and tender food procurable at all times and seasons. I have always been an advocate of cold storage and voted for the several Bills that have come before this House in recent years, I am a

strong advocate of this Bill and hope it may very soon pass through its final stages in this House.

Hon. D. J. Greene—I would like to ask the hon. member (Mr. Bishop), whether I understood him aright when he said yesterday that as soon as this company could undersell their competitors the articles mentioned would be put on the free list. That is how I took it at the time.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I might remark that particular reference had been made to the free entry of tin for lobster cans, and I said I did not believe for a moment that this company would engage in canning lobsters, as they would find it more profitable to handle them in another form. I did say that if it was found that they were competing with local men that tin would be put on the free list, so that all would stand on the same footing. I myself see no reason at present for putting tin on the free list, because it does not appear that this company will handle any lobsters for the present, so that there would be no object in putting it on the free list.

Hon. Mr. Greene—I misunderstood the hon. member, or his words as taken down, and I asked the Supervisor of Debates if he would let me have Mr Bishop's remarks on that subject, and he said he could not then, as the reporter who had them had not arrived, and I understood that as soon as the company could undersell their competitors, and not till then, would those articles go on the free list.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. Greene—That is how I understood you, and I wished to make sure because I read in the correspondence between the Premier and the Board of Trade on the Bill, where the Premier writing to Mr. Gosling says :

"I agree with you that it would be unfair to the present fish packing factories to permit a new and rival company to have any advantage over them. On the day I introduced these resolutions into the House, I stated it was the Government's intention to place all of the articles admitted free in the agreement on the free list to our people as well."

Hon. Mr. Bishop—I simply repeat that in my opinion it does not follow that articles must be put on the free list now before we know whether this company is going to operate in lobster canning.

Hon. D. J. Greene—Not lobster alone ; there is also gasolene, which many fishermen now use in their motor boats.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—I might state that gasolene for the use of fishermen will be put on the free list during this session. I do not wish to delay the House at all, but I wish to reply to a few remarks of Hon. Mr. Harvey yester day and will be as brief as possible. He said that he saw very great difficulty in arriving at the liability of the company, and as regards the amount payable by the Government to the company upon the share capital. The Government does not undertake to pay upon the share capital, but only to recognize the capital invested according to the books of the company. And surely a chartered Accountant would have no

difficulty in arriving at what would be fair to put into the accounts as regards the salaries as well as to the amount that will appear as being expended for other purposes. If the smoke houses and glue factories that will be attached to the cold storage plants can be erected, as Hon. Mr. Harvey thinks, for comparatively small amounts, then the earnings from these branches will be all the greater, and tend to relieve any claims that may be made upon the Government. I will not now refer to the arguments used by myself when the 1904 contract was being considered here, except to say that not only are the conditions different, but the people with whom we are dealing are entirely different. We were then treating with a man without knowledge or capital, and without means of securing the sympathy and co-operation of capitalists. Here we have two men, one handling fish in the fresh condition and the other salt. They require a supply for a trade already established, and are going to increase their trade in the markets of the United States by a far better supply than up to the present they have been able to secure. They are not going to confine themselves to cold stored or salt bulk cod, but to all kinds of fish in season, and during some months in cod, some months in herring, and during certain months all kinds possible. As practical business men they will know how to utilize their knowledge to advantage as each month comes around. They are competitors of the great Gloucester packers, and will compete with them to the limit. The vital point to my mind is not as to what quantity they will export in cold storage or in any particular form, but as to what will be the effect of their operations upon the general fishing industries of this Colony. Will it tend to give better price to the fisherman ? I have no two opinions in regard to that. These people will be compelled to pay a price for green fish and fresh fish beyond what is obtainable through curing it in the old fashioned way. Where there are fishermen operating who are not in touch with the different stations, as these will only number five (unless the industry is so remunerative as to attract some of the local capital which Hon. Mr. Harvey thinks available), then a great number will not be able to avail of sale to this company, but the quantity which will be brought away, and which I hope will amount to some two or three hundred thousand quintals, will so stimulate the market that those who cannot avail of those plants will get something equivalent by the sale of dry fish, for the prices of which will surely advance. Surely the hon. gentleman will not for a moment refuse to encourage the establishment of the magnificent business that we hope to see here very soon, simply because there is a fear that a quantity of herring, or some small portion of bait fishes, may find its way to the American fishing fleet and be used as bait ? It will never be possible, perhaps, to completely destroy the chances of some small portion of the herring exported fresh being used as bait, but it must be remembered the interests of Trefethen and Lord will be in preventing the Americans getting bait, and not in all seasons of the year do the

American fishermen require herrings as bait, and they will be able to procure them, as now, on the Treaty Coast.

It is possible, I say, that while Americans take herring and put them in cold storage as food, some small percentage of the quantity may be used as bait for the American fishermen, but I firmly believe that this will never amount to any great quantity, and once detected the Government will know how to apply the remedy. I think, therefore, the possibilities that underly the agreement that has become the subject of this Bill fully justify the measure, and it will be very soon demonstrated that this will become no burden whatever upon the Colony, and tend to increase the earning power of the fishermen.

Hon. John Harvey—I am going to propose an amendment to this section, and before doing so would like to speak on one or two criticisms made by Hon. Mr. Gibbs on my remarks. I am afraid that in some instances I did not make myself clear, as it appears my meaning was taken somewhat different from the way it was meant. I would say in regard to the Fish Industries Co. there was nothing disgraceful or dishonest about it. It was simply unfortunate and had too small a capital. I was a shareholder in it myself. It embarked in the Scotch herring business and never made it pay. It never had anything to do with cold storage. In regard to the details of the Bill and the question of continuous operation, I raised that point merely as an objectionable feature in detail, and I say now, as then, that I do not believe any business man on Water Street would sign a contract as this measures is. Hon. Mr. Gibbs says that because I suggested that a smoke house could be erected for $50 or $100 it was a good thing to be able to do it so cheaply. He scouted the idea of certain criticisms of mine in the way of bad management and overpayment of salaries, etc., but I cannot follow Mr. Gibbs there at all, and I think such things quite feasible. Mr. Gibbs also scouted my ideas as to insurance, but I am quite serious about it. It is quite possible that the Company might not have the property insured, and in case of fire the Colony would have to pay for it. I should like to see the Company registered either in Newfoundland or somewhere under British law. Now I come to the question of halibut, and I think Mr. Gibbs must be surely wrong when he says that $500,000 worth of halibut was bought on the West Coast last year and shipped. I know there was $60,000 worth purchased in Burgeo and LaPoile, but I question the $500,000 worth. It is a most extraordinary fact if so. Our own fishermen have been catching halibut themselves for years. It has been done by a Mr. Payne at Burgeo, and it is quite possible that $60,000 worth was taken in the neighborhood of Ramea last year and exported to the States. That that large amount was taken, and that a much larger amount could have been taken, is quite true, but is that any reason why a company should be paid to export more when there is no need of a subsidy at all ? Mr. Gibbs has stated that halibut sells for 50c. a pound in the United States. This is certainly wrong.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—Thirty to forty cents.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—Does Mr. Gibbs know what these men, Lord and Trefethen, paid the unfortunate fishermen for the halibut which they sold for 30 to 40 cents. They contracted for almost the whole of it for 3½ cents per pound. What advantage is there for us to bring in people and pay them a bounty to engage in this business? The wholesale price of halibut has been varying from 12 to 15 cents per pound. They have been paying 3½ cents, and take every pound they can get, and the trouble is there is not enough to be had. It is only another instance of the value of competition. "Competition is the life of trade." If we had ten firms going to the West Coast to-morrow and competing for the business it would be much better. These things are no argument in favor of the Bill, rather the opposite. Halibut has been exported for years, and will be in the future. Mr. Gibbs laid great stress on the utilization of skin and bone, etc., as fertilizer. What has this to do with cold storage fish? The skin and bone are stored with the fish. He spent the greater part of his speech trying to prove what a great advantage cold storage was to New Zealand, Australia, and other places, a fact which nobody questions whatever. Cold storage is not going to make fertilizer though, and, even if it did, as far as this country is concerned I doubt very much that if that fertilizer would go into the ground. A very large amount of it is made here now, and thousands of pounds have been exported, but it had to be handled by a scientific fertilizing plant, and I question very much if the Company will go into it here. It has been told also again and again that Lord and Trefethen are experts in the handling of cod. I have no doubt about it. There is nothing in the Bill, however, that says they will handle codfish. I am convinced that they will find halibut and herring much more attractive than cod. I think it a very doubtful policy to let them take away frozen herring, and I am going to move an amendment on that. Mr. Gibbs says that there are millions of herring around Placentia Bay and other bays, but I know of fishermen who have been trying to get bait and could not get it. Sir Edward Morris has said the Bay of Islands herring fishery does not pay, and yet he says that he wants this system extended throughout the country, and herring exported from Placenta Bay and Fortune Bay as well. I was surprised to learn from Mr. Gibbs' speech that the American Co. were to be allowed to fish here. That does not appear very clearly in the Bill. No alien is allowed to fish other than on the Treaty Coast, no alien vessel is allowed to operate, and no local fisherman can join an alien vessel to fish. Mr. Gibbs has said that the Government had refused a license to Capt. Corkum, because they believed he was dishonest or that his intentions were such. If the Government knew him to be dishonest they had a very good reason for refusing him the license. I do not believe this was the reason, however. As a matter of fact, I know it was not. The references made by Mr. Gibbs to cold storage in New Zealand, and in great benefits that follow-

e d, have no bearing on the present Bill. We all know what cold storage has done for New Zealand, but I would like to know if the Government of New Zealand ever attempted to make such a contract as that before us. I have never heard of such, and I doubt if any other member of the House has. It is suggested by my hon friend that I am opposed to cold storage, and to the subsidizing of this company, because I am interested in the fisheries in the section of the coast where they will likely operate. That is not a point at all. The question is: Are Lord and Trefethen, if this Bill becomes law, going to be obliged to ship or export or expend any monies in the purchase of fresh codfish. There is nothing in the Bill to bind them. All the Council has to rely on is the opinion of Hon. Mr. Bishop. I am not prophesying, and I hope it will not take place, but I can see a great danger ahead, and the possibility of our bait fishes entering the American markets, and instead of being used for food, they will be used for bait. I do not believe that squid or herring should be shipped or sent from here at all, and no license to do so should be granted. I would move as an amendment that not less than $130,000 be expended each year in the purchase of codfish, and that under the contract the Company be not permitted to export frozen herring or squid.

Hon. Mr. Greene—I would like to ask the hon. introducer of the Bill if he would rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again, as the hour is getting late, and I have a few remarks to make on the Bill, but I do not wish to delay the House at such a late hour.

The Chairman of the Committee, Hon. Jas. Angel, reported accordingly, and on his motion the report was received.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the remainder of the Order was deferred.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the "Sale of Seeds Bill" was read a first time, and orderd to be read a second time to-morrow.

The House then adjourned until Monday next at 4.30 p.m.

MONDAY, March 6th.

The House met at 4.40, Hon. the President in the Chair.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Cold Storage Bill.

Hon. D. J. Greene—Mr. Chairman, first let me thank the Hon. Mr. Bishop for acceding to my request of our last sitting, and rising the Committee. I felt the anomalous position I occupied in voting against the second reading of a Bill, the principle of which, according to the title and preamble, I fully approved of, but the measure in its entirety is so inherently objectionable that I had no other course open to me. A great deal of the difficulty, and, from my standpoint, disadvantage in discussing this Bill on its merits, arises from not considering it as a whole, the supporters of it contenting themselves with arguing in favor of cold storage in the abstract, a matter upon which we are all heartily agreed, and upon which there can be but one opinion. They content themselves with generalities, the advantages and the benefits of cold storage, and if they get the opponents of the measure to admit their premises, they flatter themselves that they have convinced and converted them to the whole measure.

So far has this been carried out that we find the Council of the Board of Trade, in preparing a case for submission to the Premier, contenting themselves with discussing and considering only the guarantee or bounty the Government was offering, ignoring altogether what effect the Bill would have on the general trade of the Colony, how far it clashed with the Bait Act or the policy underlying that Act, and we find Mr. Gosling, the Vice-President, writing to the Premier that so far as the effects of the Bill on the Bait Act are concerned, the Council had not previously given this point very much consideration. Another illustration of this one-sided consideration of the measure will be found in Saturday morning's Daily News. That paper has a synopsis of legislative proceedings and the action of the Council in their vote on the Bill. In that you will see that Messrs. Harvey, Ryan and Greene voted against it. In the editorial column you will find reference to Mr. Gibbs' speech, and an article headed in large type : "The benefits of cold storage in New Zealand." Any person not specially conversant with the present Bill would naturally ask himself how, in the face of such facts and such benefits arising from cold storage, men like Hons. Harvey, Ryan and Greene, with the best interests of their country at heart, men of progressive ideas, and with more than ordinary ability, can be so short-sighted as to offer opposition to such a scheme, and it would be hard to convince anyone that one had not some personal or political reason for so doing. The title of a bill, like the title of a book or a play has much to do with its success, and, tho a rose by any other name would smell as sweet, I doubt if you would get as many people to smell it. The resonant title of this Bill is like the songs of the Troubadore, where the "glamour of the armour hid the stammer of the grammer." Apropos of the Bill, I remember reading about a young French dramatic author, who, having written a play, was at a loss to know what to entitle it. In his trouble he went to an old theatrical friend of his for advice. The old man was busy at the time, and snarled out : "Is there anything about a drum in it ?" "No, sir." said the young man. "Is there anything about a bugle in it ?" "No, sir," was the reply. "Then call the play 'Sans tambour ni trumpette.'" The young man did so and the play was a success. If this Bill had been entitled an Act to encourage the building of smoke houses or the erection of glue factories, it would not have got a second reading in either branch of the Legislature.

As I said before, the supporters of the Bill limit themselves to the question of cold storage, and from this standpoint I have no objection to discuss the measure. What is meant by cold storage ? What do we mean when we use the term ? What do we intend ? What is it we want ? What are we looking for ? The answer is clear and sharp—"A process which will enable us to ship our fresh codfish to the American markets in a frozen or chilled condition." There can be no doubt whatever but this is the answer. The title and preamble of the Bill show it, the language of Ministers of the present and former

Governments, their supporters and opponents declare it ; the newspapers, the trade, the community at large, only know and recognize cold storage for this purpose. What have we heard only to-day in the discussion of the Bill. Why, that cold storage means new markets and advanced process, selling our codfish more economically and more advantageously, limiting the quantity exported in a dry condition, and thus raising the price of dry codfish also. That is the policy of cold storage, that is what we aim at, that is what we want, and that is what we are paying for, and yet, with this fixed idea in our minds, why is it not the dominant feature of the Bill ? Surely one would think that in a Bill to encourage cold storage in this Colony the first clause, the first enactment in big letters, would be the obligation to export fresh cod fish, and other matters might follow as subsidary to the main enterprise. When the Wright Bill was before this Chamber this omission was considered fatal, and yet the Wright agreement went much further than this does. For it provided by sec. 3 that the Company was to expend for the purchase of fresh codfish for exportation purposes the sum of $200,000 annually, and yet we opposed it, and the hon. member, Mr. Bishop, led the attack. He voted against the Bill because such a stipulation was absent from it, and moved an amendment to the effect that the Company should be bound to export a certain quantity of fresh codfish each year. The amendment was voted down and the Bill carried. Now, what do we find, that after the lapse of seven years another company comes forward and says to the Government, we are prepared, under certain conditions, to give you an up to date cold storage system. Again the matter is discussed by and with the Government, and mark you, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, Mr. Bishop, is now one of the contracting parties. Again an agreement is entered into, and again, surprisingly, significantly, and ominously, no reference is made to codfish, and there is no obligation on the part of the Company to export a single pound of it. I am not and will not assume that when the terms of this agreement were being discussed by the Government that the hon. member, Mr. Bishop, had forgotten his attitude towards and his opposition to the former agreement. I will not assume that his views in this important part had undergone a change, but I must and I will assume that he had recollected, and that he had endeavored to induce the Company and the Government to put such a provision in, and that he was unsuccessful. We are told that it is the intention of the Company to export fresh codfish, that it will be to their advantage to do so, that it is implied in the agreement, that we need have no fear, etc., etc. This is all right, Mr. Chairman, but again and again I ask why the dominant feature of the agreement, the only feature which can or could commend itself to the people of this country, is left in doubt, is left to be inferred or implied. Surely one would imagine that this would be the most prominent section in the whole agreement, that it would be provided for in plain words, about which there could be no shadow of doubt or

uncertainty and to which all other conditions and obligations would be subserviant. But the agreement is again silent on this point, and history repeats itself. Great care is shown in defining the obligations both of the Government and the Company in other respects, but on the main point there is an ominous silence. If I were called upon to draw up a lease of a house, no matter how specifically set out the term of years, the amount of rent, the mode and manner and time of payments, no matter how carefully the covenants for repairs were drawn, I doubt if either the landlord or the tenant would be satisfied if there was no reference to the house, and I am afraid I could not convince them by saying that the lease was alright by saying that the house was there by implication. This is indeed the play of Hamlet with the Hamlet kept out. Mr. Gibbs, on his advocacy of this Bill, or rather, to be more correct, in his advocacy of cold storage, tells us of all the benefits New Zealand derived from it, how the exportation of fresh meat jumped in less than twenty years from hundreds to millions, and argues and says that similar results would accrue to us by the adoption of this Bill. I say yes to this, and with all my heart let us have cold storage, but let us have it for the purposes that the New Zealanders have it, for handling our staple product for the marketing of our exports of the exportation of fresh codfish, and let such subsidiary methods as smoked herring and glue factory follow if they may.

A great deal of discussion and newspaper controversy has arisen over the question as to the bearings of the present Bill upon the Bait Act, and Sir Robert Bond has, so far as I can learn, been unjustly accused of claiming broadly that the Cold Storage Act repealed the Bait Act. I have not read his speech, but I have here before me the newspaper in which he summarizes his arguments, and paragraph 3 is as follows: "I contend that this agreement means the reversal of the fishery policy that has been followed in this country since the passing of the Bait Act in 1887, for, as I have before said, it practically nullifies in part the operation of the Bait Act." In this conclusion I fully concur. As to the legal effects of this Act on the Bait Act there can be but one opinion. It has no effect. It does not repeal, alter, enlarge, or abridge the provisions of that Act. They are apart and separate. But the policy engendered by that Act, the principles underlying that Act, the benefits and advantages accruing from that Act are repealed and destroyed. The Bait Act, introduced in the first place by us as a defence against our subsidized rivals, the French, we were not long in discovering its importance as our sheet anchor in our dealings with the Canadians and Americans. But now by this Bill, this innocent Cold Storage Bill, we are really thoughtlessly and criminally throwing away our only means of defence. It may be said that the Company can only export bait fishes under the license provided for and in the Bait Act, but that license cannot be refused, for by section one of the Agreement the Government declares that it is desirous of encouraging and assisting the freezing, handling, packing and marketing of fish and

fish product. Note, Mr. Chairman, the word marketing. The word has but one meaning, it means selling, disposing of. The Government declare that they will assist and encourage the selling of fish and fish products, can they then refuse a license to export. If bait fishes are allowed to be exported there is no doubt they will be used for bait purposes. You cannot follow them to their destination. You cannot put a check upon the action or the movements of buyers, no matter how you guard the disposal of them they will be sold in the best market, and that market is the fishermen of the United States. Do you think you will get the exporter, the carrier, the receiver, the purchaser, or the Government of the United States, to pay any regard or respect to our regulations ? If so you will be grievously disappointed. What is our experience in regard to herring purchased by American bankers in Bay of Islands. They obtain a license, make a declaration that the herring is for food purposes. Yet, what do we find ? First, that both captains and owners pledge their oath that these herrings have been caught by American fishermen, and the Customs or Revenue Department, though knowing full well that not a single herring been caught or sought for by American fishermen, but purchased in open market from Newfoundland catchers, admit them as American caught fish. Secondly, we know, and know full well, that a large proportion of the herrings are openly sold for bait purposes. Defeated at the Hague, but not beaten, they have turned over in their minds how they can best nul'ify, or at least minimize, the effects of the judgment, and this one of the means, and a most effective one, is this of regaining their lost position. The American fishermen must have bait. Summing up some of the contentions of the American counsel at the Hague, Sir Allan Aylesworth says bait has always been a matter of the greatest consequence to the fishermen of the United States. They cannot afford to waste their time in catching it. They prefer to purchase it rather than waste their time in catching bait when they should be occupied in the more valuable pursuit of cod. But there is another policy underlying the bait which we are endeavoring to entirely destroy under this Bill, and that is the policy of keeping, and inducing our people to keep, the bait for themselves, to induce them not to be so shortsighted as to be tempted for immediate profit to part from that which they will surely need in the immediate future, and without which they cannot exist. Mr. Bishop tells us that our people will not be able to resist the temptation to sell bait at the sight of either English or American gold. Then why should we introduce and encourage that temptation as we are doing here under this Bill. Our people are improvident, the very nature of their calling makes them so. Sufficient for the day, they take no heed of the morrow. If the Americans cannot waste their time in catching bait for themselves, can we afford to waste our time, not in catching bait for ourselves, but in catching bait for Americans. For these reasons I oppose the Bill. It has

the same objections to it as had the Wright Bill, the same omissions. With the hope, vain hope, I am afraid, of in some measure curing the Bill, I move the following amendment, same as that moved by the hon. member, Mr. Bishop, seven years ago, and which then received my heartiest support :

"Before the guarantee, or any "part thereof, is paid under the "terms of this Act, in any year, "the lessees shall prove to the "satisfaction of the Government "that they have expended a sum "of not less than $130,000 in that "year in the purchase of fresh cod "fish in this Colony, which has "been exported in cold storage."

Hon. J. A. Robinson—It had not been my intention to speak on this Bill, although perhaps it may be desirable on a question of so much importance for one to give a reason for the faith that is in him. But the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has scarcely left me any option. He has referred to the paper of which I am editor, and has rather misconstrued my writings. I should like to say right here that I do not recognize party spirit in this House. I have listened to the remarks of Hon. Mr. Harvey and Hon. Mr. Greene, who are opposed to the Bill, and I believe their criticisms are made in all sincerity. To condemn for want of consistency hon. members who were opposed to cold storage some years ago, and who are now in favor of it, is to argue in a circle, because, although we may have had Cold Storage Bills before, the principles of which may have been the same, the details differ. With the principle of cold storage all are in accord, and differences of opinion are found only over details. The opponents of this measure condemn it because what they regard as the dominant feature, viz., the mention of codfish, is omitted. I am not, however, prepared to assent to that view, as what most appeals to me in the contract is its inherent possibilities for the establishment of new fish industries other or in addition to the codfishery. The history of cold storage in this Colony is an interesting one. In 1897 the hustings resounded with cries of a cold storage policy. The late Sir William Whiteway had the question pressed upon him by certain mercantile supporters, and although he was not successful at the polls the same supporters approached the Winter Government on the same matter. As a result a Bill was introduced which passed both Houses unanimously, and the Fish Industries Co. was formed. Unfortunately, it was simply a company of promoters, and when the prospectus was issued it was of such a nature that the Government was compelled to disassociate itself from all connection with it. Years went on, and the same cry was heard in 1904, when another Bill was passed. This one, like its predecessor, resulted in nothing. Now another Bill is before us, but its provisions are essentially different from those of its predecessors. This time we are not dealing with men of straw, but with men who have the market themselves, and who are simply establishing branches of an already large and prosperous business. With regard to the Government's liability, it occa-

sion no alarm, for no company would contemplate an investment like this Bill calls for unless reasonably assured of making a larger dividend than five per cent. The hon. gentleman opposite (Hon. Mr. Grene) is clear and emphatic in his opinion about the relation of this measure to the Bait Act. It does not repeal, does not annul, and does not limit that Act. Surely no opinion could be stronger than that. But he regards it as a deviation from the policy that prompted the Bait Act. On that point I take issue. The policy at the present day is the same in that regard as it has always been. Through all the struggle and turmoil of the fishery policy in recent years, the sole object of the late Government was apparently to attain reciprocity with the United States. If that were achieved, every harbor, with its fishing privileges, bait and all, would be opened to the Americans. Reciprocity would imply a supervision of the bait policy. But this is not a necessary sequence to the passing of the present measure. We have the same powers under the Bait Act that we have ever had, if our fishes are taken for food purposes and sold for bait. We can easily discover it, and we have the same recourse as we have always had. The hon. gentleman says licenses cannot be refused. I agree with him so long as the conditions are complied with. If they are violated the remedy is at hand. The Government can require a license for every cargo, if necessary, and the means of protection rests in the absolute refusal of licenses if found that the fishes were being used for bait instead of food. The hon. member (Mr. Greene) refers t o the contract as "Hamlet with Hamlet left out," the Hamlet in this case being the codfish. For years Newfoundland has been confining her interest to codfish, until it has become a standing joke that fish in Newfoundland means codfish, when we have numerous industries lying dormant. Our own mercantile men have their hands full, and the fact that these industries have been considered as of little value is because no opportunity has offered to test them, except through the withdrawal of much needed capital from the salt fish industry. There should be hundreds of thousands of dollars in halibut alone, but through our own neglect or inability that fishery has heretofore been almost valueless.

With regard to the herring industry, it seems to me that the arguments advanced against the Bill are unsound. We cannot prevent the Americans from taking herring from the West Coast, and we cannot prevent them using as bait, but we can control the fishery on the Southern or Northern Coast just as much under this contract as if it never existed. During the past thirty years numerous efforts have been made to put up that dainty little fish, the caplin, in an attractive and convenient form, but, so far, without success. It is nothing short of a crime to have millions of these tasty litlte fishes used as manure. Cold storage might prove the avenue through which they would find their way to the tables of our cousins to the South.

I regard the opening up of guano factories as a valuable supplement and extension of our present fishery methods, instead

of an injury. Side issues are often as valuable a part of an industry as the main branch itself. We have had contracts galore from time to time, all of which have proved inoperative, either through lack of sufficient concessions or because we were dealing with the wrong party. If we want this to remain a fishing country, like it has always been, let us fold our hands and go on in the same jog-trot manner, but if we want to keep pace with the times and see the country progress as it should, we must do what we can to attract capital and encourage investment. It is only natural to prefer a bargain with all the advantages on one side, but business men are not going to enter into contracts unless their side is also considered. In this case we have men, Trefethen and Lord, who, we are told on the highest authority, are sound and substantial business men. They are not coming here philanthropically, but to make money for themselves, and they cannot make it for themselves without making it for the country. And, therefore, although there may be many privileges we would prefer to exclusively retain, yet there must be a give and take. We must be content to yield certain things if we are to reap certain benefits, and, as I take it, in the Act now before the House we are yielding nothing but what is necessary, and the bargain all round is fair for those who are coming in and to ourselves. This Bill has my hearty support, and I hope it will prove successful. I have no fears whatever that it will do any injury to the country. On the contrary, I believe, though the benefits may not accrue to St. John's to a certain extent, although they will indirectly, they will do so to a marvellous extent in the outside parts of the Island, which need developing even more than we do in the city.

Hon. John Harvey—I have already taken up a sufficient amount of the time of this House, but I would like to speak on one or two points opened up by previous speakers, and refer to them. One is the statement by Hon. Mr. Robinson to the effect, as I undertand it, that in his opinion we cannot prevent herring from going off the West Coast. I entirely differ with him there. The herring only go off now because our people are permitted to sell them to the Americans. I do not believe the Americans can catch them themselves, and we have the power to prevent our people from selling them. It is true the Americans can come down and use purse seines, but the point is that they are not going to come down and use them. As Mr. Greene has stated, they have not got time. I take issue entirely with Mr. Robinson in his views that we are not still in a position to control the export of bait fishes from Bay of Islands. The other point which fills me with more anxiety is the statement made, on both sides of this House, that under this contract it is going to be impossible for the Government to refuse to give licenses to Lord and Trefethen for the export of bait fishes. That is what I understood from both Hon. Mr. Greene and Hon. Mr. Robinson.

Hon. Mr. Robinson—I made no such statement.

Hon. Mr. Greene—Under the 2nd section, where our Government pledge themselves to use

every facility of marketing herring, it necessarily implies the granting of licenses.

Hon. Mr. Robinson—That the Government could not in the spirit of the contract refuse to give licenses to export bait fishes for food purposes.

Hon. John Harvey—It is practically agreed by both speakers that the Government cannot refuse to give licenses for the export of bait fishes for food purposes. As I pointed out previously it has been the policy of the Government to refuse licenses for bait fishes to Americans except in Bay of Islands, now we are told it is impossible for them to refuse these licenses. I confess I hoped that that was not the case, and, with all due respect to Mr. Greene and Mr. Robinson, I do not believe to-day that is the case, and I hope the introducer of the Bill will make it clear that that is not the case. I was going to ask the two representatives of the Government in this Chamber, and they cannot, I think, fail to be impressed with the argument, if it is not possible, as a safeguard to the Colony, at least to some of us who have the good of the Colony at heart, to notify Messrs. Lord and Trefethen before they erect any of these plants that the question that they may be permitted to export herring and squid in cold storage is one that is not clearly granted under the Act, and would be carefully considered by the Government. I think perhaps that would protect the position, and may give the Government the power afterwards to refuse licenses. I think if Lord and Trefethen were informed that that was a privilege which would have to be considered before being granted, it would prevent them from making any mistake, and protect the Colony. I think the exporting of herring for food purposes is a suicidal policy.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—It may be taken for granted, I think, that Lord and Trefethen will watch very carefully the debates in both Houses upon this Bill, and they will become acquainted with what has been put forward by those opposed to the Bill, as well as those of us who defend the action of the Government. I shall not concur for a moment with the view expresed by Messrs. Greene and Robinson in saying that permission cannot be withheld from Lord and Trefethen, when this Bill is passed, to grant them licenses for the export of bait fishes. The Government will hold the same power it does to-day, and will not refuse licenses for the export of cargoes of herring on the understandng they are to be used for food purposes, and I submit that it will not be possible for any considerable quantity of herring exported to be used for bait purposes without coming to the knowledge of the Government. And when that does occur, and we find that they have played us false, they will get no more licenses for the export of these food fishes. I cannot for a moment either agree with Hon. Mr. Greene, who thinks that bait fishes, and by these I mean such fish as caplin or herring, should not be exported at all, but should be held and preserved for the use of our own fishermen only. During the months of October and November last my own firm, in one or two little harbors in Green Bay, spent $7,000 among the fish-

ermen, who earned in catching herrings which were barrelled and exported to Europe. Will any member say that these herrings should be allowed to swim, and go to their migrations afterwards, and be left untouched and undisturbed, while a considerable number of families are now provded for who would otherwise have been destitute ? The same applies on the West Coast. These fish only come in after the codfishery is over, and people have a chance to earn where otherwise they would not. Moreover, I do not admit that our fisheries require such quantities of bait. There are countless millions of herring in deep water as well as around the coast. Mr. Robinson very properly remarks that everybody generally is clamoring for reciprocity with the United States, and if that were affected to-morrow there would not be only free admission, but all markets would be open to our people, the same there. The more we consider this matter it seems to me we are sacrificing nothing under the conditions of this Bill. I said before, the business to be established by Lord and Trefethen is to be a rotary business. They will take all fish in season, and no other business will suit or be profitable to them. They must of necessity handle all fish they can secure, and I am not concerned as to how many thousands of pounds of fish will be exported fresh, but that they will handle large quantities of our fish. I regret that I am unable to accept the amendment proposed by Mr. Greene. The contract has been made with these gentlemen and must stand or fall as it is.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—Just a few words in reply to the statement by Mr. Harvey that it is possible for us to control the export of herring from this country, and that the Americans, if we so desired it, need not get any herring at all unless they catch them themselves. That would mean a policy of preventing our people from catching herring. If we are prepared to adopt a policy of that kind, then the Government must be prepared to carry on that industry, because it is neither right nor just for a Government to say to thousands of people who are depending on the catch of herring for a livelihood, "you must not engage in that industry, and not sell the herring," without compensating them yearly for the damage done. If we, as a Government, are prepared to catch the herring, then these arguments might be sound, but no Government is prepared to go into the Bay of Islands or any other place and catch them solely for the purpose of preventing the Americans from doing so. The amendment proposed by Mr. Greene cannot meet with my support for the reason that it is unnecessary, and, I take it, unfair to place too many restrictions on a contract such as this. If every industry which has been estabished here were, at the beginning, hedged around with conditions and stipulations, we would have very few. Industries of various kinds have been established and no restrictions have been made. For instance, when the Boot and Shoe Factory was started, and the tariff was raised in order to give protection, the Government did not ask that they should make so many pairs of each size per year, or so many

different kinds, or that the quality should be so and so. The same with the tobacco, butter and soap industries, there were no stipulations or restrictions made, but protection was offered simply because we want to develop the country, give employment to our people, and keep the capital we have in the country, instead of being invested abroad.

Under this Bill we will have a very large sum of money invested in the Colony, and we will be able to control the operations of the Company under its charter. They could go to any part of the Treaty Coast and conduct the busness without our permission, and export every herring, caplin and squid they might catch, to bait the American fleet, but we are, under this charter, controlling them, and they cannot export herring or other bait fishes for the purpose of baiting our rivals. The moment we find that out, the Bait Act is there to prevent that from happening, and no Government is going to be so lax in the duty it owes to the people as not to prevent this company from defrauding the country. Hon. Mr. Greene went on to say that we want the bait for ourselves, and our object is to prevent anybody else from getting it. What of the millions that are scattered throughout the British Empire, who can come here and take the bait fishes, and we cannot exercise any more control over them than we can over our own people. They can exercise the same rights as ourselves, because they are British subjects. The only thing we have to look out for is that the herring shall be used for food purposes and that ought to be easy enough. It is a well known fact that under the Canadian Customs laws Canadian Customs officials go into the United States and examine the books of firms doing business with Canada to see if smuggling is going on or the revenue being defrauded. And we can adopt a similar policy for the purpose of seeing whether this company makes fradulent use of the rights granted by this Bill. But our fears will be dissipated in that respect, because as pointed out by Hon. Mr. Robinson we have millions of fishes in the waters around our coast which to-day are valueless and should be the source of vast wealth to the country. That is the theme of the Bill, not alone cold storage for cod but for everything swimming in the waters around our coasts. That is the true and proper policy for this or any other company to adopt.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—I am very glad to hear Mr. Bishop agree with me about this license. The license may be given or refused.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—The license can be refused. The moment the Government finds the company acting apart from the rights of the contract, they have the power to refuse the license.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—Under the Bait Act we can refuse a license. Under this Act we have to give a license, unless it is shown the herring are for bait purposes.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—Everybody can get it, Germans or Dutchmen, or anybody else.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—I am surprised that Hon. Mr. Gibbs takes that position, because within the last few weeks Capt. Corkum was refused a license under the Bait Act. We had the power to

refuse Capt. Corkum a license, and you say that under this agree ment we cannot say that. We must give them a license if they use the herring for food purposes. I do not agree with that position, and am glad to hear that Mr. Bishop says "No." But two legal gentlemen do not agree with that. Arguments have been made that the Bait Act is not affected by this Act at all. This is practically erroneous. The Bait Act is entirely cancelled if this reading is correct. If it is correct there is at least one gentleman here who will agree with me that it is an extremely dangerous thing, and that is the hon. introducer. There is another argument, that is reciprocity. Of course we have always been willing to give the Americans free bait for free entry for our fish, but do not let us do it before that. Under this Bill we are giving them free bait and a subsidy of $25,000 a year. That is a very different thing from reciprocity.

Hon. Mr. Robinson—That last expression of Mr. Harvey's is hardly a fair one, that we are giving them free bait and a subsidy. The only reason that I am standing on my feet again, Mr. Chairman, is that Hon. Mr. Bishop and Hon. Mr. Harvey have unintentionally misunderstood me, when I stated that this Company could not be refused a license to export bait fishes for food purposes. I thought it seemed to be perfectly clear under the Act that when they are going to export herring for food purposes the Government were bound to give them a license. But to say that they have not got the power under the letter of the Act, I do not think they had that construction. Under this contract, if Lord and Trefethen propose or desire to export bait fishes for food purposes, the Government in the spirit of the contract cannot refuse it.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—The Government's power is in no way lessened or impaired, and until the Bait Act is amended the Company will have to apply under the same manner as others for licenses to export bait fishes for food purposes. The Government will continue to issue them when it is clear to them that the fishes are to be exported for this purpose, but, on the other hand, if they think that the fishes will be used for bait purposes, the Government has the same power to refuse.

Hon, Mr. Angel—Before the passing of the Bill I would like to make a remark or two. I have listened with attention to all that has been said for and against the Bill by the various speakers, and I have arrived at the conclusion that I would be perfectly justified in voting for the Bill if I had had the opportunity of doing so. I look upon the Bill as being purely experimental, and there is no telling what the result will be. We had cold storage bills coming here before us for years and nothing has come of them. We have been looking for a market for frozen fish for some time, reciprocity has been attempted, but nothing has been done. A local company was capitalized and went into the cold storage business, but only to fail. A few years ago a gentleman came here from abroad, was granted many concessions by the Government, but he was unable to raise the capital, and his proposals amounted to nothing. Now the matter comes before us again, and seeing that

there is a chance of something being accomplished, we cannot do better than vote for it. The contract is only for fifteen years, and if we see anything objectionable in the proposed industry during that time, it will be an easy matter to have the remedy applied at the end of that time. I have listened to some of the hon. members say that it spells blue ruin to our Bait Act, but I only think these gentlemen were looking through blue glasses. Other gentlemen have pointed out the great advantages, and, if they be right, why the Bill has everything to commend it. I myself cannot attempt to describe what is going to follow, but if these cold storage plants will relieve the present markets and establish new ones, it will achieve what we have been looking for for years, and what has puzzled the brain of legislators as well as fish merchants. One hon. gentleman has said he had known halibut to be rotting on parts of the West Coast, and also herrings, for want of a market, and if cold storage was to alter this state of affairs we were accomplishing a great deal. For these reasons, and viewing the Bill from a merely speculative standpoint, I would have voted for it if I had been given the opportunity.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

Hon. Mr. Angel moved that the report be received, and Hon. Mr. Greene moved the amendment stated above. On a vote being taken there were for the amendment : Hons. Greene, Harvey and Ryan. Against : Hons. Bishop, Ayre, Angel, Harris, Gibbs, Robinson. The motion was lost, and Hon. Mr. Angel's motion that the report be received carried.

Hon. R. K. Bishop moved that the Bill be read a third time to-morrow. The motion was carried, and it was ordered accordingly.

The other items on the Order paper were deferred.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House adjourned at 6.10 p. m. until 4.30 to-morrow.

TUESDAY, March 7th.

The House opened at 4.30.

On moton of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Cold Storage Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Assembly with a message to that effect.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—I beg leave to move the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Esquimaux and Indians resident in Labrador." I feel sure hon. members are fully aware of the conditions which have brought about the necessity for this Bill in all its points, and it is not my purpose to make any further explanation regarding it.

Hon. J. A. Robinson—Before the Bill passes through there are one or two points I would like to call attention to. With the principle of the Bill all will be in accord. In paragraph one we find that the permission of the Governor in Council must first be obtained. I fail to see the wisdom dom or the necessity of this. The Bill in no way interferes with the liberty of the subject. We permit Indians to travel when and where they please, and to act on their own volition. The object is to prevent any other people from taking them away for

exhibition purposes. Why then leave a loophole and place an invidious power in the hands of governments, which can only exercise it by violating the principle of the Bill ? This Bill is either too comprehensive or incomplete. I am inclined to think it is too comprehensive. The Mountaineer Indians, as is well known, belong to the great Alonguin family, which are spread over North America. They are altogether different from the Esquimaux. The Esquimaux cannot be transplanted from his native regions without increased liability to disease. But why are the Mountaineers alone referred to ? What about the other Indians ? How are they going to distinguish between them ? How is this going to affect the Micmac Indians? Prowse says in his history : "The great opponents and life-long enemies of the Eskimos, the Montagnais and Nascopee, have always been hunters. With their families they wander all over the vast peninsula of Labrador, shooting and trapping. The caribou, their principle supply of food, is yearly diminishing. Starvation, whiskey, and the contagious diseases of the whites have so decimated these hardy tribes that now only a few hundred poor, degraded savages represent the once flourishing branch of the fierce Alonguin race." This may be so, but there are Nascopees still left on the Labrador, members of the same family as the Mountaineers. What is the object of blacklisting one and not blacklisting the other ? The Eskimo is altogether different. He cannot go to Southern lands without sealing his death-warrant. The only attraction for the Eskimo is the gold they might get, for which they pay their lives.

The Bill passed the second reading, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—I beg to move the second reading of the Seeds Bill. I understand that the object in bringing in this Bill is because it has been found that a great deal of worthless seeds have been imported and distributed, and the Agricultural Society recommended that a Bill of this kind should be introduced, by which we could issue licenses for the sale of seeds, and an Inspector be appointed to examine seeds before they are distributed.

The motion for second reading was passed, and on motion of Hon R. K. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill entitled "An Act to Encourage the Manufacture of Peat" was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Bishop tabled copies of the reports of the Reid-Newfoundland Co. for the year ending December 31st, 1910.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House adjourned until Thursday at 4.30.

THURSDAY, March 9th.

The House met at 4.30.

Hon. R. K. Bishop moved the House into Committee of the Whole on the Bill respecting the Esquimaux and Indians resident in Labrador. Hon. Mr. Ayre in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. Robinson moved that Section 1 be amended by the insertion of the word "Nauscopee" in the third line after the word "Esquimaux," and also in the 7th, 9th and 11th lines.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment.

Hon. Mr. Ayre moved the report be received. The motion was carried.

Hon. R. K. Bishop moved the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Hon. R. K. Bishop moved the House into Committee of the Whole on the Seeds Bill. Hon. Mr. Ryan in the chair.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—It would be well to have an appeal from the decision of the Inspector. There seems to be no appeal at all. If the Inspector reports that seeds are unfit, the Bill says the seedman's license shall be cancelled.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—The Inspector has no power to cancel the license ; he has only to report. It is cancelled by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—The Minister under this section has no power to hold back the cancellation ; he should have the right to withhold such if conditions warranted his so doing.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—Do I understand the hon. gentleman to mean that the Minister would have no option.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—The wording of the clause as I understand it is that he has no option. I think it is an important matter. As I read it, the minute the report against seed comes in, the Minister has got to cancel the seedman's license.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. There is no law on the Statute Book but has a discretionary power, implied or otherwise, as to its carrying out, and under this section the Minister has a discretionary power implied, because the section first calls for a report. There cannot be a report without an inquiry, and then it will be for the Minister to see whether upon the evidence adduced, it is sufficient to call for the cancellation which the section provides for. I think that is perfectly clear.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—I am quite satisfied. I only wished to call attention to the matter.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—It is to be presumed that the Inspector will use his technical knowledge to judge whether the dealer in licensed seed continues to sell seeds which he has condemned, and I think it would be better to pass the Bill in its present form. If it does not prove satisfactory it can be amended another session.

Th Committee rose and reported the Bill passed without amend ment. On motion of Hon. J. D. Ryan the report was received, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg to move the second reading of the Peat Bounty Bill. This Bill is an amendment on the one at present on the Statute Book. The

original Bill provided a bounty to encourage the manufacture of peat during five years. The Government think it would be advisable to extend that period, and the Bill now before us provides for a period of ten years instead of five.

The motion was passed and the Bill was ordered to be sent to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

The President read a message from the Assembly informing the Council that they had passed the accompanying Bills, entitled "An Act to amend the Education Act" and "An Act to Regulate the Manufacture and Sale of Explosives." On moton of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

Hon. R. K. Bishop tabled the report of the Postmaster General for the year 1909-10.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House adjourned until Monday next at 4.30 p.m.

MONDAY, March 13.

The House met at 4.30.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg to move the third reading of the Agricultural Bill as amended.

The Bill was then read a third time, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop it passed and was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message to that effect.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg to move the third reading of the Seeds Regulation Bill.

The Bill was read a third time and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop passed, and was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message to that effect.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg to move that the next item on the order paper (committee on Peat Bill) be deferred.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg to move the second reading of the Education Bill. Hon. members are aware that the allocation is to be devoted to a very needful purpose, that of increasing the grant for small settlements where at present there are no schools, and for places where schools are only kept open part of the year for want of sufficient funds to pay the teachers.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—I would like to say a few words in support of this Bill. Anything that will help or foster the education of the young will always have my hearty support, and it is a most hopeful sign for the Colony to see such a large vote for education, and to see the grant being augmented each year. I look upon education as I do public health matters, and all should take an active interest in both. At present we have a splendid staff of Inspectors doing good work, and it is pleasing indeed to see what all Governments are doing to help them. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Hon. J. A. Robinson—M. President, the subject of education is so important that no apology is necessary for extended reference The Bill before the House, so far as its principle is concerned, cannot fail to meet with general approval. When seconding the motion for the appointment of a committee to draft the address in reply, I intimated my intention to refer to educational matters when the Bill foreshadowed in the Speech came before the House, and, sir, I now propose to do so, as briefly as possible. Speaking on the subject on a former occa-

sion, I said that successive legislators had abrogated their functions so far as education was concerned, and the more I go into the matter the more justifiable the assertion appears. Time was when the Sealing Bill was the hardy perennial. Each year new acts were passed, resulting in rendering confusion worse confounded. Happily, thirteen years ago a common-sense working basis was arrived at, and since then matters have been working satisfactorily. The Education Bill is now the perennial, with this difference — Sealing Bills evoked general interest, Education Bills little or none. During the last twenty years seventeen bills dealing with education have been before the Legislature. There would have been two more but for the disorganization resulting from the interregnum of 1894 and the resignation of the Winter Government in 1900. The Bill before the House is to ask for the appropriation of $7,000 for distribution amongst the different denominations in places so sparsely populated as to be unable to supply schools. In Newfoundland there are 1,267 settlements, an average of 190 to each, or about 50 children. With St. John's and the larger towns removed, the average is about a half. As a result there are many localities where there are no means whatever of getting an education. In 64 places there are no schools, in 60 school is open less than six months in the year, and in 200 places less than the year.

Some years ago it was recognized that this difficulty must be met. In 1892 the grant was $5,536.39. In 1895, after the bank crash, it dropped to $3,000, but in 1903 it was raised to $6,103.31. In 1905 it was $9,000, in 1908 it was increased to $20,000, and in 1909 it became $26,000, last year it was increased to $32,000, and now it is proposed to add another $7,000, making the total $39,000. Unfortunately, a few years ago, a change was made in the allocation of this grant, that in my opinion was disastrous to the best interests of those whom this grant is intended to benefit. Up to the year 1908 the Destitute Locality clause read : "The sum ..... shall be expended in such manner and under such rules and regulations as Governor in Council may determine." In the 1908 Act the words "on the recommendation of the Superintendents of Education" were interpolated, thereby removing the control from the Government to the Superintendents, who from the very nature of their appointments as denominational inspectors rank denomination first. Up to that fatal amendment the Government had in its power to protect the children in sparsely settled localities, even though they may not have used it. The change emasculated the Act, and was a virtual abdication by the Government of its functions, an abdication that went unnoticed and unchallenged, and for which members of the legislature of that year, irrespective of party affiliations, are equally responsible. The requirements of these places evoked considerable discussion, when an Act was passed to deal with them. Section 104 of that Act is known as the "Enabling Clause," and reads as follows :—

"The Governor in Council may from time to time, upon recommendation of the Boards of Edu-

cation concerned, and with the concurrence of the Superintendents of Education, authorize the establishment of amalgamated schools in sparsely populated settlements when the number of children will not warrant the establishment of separate schools. In such cases the Board and Superintendents consenting to such arrangements, may allot a portion of the funds accruing to their respective Boards for the purpose of such schools, and such funds shall be paid to the Board of Education of the denomination having the majority of population in such settlement, and such Board of Education shall have the management of said school. Provided that should any one of such Boards of Education desire at anytime to withdraw from such arrangement it may do so by giving six months' notice through its chairman to the Colonial Secretary, and the funds of the withdrawing Board shall from the date of the expiry of such notice cease to be paid to such managing Board so withdrawing."

And this is the Enabling Clause. Was there ever such a farce perpetrated upon a believing people? The apparent object of the clause is thrice defeated in its own terms. Amalgamation of grants demand (1) the recommendation of the Boards of Education concerned; (2) concurrence of Superintendents; and (3) may be cancelled at six months' notice. What likelihood is there of denominational Boards and denominational inspectors rising above the denominational plane? And if they did, what Boards would risk entering on a system that might be broken up any time. The whole thing was a hollow mockery. It could not be operative, and it is no harsh opinion that it was never intended to be operative. The fact is that we are afraid as legislature and government, and I do not speak of any particular legislature or government, of doing anything that may suggest disapproval of the denominational system. To that system as it applies to the centres of population, I am not opposed; it may be the best system. The spirit of mutual rivalry may be advantageous, or it may not; but where people are few and advantages scarce it is working enduring injury to children. If the fringes are removed from the Enabling Clause so-called, and the people were really enabled to unite on educational matters, if they desired to do so, there can be no reasonable doubt that immense benefit would result, and considerable waste of money and energy be avoided. Even in the Act of 1903 the legislature appears to have repented of its boldness in approving the Enabling Clause, which does not enable, for a special clause is inserted in the Act, Section 106: "The foregoing section shall not be construed as interfering in any way with the principle of denominational education which is by law established in this Colony," an apology which is absurd as it is unnecessary. The clause has not once been availed of, and, so long as legislators fear to touch the question, it will not be availed of, and the pitiful sight of three or more half-starved schools struggling where one could do the work effectively, will continue, the little ones, whilst ecclesiasts and laymen quarrel, being allowed to grow up in absolute ignorance.

Let me quote from Mr. Blackall's report for 1910. Speaking of Frenchman's Head, he says :— "This is a small settlement about two miles south of Garnish, where four denominations have each a small population. Not one of them can maintain a continuous school, and at present there is no co-operation. Until co-operation is effected, the place cannot enjoy proper educational facilities." (page 59 C. of E. Report for 1909. I have visited that place. Its people are hungry for education, but because in our wisdom we decree that the Methodist child must not learn the three R's in the same school as the Anglican or the Catholic, the children are growing up in ignorance. What applies to Frenchman's Cove applies to many other settlements. Mr. Blackall is emphatic, if not so emphatic as I could wish. He pleads for the making of citizens, but the system is making secretaries. On page 20 of his report for 1909, Mr. Blackall observes : "The persons who think that our system of education would be made more effective by being made undenominational are by no means few in number. The question is a grave one. . . . . While in the general principle I am in favor of the denominational system as the one best suited for our condition, I am by no means satisfied that ours is the only way of conducting a denominational system, and am of opinion that many useful modifications could be made in our system to the advantage of education and in the interest of economy." In these remarks I am in entire accord. Amalgamated schools in sparsely settled places do not threaten the system. There can be no divergence from it. Section 67 of the Act of 1903 makes proselytizing an offence. It reads : "No teacher in any college, academy or school, aided by moneys granted under this Act, shall impart to any child attending the same any religious instruction which may be objected to by the parent or guardian of such child." A very proper provision in any system. All I ask is that the little ones, otherwise deprived, shall learn to read and write and cypher together, leaving religious instruction to other hours and the teachers of religion. With all respect, I say that to refuse elementary education on denominational grounds is a crime against childhood. I may be wrong, but even with this additional grant, and the $13,000 promised next year, I am hopeless of the best results. More struggling schools we may have, but the Enabling Clause will remain a dead letter, and 180 do the work of 60. We all see these things and recognize the fol'y of them, but we are afraid to speak. A hint is sufficient for the charge that the denominational system is being attacked. I have no intention of doing that, though I say, unreservedly, that no greater or more disastrous mistake was ever made than the sub-division of the Protestant vote in the 70's. There may be vital differences in the viewpoint of education between Protestant and Catholic. There are none worth a straw between the various branches of the Protestant church. Now, a word or two about the C. H. E. I have already spoken on this matter, and pointed out the injury done by the present system. I know that it is considered heresy to criticize that body. We are told

that it is composed of men who give their services voluntarily, but when one assumes public duties, whether paid or not, the public should be allowed to enquire into and pass an opinion on the work done. I have nothing to say of the Councillors except to give them unqualified praise for the interest they take in their work and the good intentions with which they pursue it, but I would respectfully say that the system for which the Council of Hgher Education stands is doing a vast injury to the youth of our country. The system is a machine, destroying originality and independence. Nor do I stand alone in this view of the results that accrue from it. Mr. Burke, in his report of last year, says : "While the Council is doing excellent work in fostering an educational interest throughout the country, and creating a spirit of emulation and healthy rivalry among the various schools, yet the competitive element in the lower grades may, perhaps, have a tendency on occasions to overreach the object desired." (page xiv). Mr. Hanrahan, in his report for last year, says : "Care should be taken, however, to direct the Council's rapid development along the lines of practical progress in those subjects which are of vital importance in a good sound English education, and to avoid, as much as possible, the too great overcrowding of the school curriculum," a criticism eloquent in suggestion. Mr. Blackall and these gentlemen are schoolmasters of experience, is even more pronounced. He says : "A great responsibility rests upon the Council of Higher Education in the conduct of these examinations, for the education of the Colony is influenced enormously by this system. Is it for good or for evil ? I recognize that examinations are necessary, but I think the time has arrived for a very careful consideration of the system, as carried out by the Council of Higher Education, for I am conscious of a very serious evil resulting therefrom. The following sentiments taken from a letter received by me from one who has carefully observed things are worthy of very careful consideration : 'Your mild reference to the exigencies imposed on the pupils by the C. H. E. examinations is very timely. Our schools are rapidly becoming a forcing home for the plants which may show possible signs of prize-winning at the annual educational flower show. This of course reacts in two ways. The plants which are forced suffer by the forcing and the plants not thought worthy of attention suffer by neglect. Still this system is in vogue, and we cannot honestly deny to it the credit of a great educational stimulus.' I humbly submit that the examination system is conducted too much as a machine for creating competition, too little as a means of encouraging and directing true education. Although the following table shows that great is the call for some such stimulus as the examinations afford, I am very anxious that the competition element should be banished from them, for I know that it is injuring the education of the rising generation." (C. of E. report, 1909, page xx).

These are almost the words I employed in speaking of this last year, and it is gratifying to know that such an eminent authority

so emphatically coincides with my opinion. I want to see the abolition of this tax on the small child. I refer to the primary and preliminary grades.

The Associate Grade is unnecessary because a mere duplicate of London Matriculation, the Intermediate alone meets the real requirement. If further proof of the sloveliness of the system is wanted, I will refer you to the Council of Higher Education examiners themselves. Here are some extracts from their report of last year :

Primary Grade—" Spelling and writing were also weak." "Grammatical errors of the most elementary kind were numerous, and the spelling was often inaccurate. Very few were entirely free from error in spelling."

Preliminary Grade — " Candidates should watch their spelling closely. Many otherwise good papers were much disfigured by bad spelling." " The spelling was not good."

Intermediate—" There was a very serious amount of thoroughly bad work, inaccurate, unintelligent, and slovenly in style." " Faults of grammar and spelling were too frequent." The spelling was not generally so accurate as last year."

And no other result is possible. When cram is substituted for education, sloveliness takes the place of thoroughness. Teachers have not the time to teach, in the true sense of the word. They are compelled to force, force, force. If they don't do this the examination results are jeopardized. The smart boys and girls are pushed ahead, and the dull ones left to get along as best they may. There is another result which is doing a vast amount of injury. In the olden days it was a matter of common occurrence in schools to have the desks filled with young men during the winter months, fitting themselves for the opportunities that awaited them. There are many men prominent in this country and elsewhere who owe their success to the extra study when home from the Labrador or the Banks. Many a captain's certificate was won by a winter's work in the old schoolhouse. These young men gave a tone to school life and an inspiration to the children. Now the opportunity has passed. The schoolmaster has not a moment to spare from the incessant grind of filling the little ones with knowledge that the examiners demand, but which in point of real value is often lamentably small. I do not want the Council of Higher Education done away with, but to see substituted for it a Council of Education, free from the cramming system and without the " Higher."

At the opening of the session I referred to the expenditure of $5,249.27 for salaries of secretaries, travelling expenses and incidentals. From the published reports it is impossible to gather the meaning of this expenditure, but I have since learned that travelling expenses mean those incurred by teachers moving from appointment, quite a legitimate charge. The amount paid for Secretaries is small in the aggregate, and, I am informed, in most instances, these Secretaries are the clergymen on whom the burden of work falls, and who are the Chairmen as well. Considering the pressure of duties, the small amount, from $5 to $20, is scarce-

ly a recognition, and none will grudge it, but I submit that whenever and wherever voluntary service is procurable, it should be availed of, not merely for economy's sake, but as an incentive to education in the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. As it is, very few of the 197 secretaries are paid, the average payments being $2.50 a year, so that the expenditure is scarcely worth discussion, and could be more than met by the abolition of that voluminous mass of statistics, more or less valueless, and letterpress, more or less uninteresting, which annually appears in the form of school reports. What I wish to emphasize is that there are a large number of young men as well as older ones, and the number is increasing yearly, who would count it a privilege to devote their time and talent to educational work if the opportunity offered, but who are now without any outlet for their civic and humanitarian aspirations.

Referring again to the School Reports, I quote from Mr. Blackall's report for 1910, page xiv, a criticism of their value, far more severe than any I have ventured to express. He says: "The education of our children is surely of national as well as denominational importance, and yet there exists no one body, individual or corporate, whose appointed duty it is to study the matter or to regulate it. We have the one Education Act, it is true, but well nigh as many ways of interpretation thereof as denominations. Each denomination is doing its best, but as an isolated unit. Could not they help one another by co-operation without sacrificing anything that is essential to the denominational control of schools? Is it impossible that co-operation shall be so much as considered? Is it essential that Anglican statistics, for example, shall be compiled in an Anglican office, and all Anglican allocations certified by Anglican hands? I do not know how my brother superintendents feel in regard to this question, for under the existing system we see little of one another, but I do feel myself that all the book-keeping and compiling of statistics could be more speedily and advantageously done in one office than in the three or more as at present, and that Superintendents and Inspectors could be better employed. There is a great waste of energy and professional experience in the present system, and much inconvenience results to the general public. It is quite difficult at present for any interested person to obtain a complete statistical statement of education in the Colony for the purpose of study and investigation. One must seek a Roman Catholic report, a Salvation Army report, a Church of England report—and others, if possible. And when one has secured these several volumes, it is a task of no mean magnitude to unravel them and discover what one wishes to ascertain."

I now pass to the present system of school inspection, which is to a large extent a waste of time and energy. I have no quarrel with the school inspectors, and for those who place or have placed educational interests before interests political, or interests denominational, I have nothing but admiration and respect. It is with the system, not the inspectors, that I find fault. As a

matter of fact the more work an inspector does the less he is paid, a condition of affairs worthy of a Gilbertian opera. Every inspector is expected to pay his own travelling expenses. If he remains at home, doing little or nothing, his salary comes in full. If he travels extensively outside the Colony on other business or on pleasure, there is no reduction in the remuneration. But if he does his work, the more energetically he does it the less he has to support his family. The anomaly is so patent that its retention passes comprehension. I am told that salaries were lower, and that they were raised in order to meet the cost of the travelling. If so it must have been many years ago, for the present figure has ruled for at least a quarter of a century. The work has enormously increased, and unnecessarily so, and with the six inspectors it is impossible for each school to be visited annually under the present system. In 1909 there were 104 schools in Mr. Burke's district, and 210 days in the school year, leaving him sixteen days for travel and a school a day, an impossibility in the first place, and, even if possible, an absurdity, as local conditions must be considered, and some schools demand far more than a day for an examination to be of any value. Mr. Hanrahan has 110 schools, and is fortunate. Messrs. Blackall and Thompson 322, and Dr. Curtis and Mr. Lodge 305. In addition to the inspection work, many weeks, if not months, are employed in the compilation of the reports, whilst the clerical work is a heavy task. The more the system is looked into the more incongruous and inefficient it appears. The very method of appointment is of questionable value. Every little denomination is entitled to its own inspector. Carry the system a little further and appoint the Chairman of each Board as Inspector of the schools under his control and the absurdity would be no greater. There is now one inspector with only two schools, and another with four, another instance of denominationalism running mad. Some years ago an exceptional opportunity for remedying this state of affairs offered, but the influences against reform were too strong. The Rev. Dr. Milligan and Inspector Wickham had retired, and two new appointments were necessary. At that time I made a proposition to so modify the system as to insure not only more satisfactory results, but to offer incentives to the teachers. These suggestions were as follows :

(a) The Governor in Council shall nominate and appoint six inspectors of education, two of whom shall be members of the Church of England, two members of the Roman Catholic Church, and two members of non-conformist churches.

(b) On and after the 1st of January, A. D. 1900, only such persons shall be qualified to be inspectors as shall have been actually engaged in the inspection of schools in the Colony or in the teaching of schools in this Colony for a period of not less than five years, and shall be a holder of an Associate in Arts, London University Matriculation or other equivalent certificate.

(c) Inspectors shall rank in order of seniority of appointment.

(d) As vacancies occur they shall be filled up by the Governor in Council by the promotion to the vacancy of the inspector next in order of seniority, and a vacancy occasioned by the direct resignation, retirement or promotion of a junior inspector, shall be filled by the appointment by the Governor in Council of a qualified person of the same religious division as the person whose death, resignation or retirement caused the original vacancy.

(e) The supervision and inspection of the Church of England schools shall be conducted by the Church of England inspectors. The supervision and inspection of the Roman Catholic schools shall be conducted by the Roman Catholic inspectors ; and the supervision and inspection of Non-Conformist schools shall be conducted by the Non-Conformist inspectors.

(f) For the purpose of facilitating the supervision and inspection of schools the Governor in Council may define and prescribe districts within which the schools of any denomination shall be under the sole supervision and inspection of the inspector of the same denomination to be assigned to such district by the Governor in Council.

(g) It shall be the duty of the inspectors to report annually to the Government, who shall cause all such reports to be consolidated by the senior inspector, such consolidated reports to be laid before the Legislature by the Colonial Secretary at each session of the Legislature, and with such report the senior inspector shall include a report of the general progress of education and of all other general matters pertaining to education which shall have come under his notice.

(h) For the purpose of preparing the said consolidated report there shall be paid to the senior inspector out of the Colonial Treasury the sum of $400 annually.

(i) There shall be annually paid to each inspector, in addition to his salary, the sum of $100 to defray the expenses incident to inspection.

(j) The following annual salaries shall be paid to each of the inspectors : The senior inspector, $1,200 ; the second do., $1,100 ; the third do., $1,000 ; the fourth do., $900 ; the fifth do., $800 ; the sixth do., $700. The said salaries shall be in lieu of all fees, perquisites and expenses over and above those provided for in sub-section (1).

(k) No inspector shall directly or indirectly engage in commercial undertakings, or perform, unless by express permission of the Governor in Council, any professional duties for pecuniary reward other than those duties pertaining to his office.

Some of these suggestions might, with advantage, be modified in the light of experience, and I would suggest the division of the Island into six districts, the inspector for the year examining all the schools in this district, changing districts annually. It is, however, the appointment of teachers to the position that I most desire to emphasize. If we are going to keep our teachers in the profession we have got to open the door to something higher. If we give them the opportunity of getting to inspectorial rank, the result will be we shall

have them remaining in the profession. If something of this kind could have been adopted years ago, it would have been advantageous to the schools of the Colony. Some wholly groundless rumors were circulated at the time these proposals were made by me, and I would take this opportunity of explanation. The venerable Church of England Inspector was then the senior. Under the proposed change his nominal salary would have been $1,200, but added to this $100 for expenses and $400 for compilation of the report, the actual salary would have been $1,700, an increase instead of a decrease. Although twelve years have elapsed, this is the first opportunity that has been afforded me to explain the position I then took, a position which was misreported, I fear deliberately. My suggestions were not approved, and since that time the withdrawal from the ranks of teachers has gone on at an alarming rate.

We have got to get the educational system down to a better basis. No attempt is now made at grading. We should have our schools graded and the salaries standardized. I think it is unfair that a teacher in a large place is paid a large salary, while the teacher possessing exactly the same qualifications, doing possibly more laborious work, but in a smaller settlement, is paid a smaller salary. There should be a standard salary. There should also be a monetary recognition of experience, and teachers having experience should have a preference over others. There should be direct payment of salaries, not in dribs and drabs for the grades and bonuses, but in one sum according to the grade held by the teacher and of the school in which he teaches. Though I have said what I have I am not hopeful of seeing my views adopted. Pleading for reform is a voice of one crying in the wilderness. I hear those in our midst saying there is no system like our present system, and the man who dares to discuss changes is regarded as revolutionary, and proposed reforms as wholly without the realm of practical politics, but as long as I have a voice in this legislature I shall raise that voice against those details of the present system which are doing great injury to the children and the country, and preventing us from getting full value from the educational grants. Out of every ten dollars one is spent for education, and where it goes few seem to know or care. I again say that with the principle of this Bill I am in entire accord. I hope that now that we have $39,000 granted, and another $13,000 to be given later, when this $52,000 is available an opportunity will be given for the children who are growing up in darkness and ignorance mainly through our own indifference and timidity. My hope is a very weak one, however, for I fear it will be only a repitition of the past, old methods will continue, and little of real value will result. I give the Bill my hearty support, but make my protest.

The motion for second reading was put and carried, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg to move the second reading of the

Explosives Bill. This Act, which is intended for the regulation of the manufacture, storage, sale and transportation of explosives is the complement of the Bill which passed this House a few days ago. I may say for the information of hon. members that while this Bill is not as exhaustive as the Imperial Act governing the manufacture and sale of explosives, it contains all of it that is considered essential, and is a copy of the Act which has recently been passed by the Canadian Parliament after great care and research on the part of the Canadian Government. They were assisted in Canada in arriving at a Bill to meet the requirements of that country by Capt. Desborough, His Majesty's Inspector of Explosives at the Home Office, London, who is supposed to be the greatest authority upon explosives, and he was sent to Canada by the Home Office for this special purpose. A conference was held in Ottawa in September last, consisting of the Director of Mines, Deputy Minister of Mines. and about 30 manufacturers of explosives and mine managers, with Capt. Desborough, to consider their proposed legislation. It would appear therefore that we shall be quite safe in enacting a similar law and adopting generally such regulations as theirs, but varying in some respects perhaps to meet local conditions and requirements. Up to the present time it has not been necessary to enact any law governing the manufacture of explosives, and it has been permissable to handle and to store it without the precaution which experience in other countries has found it to be essential for preventing serious accidents. While the increasing use of high explosives would now demand precautionary measures it is not intended by the Government to incur large expense in the appointment of inspectors or other officials, and the regulations which will be made in accordance with the provisions of the Bill will be framed with a view to public safety without undue hardship upon handlers and consumers.

The motion was carried, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House adjourned until Thursday next at 4.30.

THURSDAY, March 16.

The House met at 4.30 pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the order of the day was deferred.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the following Bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow : An Act for the Encouragement of Agriculture, The Motor Car, Retiring Allowances and Crown Lands Acts.

On motion of Hon. M. P. Gibbs the Municipal Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

Hon. President read a communication from the House of Assembly, informing the Council that the Lower House had concurred in the amendment made to the Esquimaux and Indian Bill and passed the same without amendment.

Hon. R. K. Bishop then proposed the following resolution :

The Council having learned of the death of Mrs. Chas. R. Ayre, widow of the Hon. Chas. R. Ayre, formerly a member of this Council.

Resolved—That the Council do now adjourn as an expression of sincere sympathy and deepest regret with the Hon. Mr. Ayre and his family.

Resolved—That a copy of the foregoing resolution be transmitted to the Hon. Mr. Ayre.

The Resolutions were seconded by Hon. John Harris and passed unanimously.

The House then adjourned until Monday next at 4.30 p. m.

MONDAY, March 20.

Pursuant to adjournment the House met at 4.30.

Hon the President read the following message from His Excellency the Governor :

"The Governor has the honor to inform the Honorable Legislative Council that he has received a despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies conveying an expression of His Majesty's sincere thanks to the Legislative Council for their address and expression of sympathy on the death of his late Majesty King Edward VII, and loyal adherence to the person and throne of his present Majesty."

(Sgd.) RALPH WILLIAMS, Governor.

On motion of Hon. Dr. Skelton an Act to amend the Beaver Act was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Education Bill, Hon. J. D. Ryan in the Chair. The Committee rose, reported the Bill passed without amendment, and on motion of Hon. J. D. Ryan the report was received.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the House resolved itself into Committee on the Explosives Regulation Bill. Hon. James Angel in the Chair. The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment. On motion of Hon. James Angel the report was received.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

The second reading of the Forest Fires Bill was deferred.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg leave to move the second reading of the Agricultural Bill. This Bill is one upon which I do not feel qualified to speak with any expert authority, but I am sure it is recognized by every member of this House that the extension of agriculture is a most important subject. That such large sums of money have to be expended year after year in the purchase of hay, potatoes, turnips, oats, and cabbage, grown in the neighboring provinces, which nobody doubts can be produced in this country, is a condition of affairs which we should attempt to remedy as quickly as possible. That we can produce vegetable of all kinds superior to any grown in Canada or the United States has been fully demonstrated. Why then do we not produce them in greater quantity ? The answer is, partly, because our people have not been fully instructed, and have not the knowledge or the means of procuring the seeds best suited to

our soil and climate. Probably most of us here had the pleasure, a few months ago, of listening to addresses delivered in the Council Chamber by Messrs. Robertson and McPhail, gentlemen eminent in their profession, and whose opinions are accepted far beyond the borders of their own country. These gentlemen gave it as their unqualified belief that agriculture can be enormously extended here, and with the assurance of profitable returns. Successive Governments in recent years have been seeking to encourage the extension of agriculture, but to put our people in possession of practical methods is a difficulty which has not yet been overcome. The late Government decided upon a model farm, and a property was purchased and equipped at a large cost. The present Government did not agree with this, and, rightly or wrongly, decided upon a different course. The desire, however, of past Governments was the same primarily as that of the present Government, to impress our people with the advantages of tilling the soil, and obtaining from land at least sufficient to supply our wants. Some there are who ridicule the idea of our people becoming farmers or turning the land to profitable account, while others protest their belief that we can equal any production of the best agricultural portions of the Dominion of Canada. I incline to neither of these extremes, and, while believing that much more can be done than we have yet achieved, that Newfoundland cannot hope to rival even relatively the great agricultural provinces lying to the west of us. A considerable sum is being voted and expended for the promotion of agriculture, the desire of the Government being to help our people to get the best possible results from their farming and gardening operations. Whether that object can be attained time alone can tell, but certain it is that money must be spent in pursuance of any agricultural policy.

The motion was put and carried unanimously.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the Motor Vehicle Bill and the Retiring Allowance Bill were read a second time, and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—The Municipal Council in their deliberations have deemed it necessary to make certain amendments to the present Municipal law, and also to add new sections to the present Act, in order that they may be better enabled to carry on the civic affairs of the city.

The first section of the Bill provides that all water rates, sewerage rates, vacant land taxes and property taxes which may be in arrears for more than one year shall bear interest at the rate of six per cent. per annum. The Council asks that this be made law, because, they point out that except the delinquent taxpayer be penalized in some shape or form when he does not pay his taxes, that the work of collection is very much impeded. If this section of the Act be adopted, then, from the time it becomes law, persons who may be indebted to the Municipal Council for

water rates and other taxes for more than one year will have to pay interest upon their arrears.

The next section deals with the holding of appraisements in the interval between the time when the triennial appraisements are held. Houses are being built in the city every month in the year, and except the Council incurs the expense of holding an appraisement as the law now stands may mean an outlay on the part of the Council to the extent of $600 or $700, and upon this outlay there may not be $100 of taxes collected. The Council asks that the mode of procedure be simplified, and that power be given them to make special appraisements in relation to buildings newly erected or constructed between the times of holding triennial appraisements. The interest of the taxpayer is safeguarded, because notice of the appraisement must be given him.

Personally, I don't see any objection whatever to the Council being given this right, on the contrary, I think it will have the effect of lessening the expenditure which has to be made for the purpose of holding special appraisements. This in itself is a decided advantage to the Council, when we take into consideration the limited resources which it has at its control.

The next section which the Council has asked to be made law is that they be given the power to fix by bye-law or regulation the scale of fares or charges which shall be paid to licensed cab drivers. From time to time complaints appear in the daily press of undue advantage being taken by certain cabmen of persons who make use of their services. The Council, in order to remedy this condition of affairs, asks the Lower House to concur in the making of a law whereby cab rates and charges may be prescribed to be paid to licensed cab drivers driving within a radius of twelve miles from the City Hall. No doubt the Council has given this matter consideration, and in view of the fact that they represent the citizens of St. John's, who are most concerned in this matter, it would be hardly fair to refuse them the powers which they ask.

The next section (4) of the Bill will make it incumbent upon the owners of horses kept within the city limits to register them at the Council office. The Council points out that, owing to the system which has been followed, it is impossible to collect all the taxes from the owners of horses, and that it is not possible to keep a proper register of them. It is not compulsory upon the owners of horses to register now, and the Council asks that it be made compulsory. They are the best judges of what the needs of the city are, and what citizens require, and no doubt voices the sentiments of the taxpayer in this respect.

The next section deals with Companies or persons who want to lay cables or conduct pipes underground through the streets. The necessity for a section of this kind being in the Municipal Act became apparent when the Commercial Cable Co. sought to exercise the supposed right to dig up and trench the streets of the city for the purpose of laying its cables through the streets. The Council at the time refused to give the Company permission to

lay its cables through the streets, except upon the payment of a tax and other conditions covering the mode and manner of laying its cables. There was no express power in the Municipal Act to fix the charges which a Company would have to pay. This section gives them the power to give permission to open the streets and also to impose whatever special charge or tax which, in the opinion of the Council, would be fair to those requiring to use the streets of the city for the purposes named.

Section 6 of the Act purposes giving the Council power to purchase lands and other property to hold the same for the use of the Council. The Municipal Council never had any right to own or acquire property for the use of the city or of the Council. This section enables it, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to acquire such rights and property as may be necessary in order to carry on its work and the government of the city. This is a very necessary section.

The last section of the Bill, section 7, applies to certain erections within what is called the "fire zone" of the city, and also the furnishing of plans to the Council before erections or buildings can be undertaken in the city. The Council has been in the habit in the past of giving what is known as temporary permission to the trade to put up structures on their wharves and piers. This, strictly the Council had no right to do, because the law provides that within certain limits of the city no structure can be built except of inflammable material. Sheds on wharves and piers which are used for storing freight from steamers and vessels are not built of uniflammable material, and it is next to impossible to have them built in that manner. This section, then, will enable the Council, when this Bill becomes law, to give permission to persons requiring sheds for the storing of merchandize to erect them on their wharves to a height of not more than 15 feet and covering an area of not more than 200 square feet, but then it imposes the obligations upon the persons getting the permission that the roof and sides of the shed must be covered with fireproof material. With this explanation of the provisions of the Bill, I therefore, Mr. President, move that the Bill be now read the second time.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Peat Bounty Bill. Hon. John Harris in the Chair.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg to propose a new section to this Bill. The object of the addition is to prevent any subsidized company which has a special contract with the Government from claiming the bounty under this Act.

Hon. John Harvey—I am glad to find the Government making this provision, as I think it is necessary.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill passed with an amendment.

On motion of Hon. John Harris the report was received, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

The motion for second reading passed, and on motion of Hon. M. P. Gibbs the Bill ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The second reading of the Crown Lands Bill was deferred.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the Old Age Pension Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. John Harris the Pilotage Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, at 4.30 p. m.

TUESDAY, March 21.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House met at 4.30.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Peat Bounty, Education, and Explosives Regulations Bills were read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message to that effect.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—Mr. President, I beg to move the second reading of the Forest Fires Bill, and in doing so I might mention that last session power was given to form a Board to devise plans for the prevention of forest fires, which heretofore had caused so much destruction to some of our best timbered areas. It is found that the Board has done its work admirably, and during the last year there has been no forest fire of any moment. The idea of the Bill now before the House is to give a permanency to that arrangement.

The Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Hon. Dr. Skelton—I beg to move the second reading of the Beaver Preservation Bill. The present law on the Statute does not provide for prosecutions in the sense that the Act intended, and the present Bill is introduced for the purpose of overcoming this defect.

The Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill passed without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Angel this report was received, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Hon. R. K. Bishop moved the House into Committee on the Agricultural Bill. Hon. Mr. Angel in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill passed without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Angel this report was received, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Motor Vehicle Bill. Hon. Mr. Ayre in the Chair.

The Bill passed the Committee stage without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Ayre the report of the Committee was received, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Retiring Allowances Bill. Hon. M. P. Gibbs in the Chair.

Committee rose and reported the Bill passed without amendment.

On motion of Hon. M. P. Gibbs the report was received, and on

motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. M. P. Gibbs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Municipal Bill. Hon. J. D. Ryan in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—Mr. Chairman, I purpose to make an amendment to the section just read, by having inserted a clause making provision for appeal. For some reason, or through an oversight, this provision was omitted in the first drafting of the Bill. It is well to have provision made in this Bill for an appeal against appraisements, which may be made from time to time. If hon. members will look at section 5 of the Act they will find there what really should have been inserted in this section, and omitted from section 5. I would therefore move that the words found in section 5 relating to appeals be inserted in section 2. The object of the present law is, that in order to have a special appraisement that all the machinery connected with a court of appraisement has got to be put in motion. Suppose that the Municipal wanted to appraise a half dozen houses in order to get the taxes from them. It would be necessary to incur an expenditure very much in excess of the revenue received from that appraisement. As to an appeal from the Court of Revision, there is a right to go to the Supreme Court. This amendment will simplify matters and protect the rights of the taxpayers as well.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—(Referring to section 5)—I beg to ask if it is purposed to strike out the latter clause? Would it not be wiser to make a second clause?

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—No, for the reason that if we amend this the company may be called upon to pay for the right of using the street, which is not taxed or appraised in the same manner as land or buildings, but by the resolution of the Council. If a cable company were opening the streets, for instance, they would be taxed according to the number of lineal feet covered. The Council would decide the matter, and the company would have no right of appeal. An appeal in this case would be senseless. The appraisement or valuation of a house is regulatd by its size and the locality in which the house is built. There is a precedent which may be followed; with companies there are no precedents to follow. In other cities no appraisement takes place, but the amount to be paid is fixed by a resolution of the Council. In section 5 the Council would fix the price and the company would have to pay.

Hon. Mr. Harris—If section 2 is part of the old custom, as I understand it is, it read "surface" pipes; in this section it says "sewer" pipes. I do not know which is meant, only what it says here.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—The hon. member is right. "Service" is intended, and I move the section be amended.

Section 2, as amended, was then passed.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that section 5 be amended by striking out the words from "1902" down to the word "Council," at the end of the section.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—I do not understand what is meant by section 7. Is it to prevent sheds

from being built ? There is no use having a section here which provides for the building of a shed with one side open. I should like to konw whether it is permitted to use sliding doors or not.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—It would not. The section is clear.

Hon. Mr. Harris—I don't think we ought to amend this Bill which those men (Municipal Councillors) have brought in here unless we had some good reason for altering the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—I cannot agree with my hon. friend that we should not amend the Bill because it was drafted by the Municipal Council.

Hon. Mr. Harris—We should not amend this Bill without some consideration and without being able to give a reason for our action.

Hon. Mr. Greene—What is the intention by opening the one side?

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—I do not understand the Bill perfectly myself, but I think the Council had in mind when dealing with this amendment that in this particular to permit of the use of temporary structures for the storage of oil, etc., by the trade for a short time until it was shipped on board steamers or vessels. The object of the Bill is to enable the Council to give permission.

Hon. Mr. Greene—It may be temporary, with intention of removing it.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—I do not think that is the intention. It is more for the use of storing cargoes from steamboats as soon as landed and for loading steamboats. These sheds are not intended to be merely temporary. the sides and roof must be of uninflammable material. It is clearly stated in the Bill what the intention is.

At this stage the Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg to move the second reading of the Crown Lands Bill. It has been found that changing conditions in regard to agriculture, mining, lumbering and other industries in this country call for amendments to the present laws. The present Bill has been prepared with a view to assisting development and safeguarding the public interests. It will be noticed that Section 1 deals with licenses of occupation, and the reason for the section will be better understood when I state for the information of this House that the existing law leaves room for a person to secure a valuable timber area within three miles of the sea shore. Now it is, of course, well known that no licenses for cutting timber are granted within three miles of the coast, and it may become a temptation to persons to endeavor to secure an attractive area by taking it out under a license of occupation, which of course relates to the clearing of land for agricultural purposes. It is possible that a licensee may start in very energetically to clear his land, the first operation being, of course, to cut down the timber, and having taken all the timber off may, for some reason, conclude that he did not really care for farming after all. The object, then, of this section is to prevent timber being taken and sold from protected areas. Section 2 is to permit operators in timber to cut from their lands only half the quantity they are at present com-

pelled to cut, in other words, they need provide mills with a capacity of one thousand board measure per day only, for every ten square miles of their holdings. Section 4 compels the furnishing of accurate returns of the quantity of lumber produced. Section 5 is intended to prevent speculating in lands, and will be of advantage to persons to apply for lands for purposes of operating them. As things have been, applications are put in for trees of thousands of square miles which are never taken up.

Hon. John Harvey—Before this Bill passes the second reading, I want to speak on one or two matters in connection with the Crown Lands Act. I am glad the Act has come up, and the alteration in the terms for survey made. The old survey lines called for a three foot butline all around the property, and I think this is hopelessly impossible of being carried out, besides being wasteful of timber and time. As a matter of fact. that law has never been carried out by either the Government or applicant. Therefore, it is a good thing to have something substituted for it. Under the change a blazed line is proposed. There are one or two other matters on which I am going to propose some amendments when the Bill is in Committee. I think the mill called for in the previous Act was confined to too small an area, and this section was rarely carried out in practice. That Act called for the erection of a mill or mills on granted property within a certain time, the object being, of course, to have the property developed. No doubt a hard and fast rule of that sort, with a limited period, worked hardship in certain cases. This section is correctly intended to alter that and give the applicant a little more time to erect the mill. But I do not think that that time should not be set without limit in the hands of the Governor in Council. I have no doubt they could be trusted, but they should have some limit. They may have friends in their own Government, and may extend time if asked by them or their supporters to extend for a year or two or five, may yield to the pressure, and it may result in timber limits being locked up for some time, which, I think, it is the object of the Bill to avoid. There should be some limit of two or three years, if only for the protection of the Governor in Council, who may be unjustly suspected of being interested. Another matter which I want to have amended is the phrasing employed in advertising. It is the commonest thing in the world to take up the Royal Gazette and find that so and so is applying for areas, bounded on the north by Reid block No. 1, on the west by, for instance, J. J. Murphy's land, on the east by land of somebody else, this being purposely put in in order that the public may be unable to find the location of the claim. Many of these applications do not state the district or location, and it is impossible for a man in Exploits to say if half the application is covering his own backyard or not. So I am going to propose an amendment on the Bill, that in all notices published applying for timber limits the district and areas shall be named, and, furthermore, when the applications are put in by a solicitor, the prin-

cipals shall be therein mentioned, and if the applicant is a resident elsewhere than in the Colony, his address shall be given. I think, in regard to the timber limits, it would have been desirable that there should be some limit set to the extent of area which shall be granted by a Government to any one company or individual, say five hundred miles, and when a company wants more than that they should come to the Legislature. I think there is a great tendency to issue grants on much too extensive a scale, and the result of such grants may be to induce possible and probable wild speculation. It means an enormous amount of capital would be required, much more than for a smaller grant. There is one great difficulty in the Crown Lands Act as it stands which is not protected in the new Bill, and which I think ought most decidedly to be amended, and it is this. Under the Mineral Act, a mineral license or lease falls to the ground automatically if the rent is not paid, and that, I think, is as it ought to be. On the other hand, a timber lease does not expire when rentals are not paid, and I know of one case where a great abuse has resulted from this thing. There was a timber limit in which I had an interest, situated north of Bonavista Bay. I held it for a year or two, then had an application from an American company, who were recommended to me, asking for an offer. I made an offer, asking no cash, simply that a mill should be put up, and that I should be awarded a certain amount of stock in the company. I got an agreement signed, and the deeds were transferred to the company. It was a New York concern, and it was really nothing more than a fake. They printed some very fine scrip on gilt-edged paper, and went out on Broadway, and I understand they sold all they could for cash. The rentals came due and were not paid. The contract with me came due and nothing was done; not a cent was spent on the place. They probably went on selling scrip, and no doubt made quite a lot of money out of it. I took the matter to the Government of the day, and asked them to cancel the lease for non-payment of rentals. I explained what was going on, and the reply I got was that the Government were unable under the Crown Lands Act to cancel that lease, because the provision of the Act is this that where a rental falls due, and is not paid, the rental shall carry interest at the rate of 6 per cent., meaning that the Colony is loaning the licensee his rents and charging 6 per cent., and the only way to recover is by taking a suit at law to recover damages against the licensee. It is not likely that any Government is gong to take that position, and particularly against a company which is registered in New York, at any rate it has never been done. The courts here are very easy with foreign companies, and the result is these people continued to hold that property, because the Government was not able to take it from them. I think within the last two years they have paid up the rentals, because they found timber limits were increasing in value. The Government has no means of cancelling without going into court, and I think that ought to be altered, and just as mining properties are forfeited so a timber property should be

forfeited, subject to say six months' grace from the Government. I think these leases ought automatically to be extinguished, otherwise the Colony is lending itself to such possible scandals as that to which I have referred. On these points I think the law ought to be amended, and I propose to try and pass some of them when in Committee.

The motion for second reading was carried.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg leave to move the second reading of the Old Age Pension Bill. The question of how to provide some means of assisting the aged poor has been for many years occupying the serious thought of leading statesmen in various countries, but not until quite recently has any plan been worked out and put into practical operation. It is quite a number of years since the question was mooted in Newfoundland, and some years ago the late Government, as will be remembered by all present, appointed a commission, to sit out of session, take evidence, and report. The personnel of the commission warranted the expectation that a report at once comprehensive and cogent, and a scheme worthy of such brainy men, would have been recommended, but no report was made by that representative and most intelligent committee. One can hardly be blamed, therefore, for impugning the bona fides of the Government which appointed them. That there was need for caution all will admit, but I doubt if many persons can be found to agree with the opinions we have heard voiced recently. We have been told that the scheme recently adopted and put into practice in England is the only sound scheme, and that universal distribution above a specified age limit alone deserves recognition or can be found satisfactory. Even if, for argument sake, it be admitted that the British scheme is the best or most satisfactory possible, though this is debatable, how could we expect in this country to emulate a country with such vast resources as Great Britain. It would appear from the arguments advanced in certain quarters that, because we cannot follow the example of Britain, we should not attempt anything, but I venture to think such opinions will find no responsive sentiment in this House. I am of the opinion, Mr. President, that no action of any Government for a great many years past gave such universal satisfaction or proved of such benefit to the people generally as will the pension scheme provided for under this Bill. Unbiased opinion, Mr. President, will have to admit that the Government have arranged a plan at once simple, effective, reasonable and workable, and quite within the means of the Colony, without any additional burden upon the taxpayers. That the Government could carry out the extensive programme outlined in the Premier's manifesto without increased taxation, was ridiculed by our opponents, but not many of the strongest supporters of the Premier thought that a pension scheme was feasible. The amount of the pension has been criticised also, but the recipients will regard $50 per annum a very rea-

sonable allowance. The age limit is thought to be high, but the explanation of that is the greatest difficulty in connection with putting the Act into force will be the selection of the first 400 persons, and everybody will agree that the oldest should have the first consideration. When those 75 and over are provided for, it will be a simple matter to lower the age limit. You are, of course, aware, sir, that it is the intention of the Government to provide for another 400 persons next year, and, if not then, certainly in following years conditions other than the age limit will be taken into account. I feel, Mr. President, that no argument is really necessary to incite the sympathy of this House, and that the Bill will receive its ready and hearty support.

The motion for second reading was passed, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The second reading of the Pilotage Bill was deferred.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House adjourned until Thursday next at 4.30 p. m.

THURSDAY, March 23.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House met at 4.30.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Agricultural, Motor Vehicle and Retiring Allowances Bills were read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Assembly with a mesage to that effect.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Forest Fires Bill. Hon. James Anugel in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—May I ask if Section 8, which is proposed to be repealed, includes in it the clause relating to a screen over smoke-stacks of engines ? I am not going t o tax the patience of the House, but would simply remind them of the discussion which took place in 1905 when this was going through here. It may be remembered that a very high fine was put on the company if this absurd section dealing with screens on smoke-stacks was not complied with. It was found absolutely impossible to keep the screen on the engine, and under this section the railroad company was liable to a fine of $500 if at any time they were found to violate the section, although it was pointed out at the time that it was impossible to satisfactorily maintain a screen. I am glad to see the section referring to this repealed.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I should like to say that I have also a recollection of that debate and the endeavor to get an amendment from the Government at the time they passed that section in the Lower House, and no amendment was accepted. I will not go largely in to the matter, as Hon. Mr. Harvey has very fully explained the absurdity of the Act as it stands at present.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Angel the report was received, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was ordered to be read a third time to-morow.

Hon. John Harris moved the House into Committee of the

Whole on the Beaver Preservation Bill. Hon. Mr. Ayre in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill passed without amendment. The report was received, and motion of Hon. Mr. Harris was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs moved the House into Committee of the Whole on the Municipal Bill. Hon. Mr. Ryan in the Chair.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—It has been pointed out to the House that it may be desirable to amend the section 7 of the Municipal Act, and I would therefore move that the words on the seventh line "and open on one side" be stricken out.

The amendment was carried, and the Committee rose and reported the Bill passed with some amendment.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Ryan the report was received, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

Hon. R. K. Bishop moved the House into Committee of the Whole on the Crown Lands Bill. Hon. Mr. Harris in the Chair.

Hon. R. K. Bishop moved a new Section 2 of the Bill, as follows :

2—Section 24 of the Crown Lands Act is hereby repealed and the following is substituted therefor—

24—No such license shall be granted until notice of intention to apply has been published in Royal Gazette for a period of one month prior to such application. The said notice shall contain the name and address of the applicant, and, with as much certainty as possible, shall describe the location and boundaries of the land applied for, naming the electoral district in which same is situated and its approximate area.

The section was adopted.

Hon. John Harvey—I was not aware until to-day that an amendment was proposed in the Lower House somewhat on the same lines as mine to Section 2, Subsection 1. I explained on the second reading that I thought, in the Government's own protection, there ought to be some limit set in the length of time given for the erection and completion of mills. I think the Government might be under pressure to grant terms which would not be justified, and granting them would perhaps throw imputations on the Government which would not be at all desirable. I think therefore they ought to welcome some limit which they would be obligated to give to people for developing properties. I propose that Section 3, Sub-section A1, be amended as follows—By inserting after the word "license," on the third line of the second page, the following: "But such period shall not exceed two years for commencing and four years for completing the erection of same ;" and by inserting after the word "license" on the seventh line, these words : "But such period shall not exceed two and one-half years for commencing and five years for completing such factory or factories." That will give ample time to any bona fide concern which wishes to erect either saw mills or pulp mills. In case of saw mills they have to start within two years. It may be a modest start, but they will have to com-

plete them within four years. Pulp mills have to start in two and one-half years, and have to complete in five years. I quite recognize that under the present Act, which permits only one year for starting and completing, that a pulp company, particularly, is in a very dangerous position, because no pulp mill can finish so soon, and may take years before it is completed, as it may take a long time for surveys. But I do think the Government ought not ask to administer the public domain with an absolutely free hand. I think there ought to be some limit, and I beg therefore to move the amendment.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I am glad to see the great interest my hon. friend is taking in the Bill, but I regret to say that I am unable to accept the amendment proposed by him, as I think it would work hardship in some cases.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—In reply to the hon. introducer's objection, I would say that any company who wanted more time than that named in the amendment could apply to the Legislature.

There voted for the amendment Hons. Harvey, Greene and Ryan.

The motion was lost, and the Section as it stood passed.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—I also think the Government should not grant more than five hundred miles to any one person or company, and that it should retain the adjoining five hundred miles. If more than this were needed in any specific case, it should be the subject of special legislation, and a special charter should be sought, as in the case of the Harmsworths. This would relieve the Government of too much responsibility, and probably prevent in some cases unjust criticism of their motives. In connection with the Harmsworth deal, the discussion both inside the House and outside did good. I therefore move that the section be amended accordingly.

The amendment was put and lost on the following division—for : Hons. Harvey, Ryan and Greene ; against : Hons. Bishop, Ayre, Angel, Robinson and Gibbs.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—I should like to ask the hon. introducer of the Bill what is meant by the word "Blaze." It is not clearly defined, and might mean that in a survey the ties could be blazed at from 2, 3, or 100 yards, or possibly 200 yards.

Mr. Harvey then proposed an amendment whereby the Minister of Agriculture and Mines should issue regulations defining the words "blazed line."

Hon. Mr. Greene—What would be the difference if the line was regularly blazed and could be found, whether it were at two, three or a hundred yards ?

Hon. John Harvey—I wish to propose two other amendments in connection with the old Act. The first is to call for the deposit at the time the application is made at the Crown Lands Office for a timber land of a bonus of $2 per square mile. This would prevent idle and fake applications and would also check, to some extent, the system of repeat applications. An applicant frequently now puts in an application in the hopes that it will not be dealt with by the Government for a long time. When pressure of work prevents the Government from dealing with that application, the Government is open to the imputation

of holding back consideration in the interests of the applicant. The applicant remains, for all intents and purposes, owner of the limit, and able to deal exclusively with it, although he has not paid one cent for his property. If the application is granted, and he does not want to make the cash deposit called for by the present law, he gets one of his friends to put in a new notice in the Royal Gazette as soon as the old application has expired, and the same thing is repeated, and not only is it possible to hold properties for years in this way, but, as a matter of fact, and as the members of this House know, it has been done again and again and is being done to-day.

Mr. Harvey then proposed the following amendment—" The said bonus to be paid upon the whole area applied for, and it shall be deposited with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines at the same time that the application for the area is made. In the event of the application being refused, the amount so deposited shall be immediately returned to the applicant."

Hon. R. K. Bishop—This matter, Mr. Chairman, has received a great deal of consideration from the Government, and has been discussed in its every phase. For a considerable time I was fully in accord with the suggestions of the Hon. Mr. Harvey, but, after hearing the matter fully discussed on all sides, I must admit that my opinions were altered. I say, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman's amendment be incorporated in the Bill it would prove a great hardship to the honest, we'l-intentioned man who would make application for an area, for the reason that if he did not have the amount to deposit he could not make the application. Most men would be unable to make this deposit before hand, but if their applications were approved it would be much easier to secure the amount of rentals, if he could prove the land was valuable. For instance, a poor man might make appplication for two or three hundred miles and with his application deposits $400 or $600. This amount is then tied up for two or three or four months, and at the end of which the Minister of Mines tells him the area applied for is not available. The more wealthy man would not mind making such deposit, and if he failed to get the area applied for he would scarcely be put to inconvenience. I think, Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this amendment would be simply assisting the rich man at the expense of the poor man, which would be nothing more nor less than class legislation. The Government of the day are showing favors to none, the first application is always considered. I think the amendment is unnecessary and I am unable to support it.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—In reply to the hon. gentleman, I might say that I cannot agree with him that any hardships would be put on the poor man by the passing of this amendment. The amount is too trifling. If a man applies for 100 miles the deposit would be only $200. The deposit would only be in the hands of the Government perhaps for a day or so, possibly for a couple of months, and if the applicant did not have the amount it would be an easy matter for him to get it. The point is that none but bona fide

applications would be made. That persons should be allowed to hold enormous areas for months without paying any taxes is absolutely unfair both to the public and the Government, and I am of opinion that this amendment would have a great effect in remedying this.

Hon. Mr. Robinson—Mr. Chairman, is this amendment in order ? I think we have no right to make such an amendment here. It involves the question of taxation and in my opinion it should come from the other House.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—I think it is perfectly in order.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—I have no desire to invade the privileges of the Lower House. I might say in connection with applications that the unexpected often happens even with those idle speculators. Last year some areas were granted parties whom it was thought would be unable to meet the rentals, but the very opposite happened, and vice versa.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—How does that bear upon this point ?

Hon. Mr. Bishop—Simply that the amendment may not produce the result aimed at ; that it would not stop speculation.

The amendment was then put and lost on the same division as the former one.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—The next amendement I wish to move has to do with the automatic reversion of properties to the Crown. If any man who holds mineral lands fails to pay the rental he loses them automatically, but this does not at present apply to timber lands. I do not think there should be any difference between holders of mineral lands and holders of timber limits. Now the present situation regarding a timber lease is that if a holder is not paying rent he is permitted to borrow the money from the Colony to pay his rent. The effect of that system is that if a man gets a timber license he need not pay any money on it until the Government goes into court and takes action against him. I propose to amend section 27, page 13, of the Crown Lands Act by adding the following clause : "If the first year's rental be not paid as provided in this section within thirty days of the approval, or if at any subsequent time during the currency of a license to cut timber given under this Act, the rental herein provided to be paid shall remain unpaid for six months after the date when such rental shall become due or when the licensee has failed to fulfil the conditions attaching to his license in regard to the erection of mills or factories, as provided under this Act, for six months after the date on which it shall have become obligatory under his license to do so, then and in either case the license shall ipso facto, forthwith become null and void and shall revert to the Crown." That is rather a long amendment, but the sense of it is understood. It allows a period of six months grace after the rental is due. This is to protect the holder against oversights. The Government is not obliged to notify him when his rentals are overdue and he is in danger of forfeiture, but in practice they would probably do so in all bona fide cases.

Hon. Mr. Greene—I do not see the object at all of the thirty day's stipulation. What is the difference in paying the last of

October and paying the last of November ? Why allow any term of grace ? It weakens Hon. Mr. Harvey's position.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—The present Act provides thirty day's grace after disapproval by the Government. I propose making it six months. It would be hard lines on a property holder to lose his property without any term of grace.

Hon. Mr. Greene—It would be very hard for a mortagor to lose his property if he did not pay the interest, but nevertheless the law is there. I would like to see the section read, so that all land should become forfeited at once whenever there is a default of payment. I beg to make an amendment to that effect.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—The amendment suggested by Hon. Mr. Greene is very, very drastic. I would point out in Section 24 of the Crown Lands Act that a license shall be liable to forfeiture. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines has the power to notify that a man's license or grant is forfeited.

Hon. Mr. Greene—What do you gather from that ?

Hon. Mr. Bishop—That a license or a grant shall become forfeited until the rents are paid.

Hon. Mr. Greene—Not at all ! It is only liable to become forfeited, but it is never done, and that is what Mr. Harvey complains of.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—Hon. Mr. Harvey and Hon. Mr. Greene will readily understand that circumstances might occur when that would become a very great hardship.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—I speak of absolute facts which have occurred under this Act.

Hon. Mr. Greene—Do I understand Hon. Mr. Harvey to say that if a man borrowed a hundred dollars he could go on forever owing the hundred by paying six dollars per annum ?

Hon. Mr. Harvey—That is the way it is practically working out, or has been working out, under the Act as it stands. Going back again to the discrimination in the holdings of licenses, I would ask why there should be this difference in dealing with mineral lands and with timber lands.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—Hon. Mr. Greene admits that we cannot cancel a license without process at law.

Hon. Mr. Greene—I did not say that !

Hon. Mr. Harvey—But it is true !

Hon. Mr. Greene—That all depends on the terms of the lease.

Hon. Mr. Bishop—It might have been so that rents have not been paid in the past, but it is not so at present. In the event of a grantee, who at present may not have paid his rent, say for one or two or five years, and may have erected mills upon his land, under this amendment the Government would have no volition whatever, but his grant become forfeited. We should not pass such drastic legislation as that proposed by Hon. Mr. Greene. We can, however, give further consideration to the matter, and we need not push the matter to-day.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs—I would like to point out that the holder of a timber lease could not be dealt with in the same way as the holder of a piece of land in the city. Suppose a man leases a piece of land in the city and takes it for the purpose of building upon it.

If he fails in operating the lease or to pay the rent, he forfeits the right to the land, but proceedings must be taken first. If within six months he can come forward, pay his rent on the lease, it is not cancelled. The man who leases a timber limit has a similar right.

Hon. Mr. Greene—I am prepared to modify my amendment, but I do claim that in the event of certain contingencies occurring the lease should be forfeited.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—If a man were to get a grant in St. John's for the purpose of building, and failed, that land by right should become forfeited. Again, I repeat, that we should not continue to make a difference between the renting of mineral lands and timber lands. If a man does not pay the rents he should forfeit them in both cases.

At this stage the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. John Harris the report was received.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the remainder of the Order was deferred.

Hon. President read a message from the House of Assembly saying that they had passed the Council's amendment to the Peat Bill.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the following Bills were read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow—The Direct United States Cable Company Bill, the Western Union Telegraph Company Bill, the Game and Inland Fisheries Board Act, and the Fire Patrol Act.

On motion of Hon. D. J. Greene the Bill to Incorporate the Newfoundland Marine Insurance Company was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the House adjourned until to-morrow at 4.30.

FRIDAY, March 24th.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House met at 4.30.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the Forest Fires Bill was read a third time and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. John Harris the Beaver Preservation Bill was read a third time and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message asking their concurrence in the same.

On motion of Hon. M. P. Gibbs the Municipal Bill was read a third time and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same with some amendments.

Committee on Crown Lands Bill was deferred.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Old Age Pension Bill. Hon. John Ayre in the Chair.

The Committee reported the Bill passed without amendment. Hon. Mr. Ayre moved the report be received, and Hon. R. K. Bishop moved that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Hon. John Harris—In moving the second reading of the Pilotage Bill I may say it practically is consolidation of the various Pilot Acts now on the Statute Book. There is very little alteration in the Bill except so far as is necessary to meet the requirements of

the new system at present adopted. The only important amendment is that which increases the pilots' annual license fee from $15 to $50. This increase does not really reduce or curtail the income of the pilots, for the reason that under the old system they had to pay $15 per annum and also keep up their boats, whereas now they only pay $50 and the upkeep of the new pilot cutter is met by the funds received by the Commissioners, so that they are really better off, even though the fee is increased. The present Commissioners are endeavoring to improve the service, and I think have improved it, and, with the co-operation of the pilots, it could be still further improved. It is the intention, I believe, when funds allow, to get a more powerful steamer than the one at present used. I do not propose to say anything further, except to move the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was read a second time, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Harris was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the Fire Patrol Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be sent to Committee on to-morrow.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg to move the second reading of the Western Union Cable Bill. There is really nothing in this Bill that requires explanation or comment, and I do not propose to take up the time of the House in any attempt at explanation.

The motion was carried.

Hon. R. K. Bishop moved the Bill be sent to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the Direct U. S. Cable Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to Committee to-morrow.

The second reading of the Inland Fisheries Bill was deferred.

Hon. D. J. Greene—I beg to move the second reading of the Marine Insurance Company Bill. This is a Bill to incorporate a company under the title of the Marine Insurance Company of Newfoundland. The gentlemen comprising the company are all well known citizens of St. John's, the capital is $150,000, divided into shares of $100 each, the head office is in St. John's, and the liability of shareholders is limited to the amount of shares. They come before the Legislature to ask for an Act of Incorporation, inasmuch as the present Act does not apply to insurance or banking. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

The motion was carried, and Hon. D. J. Greene moved that the Bill be sent to Committee on to-morrow.

Hon. D. J. Greene gave the folowing notice of questions—To ask the Hon. Representative of the Government to lay upon the table a statement of current revenue expended by the Commissioners for the year 1910, and also for a statement of the amount of the Pilot Fund, so called, now held by said Commissioners.

Hon. John Harvey gave the following notice of question—To ask the Hon. Representative of the Government in this House if the Government has any information corroborating the statement published in the Halifax Herald to the effect that on March 10th the schooner Ronald G. Smith, from this Colony, had arrived at Lunenburg with frozen herring,

and was baiting the following schooners :—Carrie L. Hertle, Cleritonia, and Henry L. Montague. Also, if the Government has any information as to whether the frozen herring caught by the schooner Juanita, reported in the same paper to have arrived at Lunenburg from this Colony, was all or any part of it used to bait Lunenburg bankers. Also, if the masters of these two vessels, and of the Canadian registered schooner Coronation, which loaded in this Colony with frozen herring for Lunenburg, and put into St. Pierre in distress (subsequently leaving there for Lunenburg), signed bonds undertaking that their cargoes were to be used for food purposes only. I would like to say that I do not ask these questions for the purpose of badgering the Government, but because I consider it a very important matter and likely to become more so in the near future. The Canadian banking fleet at the present moment is in a very flourishing condition, more so than ours, and every shipyard in Nova Scotia is filled with orders for twelve months to come. These are all dependent on Newfoundland bait to carry on their fisheries, to a large extent on herring and caplin, and still more on squid. My views of the matter are that these vessels should come here and buy our bait. As I am informed the captains sign bonds that the herring they take away are to be used for food purposes, and under the bond the Ronald G. Smith went to Lunenburg and discharged herring on board bankers.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the Coastal Mail Service Bill was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

Hon. R. K. Bishop gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the suspension of the 23rd Rule and other rules of the House as regards all bills, addresses and other matters now or to come before the House for the remainder of the session.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the House adjourned until Monday next at 4.30.

MONDAY, March 27.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House met at 4.30.

In accordance with notice of motion, Hon. R. K. Bishop moved the suspension of Rule 33 and other rules of the House as regards bills, addresses, etc., for the remainder of the session. The motion was passed and the rules suspended accordingly.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the Old Age Pension Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Assembly with a message to that effect.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Crown Lands Bill. After the passing of Section 5 the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again. The report was received.

On motion of Hon. John Harris the House went into Committee on the Pilots and Pilotages Bill. Hon. Mr. Angel in the Chair.

Hon. John Harris—Mr. Chairman, I beg to move as an amendment to section 3 the substitution of the word "Secretary" for "Chairman" at the end of the certificate form. The amendment was carried.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill passed with an amendment.

The report was received.

On motion of Hon. John Harris the Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message to that effect.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Fire Patrol Bill. Hon. Mr. Ryan in the Chair.

The Committe rose and reported the Bill without amendment. The report was received, and on motion Hon. M. P. Gibbs the Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Assembly.

The Direct United States Cable and the Western Union Cable Bills passed the Committee stage without discussion or amendment, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bills were read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Assemb'y.

On motion of Hon. D. J. Greene the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Marine Insurance Bill. Hon. J. A. Robinson in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment. The report was received, and on motion of Hon. D. J. Greene the Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Assembly with a message to that effect.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop Coastal Steam and the Loan Bills were read a second time. The Bills passed the Committee stage without discussion, and without amendment, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop were read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Assembly with a message to that effect.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the House then adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, at 3 p. m.

TUESDAY, March 28th.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House met at three o'clock.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Crown Lands Bill. Hon. John Harris in the Chair.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop a new Section 2 was passed and Section 3 renumbered.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg to move another new section to this Bill, to be Section No. 5. I hope this amendment will be satisfactory to my hon. frend, Mr. Harvey. It is as near as we can come to the desire he expressed at a former sitting of this Committee. I know that his desire was that a license or lease should lapse immediately by the non-payment of rent, but there are some cases where such might prove a very great hardship, and so we are endeavoring to protect the public interest without bringing undue hardship to any person. I propose the Section I have just read.

Hon. John Harvey—This is not quite as full and complete as I should have liked to see it; but at the same time I think it probably covers the danger of such objections arising as were in my mind when I introduced my own amendment, and I think at any rate I might accept that. While on my feet, I am going to say that I am disappointed that the previous amendment I moved on this Bill, whereby some payment should be made on a timber application, was lost, and I am going

to move it again in a modified form. I proposed before that at the time an application was put in for a timber license the amount of bonus, $2 per mile, should be deposited with the application, and returned if the application was refused. This is the usual custom in Nova Scotia and other countries. It was objected to that it became hard on the poor man ; $2 per mile was too much for him to pay, and it was class legislation, etc. I propose, therefore, that half the bonus should be paid. I do not think anybody will object to that. In any case, the amount of $1 per mile is so trifling that anybody making a bona fide application should have no difficulty in raising that amount of money. One important object to be gained is the checking of so-called "repeat applications," whereby control is often held over large areas of the public domain for considerable periods without a cent of money being paid. When an application is made by certain individuals for a timber limit, his first endeavor is to prevent that application being pronounced upon by the Executive for a long time, because he has then to pay rentals. He, therefore, desires delay. When it is pronounced upon he has 30 days to pay his rent, and in a great many cases, when the application has been approved by the Government, he finds it not convenient to put up rentals. He goes to a friend or partner and says : "This application runs out in a fortnight ; before it does so, and before anyone else knows about it, you put a notice of application in the Royal Gazette for it ; your application will be ahead of anyone else, and we can continue to hold ;" and so it goes on, and in this way many applications over large areas, as members of the Executive in this Chamber are aware, are monopolied by speculators for years, without anything being paid on them. So that I think if we add to this Act a clause whereby whenever an application is put in, a certain sum, even if it is only small, is put up, it will tend to minimize that evil. When we have finished the amendment now before the House, I intend to remove the other, that half the bonus be paid. I would just point out that I would like to move the amendment as follows—Amend Section 22 by striking out, etc.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—I beg to draw the attention of the House to the fact that I do not think we can accept the amendment. This is really a charge or tax upon persons who wish to acquire rights from the Crown for which certain fees are exacted. Bills of this kind cannot originate here. We have no power to impose obligations or taxes upon any person for any purpose whatsoever.

Hon. John Harvey—This is not the imposition of any tax. It is simply an alteration of the tax which in force now. Two dollars per mile is now charged, and I simply propose that half should be imposed in advance.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—The hon. member is dealing with a Section of the Act which imposes an obligation upon persons in the nature of a tax. We have no right either to lessen or increase a tax. This is my point, that we cannot entertain an amendment of this kind. The hon. gentleman thinks that the amount to be deposited would be very trifling. Well, it

might be for members of this Legislature, but there may be a very deserving class of persons in this country who may wish to make applications for timber areas, may know of a very good location, but are unable to deposit even the sum of $1 per mile. If they were to make application for 500 or 800 miles it would be a utter impossibility for 70 per cent. of the people to deposit an amount like this. It is no reason that because some people evade the law we must amend the Act. That always take place ; no matter what sort of legislation is introduced or laws enacted, there will be some person who will in some way circumvent them. The hon. member says that it is hard for a poor man to get the rent after his application has been approved and consequently there is no hardship in refusing him, because, if the wealthy man can deposit at the time of the application, then the hardship is about equally divided. There is no hardship whatever upon the wealthy man making the application, but there is upon the poor man ; there is an obligation imposed upon him which is unfair. I call this class legislation. If a man can bring with him an approval from the Governor in Council that the right to cut timber over an area has been granted to him, he is armed very much better than if he has nothing. For these reasons I cannot agree to the amendment.

The amendment was put and lost on the following division : Content—Hons. Greene, Harvey, Angel and Ryan ; non-content—Hons. Skelton, Gibbs, Ayre, Robinson, Bishop, and McLoughlin.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I may say at this stage that Hon. Mr. Harvey's suggeston by which he desired that the Governor in Council should take the power to export pulp wood from either Labrador or Newfoundland does not meet with the approval of the Government, who do not desire any such power. It is entirely contrary to the policy of the present Government, and we prefer that the Act should remain as it is.

Hon. D. J. Greene—In my opinion section 9 requires to be amended. To understand my objections it is necessary to refer back to section 53 of the 1903 Act. That section provides for the issue, together with a mining lease, of fifty areas of surface land within such mining location and stipulates that such lease shall become forfeited for non-payment of rent, and reversion of the land in such cases to the Crown. It provides also for publication of notice of forfeiture. That section is all right as it stands and meets all requirements It is considered, however, unnecessary, to retain the clause providing for publication, and is all right. Now if you stop at the section before the Chair at the word " repealed," second line, and strike out the remainder of the section which is unnecessary you will have all you want. I will read the words which should come out : " It shall be lawful to grant to any applicant therefor a license or lease of any mining location which may have become forfeited under the provisions of section 53 of the Crown Lands Act, 1903, for non-payment of rent or non-compliance with the conditions or reservation contained in the lease thereof without any notice to the holder of

any such forfeiture or without any proceedings at law or otherwise to enfore such forfeiture." It is surplussage to enact that lands forfeited may be granted again. There is no need to provide that notice of forfeiture is dispensed with. We have already provided for that and as under the 53rd section, the lands are forfeited to the Crown, why repeat that proceedings at law to enforce a forfeiture are unnecessary. But there is a substantial objection to the section as it now stands. As originally introduced in the House of Assembly the section read : "It shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to grant these lands, etc." For some reason, a mystery to me, the Minister of Justice, who had charge of the Bill, had the words "Governor in Council" stricken out and now we have a section saying that the lands may be granted, but not saying how or by whom. Of course if any trouble arose on this head a court of law would not allow the section to remain inoperative, but would read in words vesting the authority in somebody, and that body would, of course, be the Governor in Council. But there is another and a more serious objection to the section. Standing alone in a new Bill it is capable of the construction that forfeited lands may be granted discretionally or capriciously—granted free from rent or other obligations. In other words, granted independent of the provisions of the Crown Lands Act. It may be said that this is an extreme construction to put upon the section, and the hon. member who is in charge of the Bill will, I have no doubt, disclaim any intention on the part of the Government to put such a construction upon it. But if they did or the Crown Lands Department did, there would be no remedy except by long and expensive legal proceedings, proceedings which most people would naturally shirk. All these objections may be met and the intention of the Crown Lands Office met by allowing section 53 to stand. In its present form the section is not alone bad draftsmanship, it is a danger and a menace. I move as an amendment that all the words in the section after the word "repealed" be stricken out.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—In reply to the hon. gentleman that the Act as it now stands makes it obligatory upon the Governor in Council or the Government to institute proceedings at law in order that the lease may become forfeited. There is no other means by which this can take place. The object of the Act before the House is to dispense with the taking of any action whatever and also to dispense with publication of notice in the Rayal Gazette. No action has ever been taken in connection with mining leases, and no notice has ever been published that I know of. Except that power of that kind be taken, we cannot grant the mining right to any person, because we cannot give them a good title to it. The object of the Government in passing the Section in this manner is that they may give them a good title.

Hon. D. J. Greene—There is no law that I know of in this country making it compulsory or necessary for any process of law to bring about a forfeiture in the face of the provisions of the 53rd

Section, which declares that the land shall become forfeit. Within one moment after the non-payment of rent the title ceases. There is no necessity for any process at law, and the Government may grant it to anybody else. Does my hon. friend say that my objections to the Section are groundless? Will he also state that the Section is correct in stating that "it shall be lawful to grant" without stating by whom?

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—The hon. member knows very well that it is not possible, and highly improbable, to bring about a forfeiture of a lease under the provisions of Section 53 as it stands to-day, because unconsciously a Government or individual may waive the right of forfeiture. It is very questionable whether we can exercise that right. If we go into a court of law, I doubt if they would grant it. The law of forfeiture is a very intricate one and requires a great deal of care, thought and study. Nobody knows that better than the hon. member. It is for the purpose of making it more clear and definite that the section has been framed as it is.

Hon. D. J. Greene—I move that section 10 be amended by striking out all the words after the "repealed."

Hon. R. K. Bishop—One hesitates to attempt to make any refutation of a statement made by a man who had the experience of Hon. Mr. Greene, but he must be aware why this section was changed. It is true what he has said regarding forfeiture, but under the old Act a notice of this forfeiture was to be published in the Royal Gazette by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and as long as he failed to do so, the land could not be granted to anybody else. An amendment is now necessary, because whether by intention or otherwise, if the notice is not given the land cannot be dealt with. For that reason it is proposed to strike out that section and insert the words here and as soon as such area has become forfeited the Governor in Council may deal with it at once grant it to a new applicant, and the original holder cannot have any redress.

Hon. D. J. Greene—After the words "lawful to grant" insert the words "under the provisions of the Crown Lands Act."

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I submit that the Government cannot grant areas other than under the provisions of the Crown Lands Act.

Hon. D. J. Greene—That's what I want to guard against, but, as the section stands, there is nothing to prevent the granting of areas capriciously, unjudiciously or otherwise. I want to see it expressed that the Government cannot grant areas except under the provisions of the Crown Lands Act.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—Just a word or two before the Bill passes. Some time ago some newspaper printed in large headlines in regard to the application for some areas that members of the Government were mixed up in the applications. I want to state emphatically that I am in no way mixed up in the matter. I do not own an area of timber land in Newfoundland or Labrador. An application for a large grant appeared in the Royal Gazette which was credited to the buyer of our firm, Mr. A. Robertson,

and some of my "friends" were kind enough to say that I was behind the applicant. It now turns out that Mr. A. Robertson was another gentleman, a Canadian, residing in Canada, and not Mr. A. Robertson of St. John's.

Hon. J. Harvey—Mr. Chairman I want to explain about Mr. Bishop's remarks as to my suggestion to him that the Government should take the power now to permit the export of pulp wood under certain circumstances. I do not know why the matter has been specially referred to by him or if he had specially in mind that conversation. The point has not been raised in this House nor have I urged the free and unconditioned export of pulp wood. I did mention the matter to Hon. Mr. Bishop privately for his consideration, solely because I thought that the subject of Reciprocity is of such extreme importance to this Colony that if Canada got it and we could not otherwise do so, it might be a good thing to have the Government empowered to deal with the export under conditions, for instance, from Labrador. It is not that I wanted to see pulp wood exported in its unrestricted sense. Merely that conditions might raise that would make it of great importance that the Government should have this power. I may add that I do not own a stick of timber either in Newfoundland or Labrador.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill passed with some amendments, and upon the report being received, on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message to that effect.

A message from the Assembly was read to the effect that they had passed the following Bills and requested the Council's concurrence—Revenue Act Bill, Inflammable Oils Bill, Harbor Grace Marine Dock Bill, Public Service Act Bill and Intoxicating Liquors Bill.

Hon. J. A. Robinson—Mr. President, I beg to move the first reading of the Intoxicating Liquors Bill.

The Bill was read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Robinson—Rising to move the second reading of the Temperance Bill, I do so with mingled feelings, for whilst it affords me considerable pleasure to introduce a measure so fraught with possibilities for lasting good, I have cause for anxiety; not that I fear the reception which this House will accord the Bill, but because of my inability to adequately emphasize the importance of a measure of this kind. In justice to myself, I may say it was but an hour before the meeting of the House when I was requested by the promoters to assume charge of it.

The subject of reform as it relates to the liquor traffic and legislative restrictions thereon is not a new one, either here or in other lands. The customs of our forefathers have passed away and for a generation or more men have recognized the magnitude of the evils inseparable from the trade in intoxicants, and have set themselves vigorously and determinedly to abolish them, where possible, and to reduce them where public opinion is insufficiently advanced to accept the prohibition of sale. A wave of reform is sweeping the English speaking world, and, notably

in North America, it has gained almost irresistable power, with results startling in their significance. In the United States to-day are many sections, whose names have hitherto been synonymous for the trade, that have cut off all connections with it. The Dominion of Canada has taken a foremost place in this matter. Year after year new areas have gone dry, and many a place where once the traffic flourished is now flourishing in its stead. Newfoundland, too, is well in the van, and has just reason to be proud of the results achieved in the struggle against a trade whose influences upon the best interests of the people are so detrimental. Throughout the districts the power of the trade has been destroyed, and in the city it has been crippled. It is about thirty years since the first constituency adopted the principle of Local option. That was, I believe, the town of Carbonear, and it is an interesting and suggestive fact that Carbonear to-day, after 30 years of freedom from the open bar, is perhaps the most prosperous town in the country. Other districts fell into line from time to time, the last being Harbor Main, the memory of which crowning temperance victory is still fresh. A satisfactory fact is that not in a single instance has any district availed of the privileges of prohibition and afterwards gone back to license. What the outports have done, St. John's is beginning to do, and in the present Bill is an indication of the increase of popular approval of the restriction of the sale.

It is advanced by the advocates of license that any effort at limitation is an interference with the rights and liberties of fellow citizens, and the license holders whose interests are apparently imperilled claim protection. During a quarter of a centurys advocacy of local option principles, one of the most painful and unpleasant features of the work has been that the fight has on some occasions been against personal friends, men, apart from their connection with the traffic, held in high esteem and regard. When convictions are strong, they must take first place, and the man who hesitates for private friendships to declare those convictions is recreant to his duty. This Bill comes as a long step in the forward march of temperance reform. There have been many set-backs, and many disappointments in the past, but the passing of this Bill will mark the dawning of that day when St. John's will share in that glorious freedom from the traffic so long enjoyed and so tenaciously adhered to by the outports of the Island.

But are license holders entitled to sympathy? I fail to see any reason to justify the claim. In this land, at least, theirs is no vested interest, and a Legislature's first duty is to consider the greatest good for the greatest number. Moreover, if a man builds a house on the slopes of a volcano, in the face of oft-repeated warnings, what right has he to complain if the volcano bursts into flames and his home is swept to destruction. And are not the cases parallel? Those now in the business, almost without exception, went there with their eyes wide open to the signs of the times and their ears filled with the echoes of rising discontent. They heard the first rumblings

thirty years ago ; and almost every year since then—till Harbor Main completed the outport circle—new sections of the country have thrown the prohibition flag to the breeze. One district sounded the note of warning over a quarter of a century ago, and fifteen others have repeated it through the years. And what of the rumblings of the local option election two years ago ? None could read the figures and know the attendant facts without realizing that the end of the business was drawing nearer and nearer. Last year in the Legislature important reforms in the license law were introduced and shorter hours approved. Was not that a warning ? Instead of complaining of interference the saloon keepers should marvel that they have been able for so long to withstand the advance of public sentiment.

The Bill which I have the honor to introduce is drastic. It is more drastic and more comprehensive than the most ardent advocate of temperance even dared to hope for at the present time. It come to us by the unanimous vote of the House of Assembly, bearing the weight and influence of the signatures of 5,500 voters in the electoral districts of St. John's East and West, and the voices of thousands may not be considered lightly. The people have issued a mandate, and so far as most of us are concerned, it will be, I believe, accepted with gratitude and approval. In the Assembly the provisions of the measure were discussed by practically every member present, and it comes to us framed in stronger and more stringent terms than those contained in the original Bill, and, above all, it comes as the unanimous wish of the members of the elected Assembly. It comes to us as a double mandate, first by the 5,500 qualified voters who signed the petition, and second by the repreentatives of the eighteen districts of Newfoundland. A stronger mandate never came before this Council.

Through the 5,500 signatures, gathered within a few short days, the electors of the city districts spoke unmistakably, and, so, whatever personal inclinations may have been, have their representatives in the Assembly. It was to the strength of this popular demand that the unanimity of the favorable response was due. This Chamber may not be representative in the ordinary sense. Hon. members do not represent constituencies, and in an especial sense are here to act in the best interests of the Island as a whole. Inasmuch as we are all residents of St. John's, the wishes of the city must influence us, and what those desires are the voice of so enormous a majority of our citizens attest. In that desire all the other districts concur, for their voices have been given long ago in favor of the abolition of the bar. I might, Mr. President, speak at length of the evils of intemperance ; but these all admit. The matter in hand is the curtailment of an evil, not its cause. The large majority of the people have expressed emphatically and forcibly just what they want ,and it remains for us to grant those wishes.

The Bill before us consists in the main of four parts. The first section provides for shorter hours and the license holder's 12 hour

from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m. The second section is an attempt to make possble the carrying out of the Act of 1906, an Act which has proved vague, contradictory, and incomplete. The third section will enable the Licensing Board to carry out its workmore in consonance with the spirit of the Act of 1906, whilst the fourth section provides for publicity in the sessions of the Licensing Board and appeal from its decisions to the Supreme Court. May I digress for a moment to express appreciation of the action of the present Board in voluntarily throwing their meetings open to the public. Though we may not agree with all of their decisions, citizens are generally grateful for the abolition of the obnoxious secret sessions.

The issue before this House, Mr. President, is a very clear one, admitting neither limitation nor compromise. Despite the adverse majority, the citizens of St. John's were against the open saloon two years ago, and the proof lies in the advances made in thelast two years, the direct result of strong underlying convictions. When, last year, amendments to the Licensing Act were introduced, the growth of public sentiment antagonistic to the traffic was evident, and the swelling stream has now broken into a river, whose tide may not be stemmed. Is further proof needed ? You may find it in the earnest demonstrations after the passing of the Bill in the Assembly, and the acclamation by grateful citizens of the Rev. Father O'Callaghan and those who have worked with him in the struggle for reform. It is not alone individuals and temperance organizations that are at the back of this Bill, Mr. President, it is the public. I have pleasure in moving that it now be read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Greene—I have many reasons for opposing this Bill, but before expressing my views on this peculiar piece of legislation I at first ascertained from the hon. introducer of the Bill whethe the good fellowship which existed between us would be impaired or not by any adverse action that I may take on the measure. The gratifying assurance of no impairment of friendship was afforded me, and that if I voted against the Bill I would not suffer in his regard, but, rather, that criticisms would be welcomed. Of many, this has been the greatest difficulty with me. The Bill aims another blow at the licensing law. It is on a par with the legislation that was started to reform the licensing law. That is where the most of the promoters and advocates of this Bill stop. If the shutters of the public houses go up they call that reform. If the Icense law is amended, re-amended and amended again, the millennium of temperance they think is at hand. There is no question as to whether it will promote temperance. The cry is that the Act when it passes will be a success because it will reform the licensing law and curtail the hours of the publican. But, I ask, will this sort of thing stop drinking ? Will it increase the cause of temperance ? These questions which should be of paramount importance to the supporters are hardly considered by them. These questions do not enter into their

minds. Close the saloons and they are happy. The drunkard could go in and drink away from flasks and bottles. Any amount of drinking can go on, but reform in the licensing law must be effected, and that is sufficient. I rise for the purpose of giving my unqualified dissent to the Bill. I do not believe in the Bill. It will not help temperance a bit. It will create a class of drinkers never thought of. It will create the private drunkard. It is a piece of the worst kind of class legislation to which this House should not be a party. As regards the number of petitioners, they are a large number, but anybody that knows anything knows that nothing is easier than to get up a petition. A man may commit murder and someone will get up a petition for his release, and half the country would be found to sign it, and if necessary present him with a chromo. I attach no importance whatever to the petition. I am not going to further criticise the Bill, but I shall vote against it.

Hon. Mr. Angel—I rise, Mr. Chairman, to give my support to the Bill. The object of temperance legislation is to remove, as far as possible, the temptation out of the way of those who would be sober, but have not the moral courage to pass a public house without going inside. When once there all know what follows. Also to put a stop to drunkenness and to protect those who are unwilling sufferers—the women and children—to take away temptation from those who are weak. I have no doubt but many such have signed the petition, so as to have a chance of going home early instead of late with quite a hole in their week's earnings. Now, sir, I submit that the Bill will go further than this, in that it will tend to better the morals of our people. I would like, also, sir, to call your attention to the fact of the many clergymen of this city, by far the greater part of whom, indeed I may safely say all, are very much in favor of this Bill. It has been asked here what has amending the licensing law to do with reform. I submit, sir, that through the Licensing Board reform is a way to the end, and those who have supported and advocated this Bill are of the same opinion.

Hon. Mr. Greene—That is their idea of reform, to make the Licensing Board carry out the law instead of following their own sweet will.

Hon. Mr. Angel—I believe there are names to the petition representing ability, justice, and common sense, men who hold high office in the city, whose one and only aim can be but to better the conditions of the people and improve the moral atmosphere. Reform along this line is aimed at.

Hon. Mr. Angel—Let us look at those whose duties make it possible for them to see the dire results of the open saloon.

Hon. Mr. Greene—You mean the police.

Hon. Mr. Angel—Yes, if you will. No doubt they could tell him happenings in their experience that would remove the cobwebs that seem to have dimmed the eyes of the hon. gentleman. Those who occupy the pulpits of the city, and who have an opportunity of knowing the condition of affairs existing, give it their hearty support ; there are those

who are the bone and sinew of the city who cannot withstand the temptation of the liquor sellers, as well as men who are sober and can go to and from their work without being moved to temptation. These are the men who support this petition, sir. We have the signatures of young men whose mothers and fathers suffered because of their intemperate habits, because of the open saloon, and wish to have the temptation removed or restricted in its operation, others who have not contracted the habit of going into the public house would have the temptation removed. And, Mr. Chairman, what about the thousands that are suffering from the results of intemperance? What of the little children and women going without sufficient clothing to keep them comfortable? In short, how many people of the city are suffering from the open public house? Take the workingman, who may be earning $1.20 or $1.30 a day, he cannot afford to spend it in liquor, not a cent of it.

Hon. Mr. Greene—Give them more wages.

Hon. Mr. Angel—The wage is regulated by the law of demand and supply. The man with constant employment, getting from $1.20 to $1.40 per day, but when we consider he cannot get constant employment at the above figure, what must his condition be if some of it goes for self gratification at the expense of the comforts of his wife and family. Surely it is in the interest of the helpless to lessen the evil.

Hon. Mr. Greene—The railway pay $1.50.

Hon. Mr. Angel—Yes, and it is not too much considering the hardship and toil. Those who work on the railway are obliged to leave their homes and their fireside, and suffer many inconveniences and hardships of one kind and another. Under these conditions he is worth $1.50 per day. If $1.20 or $1.30 is paid him here, he can go to his home, and with economy can be better off. Coming back to the point again, I say, sir, whether it be $1.20 or $1.50, he cannot afford to spend one cent of his wages in spirits. When we consider the number of people that are suffering from the results of intemperance, and the many whose innocent families are undergoing such hardships and misery as a direct outcome of the traffic, I think it is high time that we remove the temptation out of their way.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—I had no intention of speaking on this Bill, but I am struck with a fact which is no doubt familiar to many people here, and that is the inclusion of licensed grocers in the prohibitory provisions of the Bill now before us. I am going to move an amendment on the lines of the original first clause of the Act. This Bill here calls for closing the retail public houses during the hours between 6 p. m. and 9 a. m., with which I am entirely in accord, but also calls for the closing at the same hours of a number of grocery businesses as well, which to my mind is neither fair nor necessary. We hear a great deal about class legislation, but class legislation is by no means such an outrageous or unusual thing as some people who use the word think it. Our own system, and all systems of taxation, are based on the principle of class legislation. The tariff is adjusted on that

basis. Tariffs are designed to hit the rich man and to favor the poorer classes. That I call class legislation in principle. Do not let us have our common sense blinded by a phrase. What I believe about the liquor business is that the really serious evil that is being done by it is being done to one class in the community, and that class is the so-called laboring clases. I was never a believer in temperance legislation, it is an objectionable type of legislation. But within the past few years, when I have come directly and indirectly more in touch with the homes of the poor in St. John's, I have come to the conclusion which everyone must come to who knows anything about it, and that is the class of are being kept down, kept poor and miserable in a great many instances by drink. The homes are kept dirty and unhealthy, the women suffer, and the children get no chance to improve when the breadwinner drinks. The evil that is being done here is, practically speaking, confined to one class, and it is being done by the shops which depend for existence upon the retailing of spirits by the glass over the counter. It seems unfair that legitimate grocery businesses should be penalized. I also think that, in reference to the whole subject of temperance legislation, we should not go on indefinitely restricting and curtailing businesses which have been established and licensed by the Colony, without at least taking into consideration whether or not they have any right of consideration and of compensation. The question should not be absolutely ignored. I am aware that these licenses are only issued from year to year, and that technically and legally there is no vested interest beyond that year. But, as a matter of practical fact, the story is a difficult one. These licenses, as a matter of actual fact, have become almost permanent. It is a recognized thing nowadays that a license is renewed during good behaviour, and in so far the license has become a vested interest and money is invested in it on this understanding. That, I think, is the actual fact. Returning to the grocers. I think they may be trusted to keep open after six, but of course their liquor business must close. I should like, personally, to see all shops which retail liquor by the glass over the counter closed. But, nevertheless, I do not feel that that necessitates prohibition. There is no reason why all classes should be restricted because an injury which can be otherwise dealt with is being inflicted upon one. I purpose, however, in Committee to move an amendment for these grocery stores to be kept open.

The motion for second reading was then put and carried on the following division : For—Hons. Robinson, Gibbs, Harvey, Bishop, Ayre, Skelton, Harris, Angel, McLoughlin. Against—Hons. Greene, Ryan.

On motion of Hon. J. A. Robinson the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Temperance Bill. Hon. Dr. Skelton in the Chair.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—The Bill now before the House has for its object the restricting of the sale of intoxicating liquor after the hour of six in the afternoon. The reverend gentleman who promoted the petition believes that if the Bill be made law it will have the

effect of lessening the consumption of strong drink among a class who can ill afford to spend a portion of their earnings in the purchase of it. With this object in view, and the attainment of it, I feel assured that he has the support and co-operation of honorable members in this House. The asking for a restriction of the sale of strong drink after 6 p. m. has not been the result of hasty thought or consideration on his part. During the reverend gentleman's ministrations among the poorer classes of the city he has, no doubt, been able to trace some of the misery and privation which afflicts them to the spending of a portion of their earnings in strong drink. The earning power of the class to which this legislation is directed is derived from work performed between the hours of six in the morning and six in the afternoon, hence he and those who signed the petition believe that with six o'clock closing the opportunity to spend money in drink is closed, and that the money spent in the past, or a good deal of it, in this manner, will not happen in the future. I believe that the conclusions they arrived at are correct. It is, unfortunately, too often the case with some workmen that places other than the home get the greater portion of their wages, but in restricting the sale of liquor after 6 o'clock the temptation to spend in the public house is taken away, and the home will, in many cases, get that which now goes in the purchase of strong drink. I am in thorough sympathy with the restricting of the sale of strong drink after six in the afternoon. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that workingmen generally indulge in the use of strong drink, nothing could be more erroneous. There are very many hundreds of There are hundreds of workingmen in the city who have never known what it is to make use of intoxicating liquor, and this fact is best attested by the many work men members of organizations in the city who profess principles of total abstinence and temperance in relation to strong drink ; but there are some who, unfortunately, forget the duty which they owe to their homes, their families and themselves, and cause much misery and privation because of their being addicted to the use of strong drink, and it is this class which the petitioners believe the legislation asked will help. If we can help to make homes brighter, which are now clouded because of intemperance, then it is our duty as legislators to help in the work. Some believe that it is possible to make men sober by legislation. With this view I cannot agree, because it is not possible to attain perfection in this world, the seal of imperfection being stamped upon all our acts. I am a firm believer in moral suasion. The best temperance reform ever launched in the world was carried on, and is today being carried on, through moral suasion. I believe that much more can be accomplished than has been through this agency. Great strides have been made in temperance reform in this country. All of it has not been due by any means to legislation. There is a greater desire upon people to shun places where drink is sold than ever before. This is not due to the law, but brought about through the competitive forces of modern industrial-

ism, and the feeling of the average man that he cannot meet the strain which competition in the modern industrial world forces upon him if he drinks. Then, again, the average employer of labor seeks for the sober man. These influences and the influences of religion help to make men temperate, which legislation can never accomplish.

I have been associated with various labor organizations, and I have never hesitated to speak out my mind in relation to workmen spending their money in purchasing drink, and I am glad to say that the seed which I have sown has fructified. As an illustration of this fact, I may mention that steamship owners have very often complained of stokers being unable to perform their work when leaving port because of over-indulgence in strong drink. Upon many occasions I have pointed out to firemen that it was their duty to be at their post and able to perform their work, and if they rendered themselves incapable of doing so, then they were neither doing justice to their employer, themselves or their families ; the result has been that when the steamers were leaving the port of St. John's for the seal-fishery this present season every man was at his post, a sober man, waiting and eager to perform his work. This is what I mean when I say that a great deal more can be accomplished by moral suasion than has been accomplished in the past. It must not be implied that firemen generally indulge in the use of intoxicating liquors. On the contrary, there are some of them who are total abstainers and members of temperance societies.

I have heard it asserted that the poverty and misery which we find to-day in many parts of the city is due to the use of strong drink. This is incorrect. No doubt some of it is, but a large proportion of it is not. When one takes into consideration the fact that not more than thirty per cent. of the artizan and laboring classes of the city get continuous employment during the year, while the other seventy per cent. have to live for twelve months upon six or seven months' wages, is it any wonder then that poverty and misery will be found. and until our industrial conditions will enable the greater portion of our artizan and laboring classes to get continuous employment, so long will we find poverty and misery in the city, or in any other country or city where a similar condition of affairs exist.

The sections of the Bill, with the exception of the first, should not, to my mind, be enacted this session, because it appears to me that they are ill-advised, and have not been given that consideration which they deserve. Principles are admitted which have never been before. The Licensing Board in the past has been criticised for actions of theirs, and this Bill purposes going very much further, and admitting rights which Licensing Boards in the past have refused to admit. We protect the man who invests his money by way of mortgage in a licensed premises by giving a right of the transfer of the license where a sale takes place under the mortgage. No Board in the past would admit any such right, and now those who criticized the actions of the Board in the past are pre-

pared to legalize that which the Board would never admit.

Why deal differently with the man who invests money on the security of a licensed premises and the holder of the license ? If it is wrong, and some claim it is, to sell intoxicating drink, then is not the man who invests money upon the security of a licensed premises equally a wrongdoer ? Where is the consistency ? We pounce upon the man who sells, but he who derives a benefit from the sale of drink in another form we protect.

Another section of the Act practically creates an estate tail in a license, because it provides that the board may grant a license to the widow or child or other person who resides with or is dependent upon the holder of the license for their support. This is a principle never admitted before. Licensing Boards in the past, in extreme cases where the holder of a license died leaving a widow and famliy of young children not very well provided for, granted a renewal of the license, not as a matter of right, but purely as a matter of discretion, to enable the widow to rear the children until such time as they would be able to do for themselves. This section of the Bill makes it practically obligatory upon the Board to grant licenses not alone to the widow, to the children who may be minors, but to the sister, brother, aunt, mother or any other relative who resides with the holder of the license at the time of his death, and was depending upon him for support. The license under this section may pass on from one generation to another.

Then, again, there is another section of the Act which is fearfully and wonderfully made, and that is the provision with regard to meetings of the Licensing Board and appeals from it to the Supreme Court. There is provisions for meetings of the Licensing Board and notices to be published in the daily papers. Whoever framed the section must certainly know that the Licensng Board has no revenue at its disposal whatever, and consequently cannot publish notices of any meetings except that the members of the Board, in addition to giving their services free to the public, pay for the publication of notices in the press out of their own pockets. I hardly think that, in addition to giving their services free, they will shoulder this obligation as well.

Sub-section 2 of Section 4 deals with appeals from the decision of the Board, but there is no provision as to how the evidence is to be taken, who is to take the evidence. There is no such officer as Secretary of the Board, the Board has power only to elect a Chairman, consequently there is no person to file papers relating to appeal on the Supreme Court. I merely point out those defects to the House to show how hastily this legislation has been prepared, and the necessity there is of striking out of this Bill all the sections with the exception of that which relates to the six o'clock closing.

The Licensing Board in the past was criticised unjustly, to my mind, for doing not half as much as this Bill now purposes making law, but simply for exercising a discretionary power when certain exigencies arose. This Bill goes further than ever a

Licensing Board did or even attempted to go. Why the Board has been subjected to such adverse criticism I am at a loss to understand. One would imagine they were highly paid officials, whereas not one member of the Board receives one cent of compensation for his services, his services being given free.

But, independent of this criticism of the Bill, at the root of all temperance reform is the housing problem. We have it here in this city of a most acute character, and I take advantage of this opportunity to impress upon temperance reformers the necessity of something being done. This is not a Government matter, it is purely a city problem, and the city should find the ways and means of coping with it. Bishop Stang, of Fall River, one of the brightest minds in the United States, speaking in relation to temperance reform, says : "If the question of the hour is alcoholism, the most effective temperance reform must begin, not with the saloon, but with the home, the kitchen, and the table." Temperance oratory and temperance writings will not have much effect upon the man who is forced to live in unwholesome surroundings, will not have much effect upon a man who goes to a home where, when it rains, the water comes through the roof on the breakfast table, or when he lies down at night finds its way thro the roof to his bed. There is no inducement for the man who lives under such conditions to remain at home and live in the bosom of his family, in fact, home is a place to be shunned. What you want to see in the home that is a home, where people live under proper conditions, is the shining cup and saucers, the snowy linen and the sparkling glass of water on the table, the sweet smelling bread and fresh butter, and the fragrant tea. How can the man who secures but six or seven months' employment out of twelve have these things in the home. It is an utter impossibility to do so. All poverty is not through drink. As I have pointed out, not more than thirty per cent. of the artisan and laboring classes of this city can get continuous employment, and what is the result ? Poverty, dirt, disease and overcrowding in tenement houses. In the miserable surroundings of the tenement disease and the most degrading forms of poverty appear, for the tenement is the cause as well as the result of poverty. Foul air and unsanitary conditions devitalize life and drag down the worker. Go into many parts of this city and you will find conditions as I am describing them. Exhaustion and sickness lead to dependence upon charity or recource to the saloon, drunkenness comes from poverty quite as much as poverty comes from drunkenness. A very large proportion of the tenement houses in portions of this city are not fit for human beings to live in. All efforts, then, at reform will be useless unless this problem is tackled.

It may be said that if the workman saves what he now spends in drink that his conditions will change, but those who talk or reason that way do not go below the surface. How can conditions change when nearly seventy per cent. of the working classes of this city are separated by so nar-

row a margin from destitution that a fortnight or a month of bad trade, sickness or unexpected loss brings them face to face with hunger or pauperism. This is the nominal state of the average workman in every town and country. "A pigsty," says Jacob Riss, "in time will make a pig of a man who is made in the image of God. For gold we sold the black man into slavery, and for gold we let his white brother perish in the slums."

We had an outbreak of typhus fever in this city not very long ago. Was that due to drink? Not by any means. One of the persons who was afflicted with typhus before it became known, died, and the victim was waked in a place where more than three-fourths of it was underground, in a hovel where you would not stable a horse or even put a dog to live. In another case that developed it was found that in a three-roomed apartment, the greater portion of which was below the level of the street, twelve persons lived. I merely mention these cases to show that over-crowding to a very alarming extent exists in this city and that people are living under conditions which, to say the least, are most degrading. With over-crowding go the evils of vice, sickness and even premature death, because there you will find typhoid, tuberculosis and other infectious diseases. It is in these places we call the home where sweat-shop work is done, and very often the death warrant of the wearer is sewed in the lining. We close our eyes to these facts and make no effort to alleviate the suffering which is caused by men, caused by greed to accumulate wealth, caused by our want of sympathy for the poor. There is no greater tax upon the city than poverty and disease and the foul smelling tenement. Let us remember that it is more important that the home should be properly provided than that the schools should be adequate, because the home is the foundation of private and public well-being. Upon the home rests the moral character of every people in every land. Our civil and political liberties of all are grounded there—virtue, manhood and citizenship grow there. But, evidently, we take no thought of those ideas or these principles.

I have availed myself, Mr. Chairman, of bringing this housing problem before the Legislature and before the city, because I feel as others who have given this question thought and study, that you can never have temperance reforms in this city of an effective character so long as people are forced to live in unsanitary surroundings, and in foul-smelling streets and houses. This, as I have pointed out, is not a Government matter, it is purely a city matter, because this housing problem affects no other part of the country except the city. We have an abnormally high death rate, more especially among the young, a veritable slaughter of innocents goes on month after month and year after year and no thought or consideration whatever is given for the lives of the young. They are victims who are paying the penalty for our industrial wealth and expansions. If the city has got to grow and expand upon the bodies of the victims which it claims, then far better that the hand of

progress should be stayed until we can preserve the lives of those who are now, year in and year out, sacrificed because of our apathy and indifference.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I may begin by saying that I am thoroughly in accord with the Bill before the Chair. I am surprised at the remarks of some of the speakers who have preceeded me, and I would first refer to those of Hon. Mr. Harvey, where he says that grocers are doing no harm. I regret, sir, the reference, but all must be aware that infinite harm has been done in the past by so-called grocers, because so many of our citizens have gone from time to time into these places to get drinks who would not be seen in a licensed house. Moreover, sir, what should happen under the changed conditions which we hope now to come about, if so-called grocers were to keep open and the retail houses were closed up ? The very conditions which some claim prevail now will then be open to those inclined to drink. If we close the saloons but leave the grocers open where a man can get a bottle or a flask, you will bring about conditions just as bad if not worse. I think, considering the unanimity that existed in the Lower Chamber last evening, where the representatives of the people, without exception, gave their support and voice to the Bill and the magnitude of the petition which came before the House of Assembly ; in view of these facts it seems to me that this Chamber would be incurring a very serious responsibility indeed if it did not concur in the fullest degree with the Bill. I do not propose, Mr. Chairman, to enter into a long argument as to the benefits or otherwise of the restricting the sale of intoxicating liquors, but I wish to say just this, that the greatest harm perhaps that is occasioned by the sale of intoxicants is in the evening hours, when men who are occupied during the day have the opportunity to congregate and loiter upon licensed premises, drinking glass after glass of liquors until they become intoxicated, and spending money which they cannot afford, depriving their families of their money, and sometimes because of their condition, being convicted. These men, be they laborers or mechanics, who go to their homes at a late hour of the night, under the influence of liquor, are unfitted in many cases for their labor the following day, and absent themselves therefrom to the great detriment of their employers, and sometimes prevent the completion of their work which is necessary, such as the getting off of a steamship which may be kept here under very great expense. These circumstances are well within the knowledge of members of this House. I fully expect to see a most noticeable difference in the town within a very few months after this law goes into force, as I sincerely hope it will.

I do not pretend to have a knowledge of law, but I cannot concur in the opinion expressed by the last speaker (Hon. Mr. Gibbs) as regards the wording of this Bill. Section 3 says :

3. Section 16 of the Act 6, Edward VII., Cap. 17, is hereby repealed and the following is substituted therefor :

16—No retail license shall be granted to any person except

the occupier of the premises upon which it is proposed to carry on the sale of intoxicating liquors.

(1) A retail license shall forthwith cease, determine and become void—

(a)—Upon the transfer of the premises covered by the license to any person other than the holder of the license ; provided that a transfer under mortgage shall not in any way prejudice any license for the premises covered by the mortgage.

I read that in a different way. It does not give the right to continue the license on the premises. In any case, if it becomes necessary it can be amended.

The Act says the Board "may" grant, but not that they "shall" grant. That is safeguarded. I should like to see this Bill just as strong as Mr. Gibbs or anybody else, but I can say that there is a pretty good safeguard in the Bill against all conditions that may arise. For instance, section 2 reads :

(2)—Any person who shall think himself aggrieved by any act of the Licensing Board in relation to the granting or refusing of a license may appeal against such act to the Supreme Court, subject to the following conditions, namely, that the appellant shall give to the Board, within three days, notice of his intention to appeal, and shall, within the same time, give security to the satisfaction of the Board, to prosecute such appeal with effect at the next sitting of the Supreme Court and to abide by the judgment of the said court thereon and to pay such costs as may be then ordered. Upon the giving of security by the appellant the Secretary of the Licensing Board shall forthwith file all papers connected with the appeal in the Registry of the Supreme Court.

I hope if Mr. Gibbs or any other member of this House desires to amend the Bill and show hon. members here good and sufficient reason why it should be amended they will do so, and not that we should be asked to throw out any important section of the Bill. The manner in which this legislation has been brought forward and the emphatic acceptance of it by the Lower Chamber compels us to receive it with great care.

Hon. M. P. Gibbs—In reply to the hon. member. He says the carrying out of sub-section (a) of section 2 will be protected because there will be meetings of the Board, and because of the publicity which there will be. Surely the hon. member does not mean that, because the general public who go there may side with the holder of the license or with the temperance reformers, that the decision of the Board is going to be swayed one way or the other. What it means is that if the holder of a license dies and leaves a widow or children not in good circumstances, then the Board will, in that event, grant the license to the widow or children. If the holder of a license should leave neither widow or child, but leaves a mother or brother or sister or somebody else dependent upon him, then the Board will grant the license to that person. The language is clear and unmistakable upon this point. If the child be an infant they will grant it to a trustee or

guardian until the infant attains the age of twenty-one.

Hon. Mr. Harvey—Hon. Mr. Bishop seems to think that I intended to move that those having grocery stores in connection with their licenses would be able to retail liquors after six o'clock. I mean to propose that they be allowed to conduct the grocery stores only, and that the selling of liquor be checked as with every other license holder. I think it is utterly absurd that the grocery stores should be stopped from selling. I think that all friends of temperance must be alarmed at the position taken by Hon. Mr. Gibbs. It appears to me that the points raised by the last speaker cannot be passed over lightly, and I take it that Mr. Gibbs is correct and we should carefully consider the matter. We hear a great deal about the petition being a mandate from the people. I signed that petition, but I did not give any mandate further than the first section of the Bill. I am not going to move that all the other sections be stricken out. but I wish that Mr. Gibbs would move an amendment along the lines of his speech and I would support it. The original Bill was, I think, only just to the proprietors of those grocery stores that they be given a chance to compete with others in the same business. By closing them at six o'clock we simply drive them out of business altogether I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Bill would be going far enough if passed in its original form, and I beg to move an amendment to the effect that grocery stores be permitted to remain open after six o'clock, provided that they be not allowed to sell liquors, subject to the penalty of forfeiture of license for any breach.

Hon. John Harris—I rise to support the amendment moved by Hon. Mr. Harvey, which I think is most reasonable. The words are not his nor are they mine. The words are those of the Minister of Justice, the introducer of the Bill, and only at the last moment was the original amended in the Lower House. The Bill was amended in a rather thoughtless manner and without consideration or, I might say, with indecent haste. Two amendments were offered and this one was accepted. I also agree with Hon. Mr. Gibbs that the whole Bill outside the first section be expunged. Next session, if the Bill as it stands comes up, we could give it further consideration. In the principle of the Bill I fully agree.

Hon. Mr. Greene—Mr. Harvey, why is your motion that the grocery stores close at nine ? Why not allow them to remain open as long as the other groceries ?

Hon. Mr. Harvey—My only object is not to place them in any worse position than they are now.

Hon. Mr. Angel—This has been a vexed question for some time, and there is no reason that those with grocery and liquor stores combined should not separate them. I believe they can well afford to do so.

Hon. Mr. Robinson—I am not surprised that this matter has been brought up, but fail to see how it is possible to accept such an amendment without striking at the vital principle of the Bill. If groceries are to be allowed to remain open and transact grocery business after six o'clock the

street will soon be filled with grocery stores. What is there to prevent every saloon keeper in the city from stocking a pound or two of tea, some biscuits and sugar, and thereupon painting the legend "Groceries and Provisions" alongside his liquor sign. We shall be told that liquor selling would still be illegal, but anybody who has knowledge of the carrying out of the liquor laws in the country recognizes that the supreme difficulty is to secure conviction. The police have trouble enough already with out providing them with more. There may be an apparent hardship in closing the liquor selling grocery stores at six o'clock, but if the object of the Bill is to be attained closing is necessary. Moreover, we have no right to discriminate between the wealthier liquor seller, who is the fortunate possessor of a wholesale license and a lucrative business on the one hand, and the small saloon keeper who has no other business to help him out. I hold strongly, Mr. Chairman, with the section as it already stands.

The amendment was then put and lost on the following divisions : For—Hons. Harvey, Harris, Greene, Ryan and Gibbs ; Against—Hons. Robinson, McLoughlan, Bishop, Angel, Ayre and Shea.

The remaining sections were passed and the Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

The report was received and on motion of Hon. Mr. Robinson was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a note to that effect.

The House then adjourned for recess until 6.30.

The House resumed sitting after recess at 6.45.

The Revenue Act went through the various stages without discussion and was ordered to be returned to the Assembly with a message that it had passed without amendment.

The Public Service Bill passed the first and second reading and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill, Hon. John Ayre in the chair.

Hon. John Harvey—Although it is extremely unusual to have any remarks made in this chamber upon the essentially money bills similar to the typical bill now before us and although it may be considered outside our province to discuss bills of this nature, I think there is in the present instance every excuse and justification for making a few remarks upon the subject of the Civil Service. I think the very fact that the subject is ostensibly one that is not supposed to particularly interest this Chamber, and that this House can not be considered in any way to have any axe to grind in connection with it, may be a good reason for saying what I wish to say in this instance. The view which I want to express in a very few words is one that I know is shared by a large number of the members of this House, as well as by many outside of it. I would say, then, that the point which I desire to make is that the salaries of the Civil Service ought to be overhauled and reconsidered from the Governor's salary down. The salaries are in many instances very unfairly small for the service obtained, and in my opinion it is not strictly honest that the Colony should demand service

for which it does not pay a fair wage. It is notorious that the cost of living has in recent years advanced enormously, and yet there has been no corresponding increase in the chief salaried positions of the civil servants for many years. I repeat, therefore, that I consider that these salaries, and the duties attached to them, should be carefully reconsidered in detail from top to bottom. I will take, for instance, the position of Prime Minister. There was a time when the Prime Minister occuppied the two positions of Prime Minister and Colonial Secretary, and had his salary attached to the office of Colonial Secretary. The work has now got far beyond that stage, and it is quite impossible for the Prime Minister to do his duty as Prime Minister and at the same time occupy the departmental office of Colonial Secretary. Why, then, should we expect a man like our present Prime Minister, who is practically doing the work of two men, to have no proper salary attached to the office and to be dependent on the chances of official life for his remuneration ? It is utterly beyond the dignity of the Colony that this should be so. I do not pretend to know very much about the detailed salaries and positions of the civil servants, but I believe that the whole of them require reconsideration. I will take, for instance, such a notoriously underpaid case as that of the Sub-Collector of Customs, Mr. H. W. LeMessurier. I do not hesitate to say that Mr. Henry LeMessurier would be poorly paid for the service that he gives this Colony at double the salary that he now receives. Another case in point is that of Mr. A. W. Mews, who at times is called on to more or less administer the general affairs of this Colony. He is entirely underpaid, and I think that the same thing maintains in a lesser or more degree down through the list, and there are probably many others of whom the same may be said. It certainly does not add to the dignity of the Colony with the increasing revenue and expenditure to have these men working for less than they are worth, or for less than they can afford to live on as they ought to be able to live in the positions they occupy. I trust this matter may be taken up and dealt with at an early date.

Hon. Mr. Robinson—With the views expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Harvey) I am in full accord. We have lost and must continue to lose valuable services so long as we fail to recognize them. Our Civil Service is in fault. The apparent cure rests in the appointment of a Civil Service Commission, and the establishment, after thorough and impartial investigation, of a system under which promotion shall be assured and experience recognized. It is an astonishing fact that there are men in some of the public offices to-day who have been working 25 and 30 years and are receiving little, if any more, than when first they started. Considering the cost of living, they are receiving actually less. As soon as a man gets into office he appears to have attained the goal. All chances of promotion are gone ; and with them his ambition also. I am glad the Hon. Mr. Harvey has brought the matter forward.

Hon. John Harris—I also endorse the views of Hon. Mr. Harvey with reference to the salaries of the civil service. To some extent at least I have had an opportunity of advancing the salaries of some of the civil servants in the department in which I and Mr. Ayre have some control. I refer to the Savings Bank. I think hon. gentlemen in this House will endorse the words of Hon. Mr. Harvey that the tendency may be to induce the Executive to do something to bring about the improvement.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I am very sure that if every member of this Chamber was asked to-night, he would be ready to endorse what has been said by Mr. Harvey and others regarding salaries. The public, as a general thing, have an idea that the civil servants are overpaid. In some respects they are right. A great many of them are getting more than they earn, but there is a great number of men who are inadequately paid for the work they do. The two instances given, while they stand out, might be added to in a great number. There are many others receiving a comparative pittance for the amount of time and energy and ability they put into their work. It is also right, as has been said, that no longer should a man devote his time and ability as formerly without remuneration. I am very glad the matter has been mentioned so as to enable us to speak on it.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Ayre the report was received, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was read a third time, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Assembly that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the Inflammable Oils Bill was read a first and second time, and the House went into Committee on the same. Hon. Mr. Ryan in the Chair.

Hon. John Harris—I would like to ask the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill what difference is there between this and the present Act. Is not the time allowed for the removal of oil very short, for say 500 or 600 casks ?

Hon. R. K. Bishop—The necessity arrives because people have been in the habit of leaving oils on their premises for a very much greater length of time, and have not always exercised the greatest activity in getting it removed to the warehouse. I think it has been a habit to store oil and sell it from the wharf, keeping it there to the inconvenience of the steamship agents. That is really the object ; to compel removal in a reasonable time.

The Committee rose and reported the Bil without amendment.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Ryan the report was received, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was read a third time, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Assembly that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the Marine Railway Dock Bill was read a first and second time, and the House went into Committee on the same. Hon. Mr. Robinson in the Chair.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I wish to move an amendment to section one, in which it seems to me the

Government is not sufficiently safeguarded. I move the insertion of the words : " the amount actually paid out shall not exceed, etc."

The Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment. On motion of Hon. J. A. Robinson the report was received, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was read a third time, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Assembly that the Council had passed the same with some amendment.

The Boiler Inspectors Bill went through the several stages without discussion, and on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be returned to the Assembly with a message that it had passed without amendment.

On motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Medical Bill was read a first and second time, and the House went into Committee on the same. Hon. John Harvey in the Chair.

Hon. J. A. Robinson—In this connection I would like to ask the Leader of the Government how the present Bill affects a case of which he is fully cognizant where a graduate of a medical school is practising unrecognized by the Bord, but whose services have been requisitioned by the Government in connection with a smallpox outbreak. This man has given entire satisfaction, is the only medical man within a distance of 40 miles, and the nearest settlement is twelve miles away. He has asked for examination and been refused it, on grounds, satisfactory to the Board, maybe, but certainly not to many others, and apparently not to the Government which has employed him. How does the Government propose to meet this difficulty by the present Bill ?

Hon. R. K. Bishop—It appears that the first section of the Bill will cover any such case. It affords a remedy to the one who feels injured in the Supreme Court. I don't know at this late hour that we could suggest anything better. I know the case the hon. gentleman refers to, and no doubt it is a hardship.

Hon. J. A. Robinson—I submit, Mr. Chairman, that section one will not get over the difficulty. This man referred to is at the present time subject to action, and I think action has already been taken. The matter is very serious, and there should be some remedy for the one who feels aggrieved. It is a most difficult thing to get medical men to settle down in the outports, there was many things to deter them, and all know the hardships that the outport doctors in remote districts have to undergo. I do not wish, in any degree, to see the lowering of the standard. If the Board would compile a list of universities from which graduates would be accepted, it would help, as graduates of colleges not recognized would not locate here. The present amendment will not, I think, materially assist in getting over the difficulty.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—In reply to the hon. gentleman, I might say that the Medical Board are the proper people to deal with the matter, and during the past they have done their best to keep up the standard of the practitioner.

Hon. J. A. Robinson—No one questions that. But it does not meet the difficulties of the present case. It is not my intention to press any amendments, but I re-

gret that such an important matter did not come before the House before to-night, so that it could be given the attention and consideration it deserves.

The Bill passed the Committee stage without amendment, and upon the report being received, on motion of Hon. R. K. Bishop the Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a note to that effect.

A message was received from the Assembly informing the Council that they had passed the amendments to the Crown Lands Act, without amendment.

Hon. R. K. Bishop—I beg leave to table the report of the Commission on Public Health.

Hon. John Harvey—The rules being suspended, I ask permission to say a few words in regard to health matters. I hope that next session one matter in connection with public health may come definitely before this House, and that there may be introduced a Bill for the prevention of spitting in public places, churches, street cars, railway trains, passenger steamers, etc. This pernicious practice is very much in vogue among our people, and is spreading disease at a rapid rate. Such does not exist in other communities to the extent it does here. It is unquestionably one of the main causes of our high mortality. I mention the matter now because in this report it is recommended that a formal Act should be passed to deal with the evil. It is not being pressed at this session, because it is thought desirable that such an Act should not be put forward without good notice, so that, if possible, the House and the public may have time for considering its need.

Hon. the President read a message from the House of Assembly saying they had passed the amendments to the Marine Dock Bill without amendment.

Hon. the President announced that His Excellency the Governor would prorogue the session of the Legislative Council to-morrow, at 3 p. m.

On motion of Hon. R.K. Bishop the House adjourned until to-morrow at 2.30.

WEDNESDAY, March 29th.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House met at 2.30 p. m.

At three o'clock His Excellency the Governor appeared, and the members of the House of Assembly were summoned to the Bar by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod. The Speaker presented the bills that had been passed during the session, to all of which His Excellency assented.

His Excellency then read the closing speech (which will be found in the first part of this volume), and prorogued the House until June 29th next.

INDEX

ADDRESS TO KING GEORGE, 3.

ADDRESS IN REPLY—

Motion for, 5.
Committee on, 14.
Draft, 14.
Governor's reply, 15.

ADDRESS, KING'S THANKS FOR, 93.

AYRE RESOLUTIONS, 93.

AGRICULTURE, ENCOURAGEMENT OF, BILL, 97, 103.

ANGEL, HON. J.—

On Explosives Bill, 21, 22.
On Peat, Manufacture of, Bill, 26.
On Cold Storage Bill, 78.
On Agriculture, Encouragement of, Bill, 82, 92.
On Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 121, 122, 131.

BEAVER BILL, 93, 97, 104, 109.

BOILER INSPECTION BILL, 135.

BISHOP, HON. R. K.—

On Address to King George, 3.
On Explosives Bill, 16, 17, 23, 92.
On Peat, Manufacture of, Bill, 24, 25, 27, 28.
On Smelting of Copper Bill, 28.
On Coronation Celebration, 31.
On Cold Storage Bill, 32, 63, 75, 78.
On Esquimaux, Deportation of, Bill, 79, 81.
On Sale of Seeds Bill, 80, 81.
On Education Bill, 82.
On Forest Fires Bill, 93, 97, 103.
On Crown Lands Bill, 99, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 112, 114, 116.
On Old Age Pensions Bill, 102.
On Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 129.

On Public Service Bill, 134.
On Inflammable Oils Bill, 134.
On Medical Bill, 135.

COLD STORAGE BILL, 30, 32.

CORONATION CELEBRATION, 30, 31.

CROWN LANDS BILL, 92, 99, 104, 105, 111, 112.

COASTAL MAIL SERVICE BILL, 111, 112.

DIRECT U. S. CABLE CO. BILL, 109, 110, 112.

EXPLOSIVES BILL, 15, 17, 25, 91, 93, 97.

ESQUIMAUX, DEPORTATION OF, BILL, 47, 79, 81.

EDUCATION BILL, 81, 82, 93, 97.

FOREST FIRES BILL, 93, 97, 103, 109.

FIRE PATROL BILL, 109, 110, 112.

GAME AND INLAND FISHERY BILL, 109.

GIBBS, HON. M. P.—

On Explosives Bill, 19, 20.
On Peat, Manufacture of, Bill, 26.
On Potato Canker Bill, 29.
On Cold Storage Bill, 48, 76.
On Sale of Seeds Bill, 81.
On Municipal Bill, 94, 97, 98, 104.
On Crown Lands Bill, 113, 115, 116.
On Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 123, 130.

GREENE, HON. D. J.—

On Explosives Bill, 17, 20, 23.
On Peat, Manufacture of, Bill, 26, 27.
On Cold Storage Bill, 107, 108, 114, 116.
On Marine Insurance Bill, 110.
On Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 120, 121, 131.

HARVEY, HON. J.—

On Address to King George, 4.
On Explosives Bill, 17, 22.
On Peat, Manufacture of, Bill, 25.
On Coronation Celebration, 31.

On Cold Storage Bill, 36, 65, 74, 75, 77.
On Sale of Seeds Bill, 81.
On Education Bill, 82.
On Municipal Bill, 98.
On Crown Lands Bill, 100, 104, 106, 107, 112, 113, 117.
On Forest Fires Bill, 103.
On Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 122, 131.
On Public Service Bill, 132.

HARRIS, HON. J.—

On Address in Reply, 5.
On Coronation Celebration, 31.
On Cold Storage Bill, 61.
On Municipal Bill, 98.
On Pilots and Pilotage Bill, 109.
On Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 131.
On Public Service Bill, 134.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, 14, 24.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS BILL, 117.

INFLAMMABLE OILS BILL, 134.

LOAN BILL, 112.

MOTOR VEHICLE BILL, 92, 94, 97, 103.

MUNICIPAL BILL, 92, 94, 98, 104, 109.

MARINE INSURANCE BILL, 110, 112.

MARINE RAILWAY DOCK BILL, 134.

MEDICAL BILL, 135.

OLD AGE PENSIONS BILL, 97, 102, 109, 111.

PEAT, MANUFACTURE OF, BILL, 16, 24, 25, 28, 80.

POTATO CANKER BILL, 24, 28, 29, 31.

PEAT BOUNTY BILL, 96, 97.

PILOTS AND PILOTAGE BILL, 97, 109, 111.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL, 132.

PRESIDENT (SIR EDWARD SHEA)—
On Coronation Celebration, 31.

QUESTIONS—
Hon. J. Harvey, 110.
Hon. D. J. Greene, 110.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL, 92, 94, 97, 103.

REVENUE BILL, 132.

ROBINSON, HON. J. A.—
On Address in Reply,
On Cold Storage Bill, 72, 78.
On Esquimaux, Deportation of, Bill, 79, 81.
On Education Bill, 82.
On Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 117, 131.
On Public Service Bill, 133.
On Medical Bill, 135.

RYAN, HON. J. D.—
On Peat, Manufacture of, Bill, 27.

SELECT COMMITTEES—
On Address in Reply, 14.

SMELTING OF COPPER BILL, 24, 28, 29, 31.

SALE OF SEEDS BILL, 80, 81.

SUSPENSION OF RULES, 111.

SKELTON, HON. G.—
On Beaver Bill, 97.

WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH CO. BILL, 109, 110.